NATIONAL QUALITY ASSURANCE AGENCY
FOR EDUCATION

UNDER THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE PRESIDENT
OF THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN

MANUAL

ON PREPARATION OF DOCTORAL (PHD AND DSC) PROGRAMS FOR

SPECIAL STATE ACCREDITATION

www.nqaae.uz

National Agency for Education Quality Assurance
under the Administration of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan

MANUAL

on Preparation of Doctoral (PhD and DSc) Programs for Special State Accreditation

Tashkent-2026

This manual was developed by the National Agency for Education Quality Assurance under the Administration of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan and contains methodological recommendations for the effective organization of internal (self-) assessment of educational programs during the process of special state accreditation in state and non-state higher education and scientific organizations operating in the territory of the Republic of Uzbekistan, regardless of their departmental affiliation and organizational and legal form.

The manual covers theoretical and practical recommendations for assessing the compliance of postgraduate education programs implemented and in operation in higher education and scientific organizations implementing postgraduate education with state educational standards and accreditation criteria, as well as for their improvement and adaptation to international standards.

The manual describes the procedure for analyzing postgraduate educational programs in terms of special state accreditation assessment areas, criteria and indicators, generating the necessary information, and identifying evidence and documents substantiating the assessment results.

This manual serves as a practical and methodological resource for heads of higher education and scientific organizations implementing postgraduate education, heads of education quality assurance departments, and scientific supervisors (consultants) in preparing educational programs for special state accreditation.

This manual is advisory in nature and is periodically updated based on proposals and feedback from higher education institutions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acronyms used

Abbreviations	Contents
IRC	Information Resource Center
ICT	Information and Communication Technologies
DTS	State Educational Standard
HEMIS	Higher Education Process Management Information System
LMS	Learning Management System

INTRODUCTION

This manual was developed based on the tasks set out in the Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan “On additional measures to ensure the quality of education and improve the system of providing educational services” No. PF-76 dated May 5, 2025 and the Regulation approved by the Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers “On the introduction of a system of comprehensive and special state accreditation of organizations providing secondary specialized, vocational, higher and postgraduate education, as well as retraining and advanced training of personnel” No. 498 dated August 6, 2025.

The manual contains methodological recommendations for the effective organization of internal (self-) assessment in the process of special state accreditation of educational programs in educational organizations.

The manual also contains methodological recommendations for providing relevant information on indicators approved by Order No. 6 of the Director of the National Agency for Education Quality Assurance under the Administration of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan dated December 22, 2025 "On approval of indicators for assessment criteria for comprehensive and special state accreditation of higher education and scientific organizations providing postgraduate education" (registration number: 3748).

The manual provides methodological assistance in organizing the process of special state accreditation of educational programs based on unified requirements, clearly defining the assessment areas, criteria and necessary documents, and in correctly formulating an internal (self-) assessment report, collecting supporting documents and effectively preparing for the external assessment process.

Adherence to unified approaches to preparing an internal assessment report increases and facilitates the work of the educational organization and expert commissions for external assessment.

The purpose of conducting an internal assessment process is to conduct a comprehensive and in-depth analysis of educational programs, which will be used to further improve their effectiveness. During the internal assessment process, an analytical and critical assessment of the educational program is carried out.

The internal assessment report is prepared in the form of an analytical report consisting of sections and chapters devoted to analyzing data in accordance with the relevant assessment areas and criteria.

The internal assessment report of the educational program is used by expert commissions during the external assessment process to obtain complete information and assess quality.

In order to prepare an internal evaluation report, an educational organization may form a working group consisting of the administration, academic supervisors (consultants), at least one representative of the student, as well as representatives of employers and (or) social partners, and conduct the evaluation.

When preparing an internal evaluation report, attention should be paid to the following:

- forming the report in the sequence specified in this manual;
- substantiating each document and information provided clearly, intelligibly and with evidence;
- adhering to the rules and requirements of the state language;
- using words and terms widely used in official communication;
- clearly indicating prospective plans, projects and expected results;
- including brief, clear and evidence-based analytical information on each evaluation criterion and indicator.

The National Agency for Quality Assurance in Education under the Administration of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan (hereinafter referred to as the Agency) is a specially authorized body for conducting state accreditation.

BASIC CONCEPTS AND TERMS

When forming documents related to special state accreditation of educational programs, it is mandatory to use the basic concepts and terms established in the Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan "On Education" (23.09.2020, No. O‘RQ-637), subordinate legislation, and relevant regulatory legal acts.

Also, the formation of an internal assessment report for special state accreditation is carried out on the basis of the regulations approved by the Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers No. 498 dated August 6, 2025, as well as the main concepts and terms used in this manual.

The following concepts and terms are widely used in state accreditation processes:

state accreditation - a process that includes complex or special accreditation aimed at determining the compliance of the activities of an educational organization with state educational standards (requirements) and educational programs;

assessment area - a set of main areas established for assessing quality and efficiency within the framework of state accreditation, covering areas such as management, research quality, the research process, human resources, research activities, material and technical base;

criterion - a set of minimum requirements and standards for quality in a specific assessment area;

indicator - an indicator that confirms the fulfillment of the established criterion with specific, measurable and substantiated evidence;

internal evaluation report - a document prepared by an educational organization in preparation for state accreditation of each educational program, which provides analysis, evidence, and conclusions on the educational program's compliance with the assessment guidelines, criteria, and indicators;

educational organization - a higher education and scientific organization that provides postgraduate education;

substantiating evidence - documents, data, statistics, processes, decisions, photo/video materials or other specific grounds related to criteria or indicators.

FORMALIZATION OF APPLICATION FOR SPECIAL STATE ACCREDITATION

Applications for special state accreditation are accepted electronically through the Agency's information system for state accreditation and rating of educational organizations **"accreditation.nqaae.uz"**.

Applications for special state accreditation of educational programs are accepted annually from **October 1 to January 31 of the following year** to begin their activities in the next academic year.

Outside this period, special state accreditation is conducted upon the application of the educational organization, under the terms of a contract concluded with the Agency, and subject to an increased fee.

The formation of an application for state accreditation, submission of additional documents and their consideration are carried out in accordance with the procedure established by the Regulation approved by Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers No. 498 of August 6, 2025.

When conducting special state accreditation of educational programs, the representative of the educational organization (applicant) is responsible for submitting an application based on the established requirements, paying fees within the established deadlines, drawing up an agreement between the Agency and the educational organization, creating the necessary conditions for the on-site activities of the expert commission and the adoption of a decision by the Accreditation Commission, as well as submitting information within the established deadlines.

FORMATION OF THE INTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT

The internal evaluation report prepared by the educational organization analyzes and evaluates the real state of the educational program based on the criteria for state accreditation, based on evidence, and determines measures for its improvement. The information provided in it is used by expert commissions in the processes of external evaluation of educational programs.

The internal evaluation report is prepared to assess the compliance of the educational program with state educational standards and accreditation criteria, identify its strengths and areas for improvement, formulate conclusions and proposals aimed at continuously improving the quality of education, as well as create a reliable evidence base for special state accreditation.

In order to ensure strict compliance with the accreditation guidelines, criteria and indicators, the report must comply with the current special state accreditation assessment structure. In this case, the current situation, evidence, conclusions and improvement measures for each indicator must be clearly described.

IMPORTANT:

When correctly formulating an internal assessment report, it is necessary to enter accurate and substantiated information using the questions and supporting evidence(s) recommended in this manual under the heading "Educational Program Assessment Guidelines, Criteria and Indicators".

Also, the entered information and supporting documents must be uploaded to the platform in electronic form.

General information not confirmed by supporting evidence(s) in the internal assessment report will not be accepted as a report.

It is necessary to ensure that each assessment conclusion is based on an analysis of official documents, statistical data, reports, survey results and feedback (evidence-based approach).

In order to ensure the fairness and critical approach of the report, it should reflect the real situation, be free from artificial overestimation, clearly and precisely indicate shortcomings, analyze their causes, and propose specific solutions.

It is advisable to formulate the report in accordance with national and international standards, based on state educational standards, national qualifications framework, accreditation criteria and international approaches.

Learning outcomes should be specific, measurable and verifiable, and inextricably linked to the needs of the labor market.

In order to ensure the relevance of the information provided in the report, the opinions of researchers, academic supervisors (consultants), employers and other interested parties must be taken into account.

The report is approved by the head of the educational organization, stored in electronic (if necessary, paper) form and submitted to the Agency in a ready-made form via the platform.

ASSESSMENT DIRECTION, CALCULATION OF RESULTS BY CRITERIA AND INDICATORS

Assessment criteria are divided into mandatory and general indicators and are assessed as “compliant” or “non-compliant”.

If a mandatory indicator (one of the mandatory indicators) in the criteria is found to be “non-compliant”, then, regardless of the overall result, this criterion is assessed as “non-compliant”.

External assessment criteria are divided into mandatory and general criteria, and each criterion is assessed as “compliant”, “partially compliant” or “non-compliant”.

External assessment criteria are determined according to mandatory and general indicators in the following order:

if **70 percent or more** of the indicators are assessed as “compliant” - the criterion is “compliant”;

If **50 to 70 percent** of the indicators are assessed as “compliant” — the criterion is assessed as “partially compliant”;

if up to 50 percent of the indicators are assessed as “compliant” — the criterion is assessed as “not compliant”.

The curriculum is assessed by the expert commission according to each assessment direction.

Each assessment direction is recognized as “compliant” or “not compliant”. In this case, each assessment direction is assessed as “compliant” if the following conditions are met:

when all mandatory criteria are assessed as “compliant”;

when two or more of the general criteria are assessed as “partially compliant”;

when there are no criteria assessed as “non-compliant”.

When each assessment direction is recognized as “compliant” by the Accreditation Commission, a decision is made that this educational program “passed state accreditation”, and when it is recognized as “non-compliant”, a decision is made that “did not pass state accreditation”.

REVIEW OF INTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT

Expert commissions are established by the Agency for external assessment of the quality of education. Expert commissions are formed based on the nature of the specialties.

The composition of the expert commissions is formed from among scientific leaders (consultants) and management staff of educational organizations, leading scientists of research institutes, responsible employees of republican and local executive authorities, specialists of relevant production organizations, representatives of non-governmental non-profit organizations and researchers. Foreign experts are involved in the composition of the expert commissions.

The tasks of the expert commissions are as follows:

to conduct an examination of the data obtained according to the results of the internal assessment and to conduct an external assessment;

to assess the compliance of the educational program with state educational standards (requirements), accreditation criteria and educational programs;

to make proposals for improving the quality of education and improving educational services, and to prepare a report on the results of the external assessment and submit it to the Accreditation Commission.

The internal assessment report is formed based on the **sample provided in the appendix to this manual**.

The educational organization submits the report and related materials formed as a result of the internal assessment to the Agency via the platform, approved in electronic and (or) paper form, at least **one month before** the start of the external assessment.

Expert commissions study the internal evaluation report and use it in the external evaluation process. The special state accreditation of an educational program is carried out by an expert commission on-site within a period of no more than **five working days**.

The identification of untrue information in the internal evaluation report during the external evaluation process, as well as the failure to submit documents or eliminate deficiencies within the established deadlines, shall be grounds for not conducting state accreditation.

The initial report is prepared by the expert commission **within fifteen working days** based on the results of the external evaluation, and its conclusion is submitted to the educational organization through the Agency.

The educational organization officially submits its substantiated proposals and objections to the conclusion of the initial report to the Agency **within three working days**. Based on these proposals and objections, the expert commission prepares a final report **within three working days**.

The expert commission prepares a separate report for each educational program in special state accreditation.

Based on the internal evaluation report submitted by the educational organization, the expert commission may conduct an external evaluation remotely without visiting the site.

CURRICULUM EVALUATION DIRECTIONS, CRITERIA AND INDICATORS

Within the framework of **6 assessment area**s of special state accreditation of educational programs, there are **26 criter**ia an**d 134 indicat**ors describing them.

Since special state accreditation is carried out for newly established educational programs, as well as for existing educational programs, certain indicators are applied only for existing educational programs.

In this manual, mandatory criteria are marked with a ❗symbol, mandatory indicators are marked with a symbol *, and indicators used only for existing educational programs are marked with a symbol **.

I. Organizational and management and quality assurance area

Note: *Activities aimed at the effective implementation of the postgraduate education program, ensuring financial stability, and systematically improving the doctoral education program in accordance with the needs of the labor market through internal quality assurance are evaluated.*

1. CRITERION: The existence of a structural unit for the implementation of the educational program and mechanisms for its effective functioning ❗

Note: *The organization of the activities of the relevant structural units for the implementation of the postgraduate educational program, the clear definition of their tasks and functions, and the establishment of internal management mechanisms that ensure the effectiveness of activities are assessed*

1.1. INDICATOR

There is a relevant decision of the coordinating collegial body (scientific council, council, scientific and technical council, scientific and coordinating council, etc.) (hereinafter referred to as the Collegial Body) of a higher education and/or scientific organization (hereinafter referred to as the educational organization) on the feasibility of implementing a postgraduate educational program (hereinafter referred to as the educational program)

Supporting questions:

❖ *When and on the basis of what document was the official decision made by the Collegial Body on the implementation of the educational program?*

❖ *On what grounds (labor market needs, scientific potential, material and technical base, etc.) is the feasibility of the educational program justified in this decision?*

❖ *Is the decision formalized in the prescribed manner and stored in the relevant document base of the educational organization?*

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *minutes of the decision of the collegial body on the introduction (implementation) of the educational program;*

✓ *order of the rector/director on the implementation of the decision*

1.2. INDICATOR

There are clear plans for the organization of a structural unit (department, division) (hereinafter referred to as the structural unit) responsible for the implementation of the educational program and for providing it with material and technical resources and financial resources*

Supporting questions:

❖ *How is the process of organizing the structural unit planned and how are its tasks defined?*

❖ *What specific measures, stages and mechanisms have been developed to provide the structural unit with a material and technical base?*

❖ *In what order is the necessary financial resources allocated to the structural unit and how is the financing plan for this process formed?*

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *Order on the organization of the structural unit (department or department) (or an extract from the decision of the collegial body);*

✓ *A specific plan for providing the structural unit with material and technical base and financial resources;*

✓ *Relevant tables.*

1.3. INDICATOR

The powers, tasks and functions of the structural unit are clearly defined in accordance with the goals set within the framework of the educational program and are aimed at the effective implementation of the educational program

Supporting questions:

❖ *How are the powers, tasks and functions of the structural unit defined and how are they linked to the goals of the educational program?*

❖ *How does the activity of the structural unit contribute to the effective implementation of the educational program and through what mechanisms is this process ensured?*

❖ *How is the compliance of the powers and duties of the structural unit with the goals of the educational program regularly reviewed and updated?*

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *charter(s) of the structural unit.*

1.4. INDICATOR

The structural unit is provided with material and technical resources, financial and human resources for the effective implementation of the educational program, and the work plans of the structural unit are developed**

Supporting questions:

❖ *What material and technical base, financial and human resources are allocated for the effective implementation of the educational program of the structural unit and how is their adequacy assessed?*

❖ *In what order are the work plans of the structural unit developed, approved and linked to the goals of the educational program?*

❖ *Through what mechanisms are resource management and their effective use ensured and how is this process monitored?*

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *work plan of the structural unit;*

✓ *Information on material and technical, financial and human resources;*

✓ *Relevant tables.*

1.5. INDICATOR

The activities of the structural unit are consistent with the goals and expected learning outcomes of the educational organization and the educational program**

Supporting questions:

❖ *How are the activities of the structural unit consistent with the general goals of the higher educational organization and the expected learning outcomes of the educational program?*

❖ *How do the work processes and initiatives implemented by the structural unit affect the achievement of learning outcomes?*

❖ *What monitoring mechanisms or review processes are in place to regularly assess the alignment of activities with objectives and learning outcomes?*

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *Department's (department's) annual work plan. Minutes and/or reports.*

1.6. INDICATOR

The activities of the structural unit are systematically reviewed through regular monitoring and analysis**

Supporting questions:

❖ *How is the monitoring of the activities of the structural unit carried out and what indicators are used in the monitoring process?*

❖ *How is data collected and processed for regular analysis, and what methods are used to assess the effectiveness of activities?*

❖ *Based on the results of monitoring and analysis, what measures are determined to improve the activities of the structural unit?*

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *Internal analysis materials (SWOT analysis, monitoring conclusions, Council decisions).*

1.7. INDICATOR

Measures are taken to improve the activities of the structural unit based on the results of monitoring and analysis**

Supporting questions:

❖ *Based on the results of monitoring and analysis, what measures are determined to improve the activities of the structural unit and what are the criteria for selecting them?*

❖ *In what order are the identified measures implemented and how are those responsible for their implementation and deadlines determined?*

❖ *How is the effectiveness of the measures taken assessed and how does the mechanism for revising them if necessary work?*

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *Activity improvement plan and document(s) confirming that its implementation is ensured.*

CRITERION 2: Existence of a three-year perspective plan (hereinafter referred to as the perspective plan) for the development and financial sustainability of the educational program

Note: *The activity is evaluated in order to develop and ensure the financial sustainability of the educational program, covering the areas of education quality, human resources, infrastructure, digitalization, international cooperation and financial support, with established goals and evaluation criteria, financial sources indicated and implementation controlled through internal monitoring.*

2.1. INDICATOR

The prospective plan is developed and is consistent with the strategic plan (mission, strategy) of the educational organization

Supporting questions:

❖ *In what order was the prospective plan developed and how are its main goals aligned with the mission and strategic plan of the educational organization?*

❖ *How do the priority areas and expected results in the prospective plan contribute to the implementation of the goals of the strategic plan?*

❖ *What mechanisms are used to review, update and monitor the prospective plan to ensure its consistency with strategic documents?*

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *3-year prospective development plan of the educational program (certified copy)*

2.2. INDICATOR

The long-term plan covers the areas of research quality, human resources, infrastructure, digitalization, international cooperation, and financial sustainability

Supporting questions:

❖ *On what basis and analysis are the areas of education quality, human resources, infrastructure, digitalization, international cooperation and financial stability determined in the long-term plan?*

❖ *How do the goals and objectives planned for each area affect the overall development of the educational organization?*

❖ *How is the implementation of measures implemented in these areas monitored and how is the long-term plan updated based on the results?*

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *Structural tables reflecting goals, objectives and expected results in the areas*

2.3. INDICATOR

The educational organization has the material and technical base, financial and human resources to implement the long-term plan

Supporting questions:

❖ *How are the necessary material and technical base, financial and human resources for the implementation of the long-term plan determined and how is their adequacy assessed?*

❖ *How are these resources distributed according to the priority areas of the plan and what are the mechanisms for ensuring their effective use?*

❖ *How is the availability and use of resources monitored and, if necessary, what measures are taken to optimize resources?*

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *3-year prospective development plan for the educational program (certified copy)*

2.4. INDICATOR

There is a risk analysis that affects the implementation of the tasks set in the prospective plan, and alternative measures to eliminate these risks have been identified

Supporting questions:

❖ *How were the risks that may affect the implementation of the tasks identified in the prospective plan identified and what analysis methods were used to assess them?*

❖ *What alternative measures have been developed to reduce or eliminate the identified risks, and under what conditions are they to be used?*

❖ *How are mechanisms for monitoring risks and, if necessary, initiating alternative measures established?*

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *A risk analysis mechanism and alternative measures that affect the implementation of the tasks set in the prospective plan established.*

2.5. INDICATOR

A monitoring and analysis system for the implementation of the prospective plan has been established**

Supporting questions:

❖ *How is monitoring of the implementation of the prospective plan organized, and what indicators are used in the monitoring process?*

❖ *How is information on the implementation of the plan collected, analyzed, and what decisions are made based on the results?*

❖ *How will the forward-looking plan be updated or improved based on the results of monitoring and analysis?*

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *Internal analysis materials (SWOT analysis, monitoring conclusions, Council decisions) and supporting documents.*

2.6. INDICATOR

If necessary, the results of monitoring and analysis require appropriate changes to the prospective plan**

Supporting questions:

❖ *What is the procedure for making changes to the prospective plan based on the results of monitoring and analysis, and who approves this procedure?*

❖ *How is the appropriateness of the changes made to the plan assessed and how do they affect the strategic goals of the educational organization?*

❖ *How is their implementation monitored after the changes are introduced, and how does the mechanism for making additional adjustments work if necessary?*

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *Decisions on updating or improving the plan (council or working group minutes).*

3. CRITERION: The presence of an internal quality assurance mechanism within the educational program and the participation of stakeholders in these processes

Note: *The educational program is assessed for the presence and effective functioning of the quality assurance system, the establishment of program monitoring and evaluation procedures, and the improvement of the postgraduate education program based on stakeholder feedback.*

3.1. INDICATOR

Internal documents on internal quality assurance within the framework of the educational program, including procedures (rules), are developed in accordance with the goals set out in the strategic plan (mission, strategy) of the educational organization and the institutional quality assurance policy, approved and are open to the public

Supporting questions:

❖ *In what order were internal documents (procedures/rules) on internal quality assurance developed and how were they aligned with the strategic plan, mission and institutional quality policy of the higher educational organization?*

❖ *By whom and through what process were these documents approved, and how were the opinions of interested parties taken into account during approval?*

❖ *In what form were internal documents made public and what mechanisms were established for their open presentation?*

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *Internal documents on internal quality assurance.*

3.2. INDICATOR

There is a procedure (rules) for regular monitoring, analysis and revision of the educational program

Supporting questions:

❖ *What documents establish the procedure for regular monitoring, analysis and revision of the educational program and what are the main stages of this procedure?*

❖ *What information is collected during the monitoring and analysis process, who participates, and by what methods are the results evaluated?*

❖ *How is the process of making changes to the educational program based on the results of the analysis carried out and how is its effectiveness monitored?*

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *Internal documents on internal quality assurance.*

3.3. INDICATOR

There is a mechanism for taking into account the opinions of researchers, academic supervisors (consultants), employers, industry experts and graduates (hereinafter referred to as stakeholders) in the development and improvement of the educational program**

Supporting questions:

❖ *What mechanisms (surveys, dialogues, advisory councils, etc.) have been established to collect feedback from stakeholders in the process of developing and improving the educational program?*

❖ *How is the collected feedback analyzed and by what methods is it taken into account when making appropriate changes to the educational program?*

❖ *How are stakeholders regularly informed about changes made as a result of their suggestions and opinions?*

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *Internal documents on internal quality assurance.*

3.4. INDICATOR

Measures to improve the training program are developed based on stakeholder feedback**

Supporting questions:

❖ *How is feedback from stakeholders analyzed and based on what criteria are measures selected to improve the training program?*

❖ *How are the identified measures implemented, who is responsible for them and how are the deadlines determined?*

❖ *How is the impact of the implemented measures on improving the educational program assessed and how is the process of introducing additional changes organized if necessary?*

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *Action plan for improving the educational program based on an analysis of stakeholder opinions (Table 7).*

3.5. INDICATOR

The effectiveness of the measures implemented within the internal quality assurance system is regularly assessed**

Supporting questions:

❖ *What approaches are used to assess the effectiveness of the measures implemented within the internal quality assurance system?*

❖ *How is the assessment process carried out, who participates in it and how is the data collected and analyzed?*

❖ *What decisions are made to improve or update the measures based on the assessment results and how is this process monitored?*

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *Internal monitoring and evaluation reports.*

CRITERION 4: Availability of a monitoring system to identify the latest trends in the labor market and educational needs, as well as research

Note: *The level of effective use of this information in the processes of regular monitoring of the labor market, educational needs and the latest trends in the field of scientific research, data analysis, communication of the results to researchers, and planning, implementation and improvement of the educational program is studied.*

4.1. INDICATOR

There is a procedure for regular collection, analysis and monitoring of information on the labor market, educational needs and the latest trends in scientific research, and the tasks and functions of the structural unit on these issues are clearly defined

Supporting questions:

❖ *What documents establish the procedure for collecting, analyzing and monitoring information on the labor market, educational needs and the latest trends in scientific research, and what are the main stages of the process?*

❖ *How are the tasks and functions of the structural unit determined in collecting and analyzing this information and how are they implemented in practice?*

❖ *How is the process of improving, updating or making decisions on the basis of the collected data carried out and what is the monitoring mechanism for this process?*

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *Procedure for regularly collecting, analyzing and monitoring data on the latest trends in the labor market, educational needs and research;*

✓ *Results of surveys conducted on the labor market and industry needs;*

✓ *Internal reports confirming the implementation of monitoring and analysis.*

4.2. INDICATOR

The collected data was used in the planning and development of the educational program**

Supporting questions:

❖ *How was the collected data (labor market, educational needs, research trends) integrated into the planning and development process of the educational program?*

❖ *What changes or updates were made to the goals, content and competencies of the educational program based on this data?*

❖ *How is the effectiveness of the use of the collected data assessed and what evidence is there to show that it has affected the program?*

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *Analytical information (report) prepared on the basis of labor market and research trends.*

4.3. INDICATOR

Recent trends in research and the labor market are analyzed and measures to improve the educational program are determined**

Supporting questions:

❖ *In what order are the results of the analysis and monitoring reviewed and on what criteria are measures to improve the educational program determined?*

❖ *At what stages are the identified measures implemented and who is responsible for their implementation?*

❖ *How is the effectiveness of improvement measures monitored and how is the process of introducing additional changes organized if necessary?*

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *The plan for improving the educational program and its implementation are ensured.*

4.4. INDICATOR

Based on the results of analysis and monitoring and the results of the implementation of the established measures, the necessary changes are made to the educational program**

Supporting questions:

❖ *How are the results of analysis and monitoring and the results of the implemented measures evaluated and how is the need for changes to the educational program determined?*

❖ *By what process are changes to the educational program developed, coordinated and approved?*

❖ *How is the effectiveness of the changes made monitored and how does the mechanism for introducing additional improvements work if necessary?*

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *Analytical materials on the educational program (monitoring conclusions, Council decisions) and supporting documents*

4.5. INDICATOR

Data collected on educational needs and recent research trends are openly published for use by stakeholders**

Supporting questions:

❖ *In what form (reports, infographics, newsletters, etc.) is the data collected on educational needs and recent research trends prepared and what is the publication process?*

❖ *On which platforms (website, portal, information stands, etc.) is this data openly presented for use by stakeholders?*

❖ *How will the effectiveness of the use of published information by stakeholders be assessed and how will the mechanisms for providing information be improved if necessary?*

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *A collection of open information announcements on labor market and research (educational) needs (link/screenshot).*

5. CRITERION: Implementation of mechanisms for monitoring and improving the effectiveness of the educational program

Note: *The mechanism for conducting surveys on the effectiveness of the educational program, analyzing the results, making appropriate changes to the program, and informing applicants about the measures taken is assessed.*

5.1. INDICATOR

The procedure for conducting surveys (interviews, discussions, and other activities aimed at studying the opinions of the applicants) on educational programs is established among applicants and leading experts in the field

Supporting questions:

❖ *What documents establish the procedure for conducting surveys, interviews, and discussions on educational programs among applicants and leading experts in the field, and what are the main stages of the process?*

❖ *What methods are used in surveys and discussions, how is the data collected, and how is its reliability ensured?*

❖ *How are the opinions obtained analyzed and used in making decisions to improve the educational program?*

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *Procedure and regulations for conducting surveys.*

5.2. INDICATOR

Questionnaires cover questions (issues) related to the quality of the organizational-administrative, educational and scientific processes of the educational program

Supporting questions:

❖ *On what criteria are the questions determined regarding the quality of the organizational-administrative and research processes of the educational program?*

❖ *What methods are used to ensure that the content of the auxiliary questions of the questionnaire reflects the real experience of the respondents in the research process and management?*

❖ *In what order are the responses analyzed to improve the organizational and research processes of the educational program and what decisions are made based on the results?*

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *Questionnaire forms and sample questionnaire.*

5.3. INDICATOR

Questionnaire questions (issues) and the conduct processes are scientifically and methodologically based**

Supporting questions:

❖ *What scientific and methodological approaches (methods for assessing the quality of education, empirical research criteria, etc.) are used in formulating the auxiliary questions of the questionnaire and how are they based?*

❖ *How is the process of conducting the survey (selection of respondents, ensuring anonymity, sequence of auxiliary questions, measurement scales) scientifically and methodologically justified?*

❖ *What scientific and methodological methods are used in processing and analyzing the collected data, and how do they ensure the reliability and objectivity of the results?*

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *scientific and methodological basis (instructions, explanatory note) describing the methodology of the questionnaire;*

✓ *protocol of the collegial body or expert opinion indicating the approval of the questionnaire tools*

5.4. INDICATOR

Measures to eliminate problems have been developed based on the results of the questionnaire**

Supporting questions:

❖ *In what order are the identified problems analyzed and on what criteria are measures to eliminate them determined?*

❖ *Within what timeframe and by whom will the specified measures be implemented and how will their implementation be monitored?*

❖ *How will the effectiveness of the measures taken be assessed and how will the process of developing additional measures be organized if necessary?*

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *A plan of measures developed based on the results of the questionnaire.*

5.5. INDICATOR

Based on the results of the analysis and the results of the implemented measures, the necessary changes are made to the educational program**

Supporting questions:

❖ *In what order are the results of the analysis and the results of the implemented measures reviewed and how is the need for changes to the educational program determined?*

❖ *Through what process are changes to the educational program developed, coordinated and approved?*

❖ *How is the impact of the changes monitored and how does the mechanism for determining additional improvement measures work if necessary?*

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *Information on changes made to the training program and updated training program.*

5.6. INDICATOR

Applicants are informed about the results of the survey and the work done on them**

Supporting questions:

❖ *In what form (meetings, announcements, e-mail, platforms) are applicants informed about the results of the survey and how is this process defined?*

❖ *How are the measures taken based on the survey results communicated to applicants and how are their transparency ensured?*

❖ *What mechanisms are in place to increase the awareness of applicants and make the process of expressing their opinions more effective?*

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *Information provided to applicants about the results of the survey and the work done on them (announcements, newsletters, website information).*

II. Educational program orientation

Note: *The development and approval of educational programs is an activity that is evaluated in accordance with the established procedure, their compliance with the national qualifications framework, professional standards, state and international requirements, their content is in line with national priorities and labor market needs, and their effectiveness is regularly monitored.*

6. CRITERION: The educational program is developed in accordance with the established procedure with the participation of stakeholders. This includes the definition of the purpose and results of the educational program, compliance with the requirements of the labor market, state educational requirements and the National Qualifications Framework (hereinafter referred to as the NQF)

Note: *It is assessed whether the educational program is developed in accordance with the established procedure, with the participation of stakeholders, employers and industry experts, and is formulated in accordance with the requirements of the National Qualifications Framework, as well as its formal approval.*

6.1. INDICATOR

There is a procedure for the development, approval and revision of the educational program

Supporting questions:

❖ *How is the process of developing, approving and revising the educational program carried out?*

❖ *How are the opinions of researchers, academic supervisors (consultants) and employers involved in the development of the educational program?*

❖ *Is the approved educational program publicly available to the public and stakeholders?*

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *Procedure for the development and approval of the educational program.*

6.2. INDICATOR

The participation of employers, industry experts, and academic supervisors (consultants) in the development of the educational program is ensured, and this process is systematically established

Supporting questions:

❖ *How is the participation of employers, industry experts, and academic supervisors (consultants) in the development of the* educational *program ensured?*

❖ *Is there documentation that this process is being carried out systematically?*

❖ *How are the suggestions and feedback of the participants collected, processed and taken into account?*

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *Documentation confirming the participation of stakeholders.*

6.3. INDICATOR

The goals, expected scientific results and competencies of the educational program are clearly defined and are closely interconnected

Supporting questions:

❖ *In what documents or materials are the goals, expected scientific results and competencies expressed in the educational program?*

❖ *How is the interrelationship and compatibility of these elements confirmed or assessed?*

❖ *How is it ensured that the researcher and scientific supervisor (consultant) understand and are aware of these goals and results?*

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *The educational program and its section reflecting the goals, results and competencies.*

6.4. INDICATOR

The goals and expected scientific results of the educational program are developed in accordance with the MMR, state educational requirements, professional standard(s) and (or) international educational standards

Supporting questions:

❖ *With which documents (MMR, professional standards, international educational standards) are the goals and expected research results of the* educational *program verified?*

❖ *How do you confirm that these normative and international requirements are communicated to the students?*

❖ *Through what internal monitoring or evaluation process does the educational program verify compliance with these standards?*

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *table of comparison (compliance) of the educational program with the MMR, state educational requirements, professional and/or international educational standards.*

6.5. INDICATOR

The educational program reflects relevant scientific, theoretical and practical knowledge in the field

Supporting questions:

❖ *On the basis of which documents or standards are the qualification(s) awarded at the end of the* educational program *determined?*

❖ *How is it confirmed that these qualifications have been delivered to the applicants during the program?*

❖ *What monitoring or evaluation mechanism is in place to verify that the qualification(s) awarded at the end of the educational program comply with the established standards?*

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *educational program and qualifications awarded at its end.*

6.6. INDICATOR

The goals and expected scientific results of the educational program are developed in accordance with the strategic plan (mission, strategy) and academic profile of the educational organization

Supporting questions:

❖ *What documents confirm that the goals and expected scientific results of the educational program are aligned with the strategic plan and academic profile of the educational organization?*

❖ *Who (e.g. employers, industry experts) was involved in developing these goals and outcomes?*

❖ *Are the goals and expected academic outcomes of the educational program regularly reviewed for compliance with the strategic plan and updated based on the results?*

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *3-year prospective development plan for the educational program (certified copy)*

✓ *Educational program.*

7. CRITERION: Annual priorities for the development of the educational program are developed, key performance indicators (KPIs), necessary resources and responsibilities are provided

Note: *It is assessed whether clear priorities for the improvement and development of educational programs are determined, and target tasks and performance indicators for their implementation are systematically organized.*

7.1. INDICATOR

Annual priorities for the development of the educational program are developed as an official document (plan or program

Supporting questions:

❖ *How were the annual priorities for the development of the educational program developed as an official document (plan or program)?*

❖ *Is there an internal monitoring or expert assessment mechanism to assess the compliance of the content and objectives of the educational program with the priorities?*

❖ *Is stakeholder feedback systematically collected on the compliance of the educational program with strategic goals?*

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *Document(s) justifying the approval of the educational program.*

7.2. INDICATOR

Clear goals and objectives are set for annual priorities

Supporting questions:

❖ *What annual priorities are set for the development of the* educational *program?*

❖ *What goals and objectives are set for the annual priorities?*

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *Annual priorities for the development of the educational program.*

7.3. INDICATOR

Performance indicators (KPIs) have been developed for specific goals and objectives in annual priority areas

Supporting questions:

❖ *Are specific goals and objectives for the priority scientific areas set for the year set in official documents?*

❖ *Have measurable, specific and time-bound KPIs been developed?*

❖ *Is the implementation of KPIs regularly monitored and management decisions made based on the results of the analysis?*

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *Approved KPI table(s) (with units of measurement, target values).*

7.4. INDICATOR

The results of annual activities on the development of the educational program have been analyzed and proposals and recommendations for the next year have been formulated**

Supporting questions:

❖ *Have the results of activities on the development of the educational program in previous years been formally analyzed?*

❖ *Based on the results of the analysis, have specific proposals and recommendations for the next year been developed and approved by relevant decisions?*

❖ *Have the formulated proposals and recommendations been practically taken into account in the next year's educational program, curricula or roadmaps?*

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *annual analytical report on the development of the educational program;*

✓ *conclusion with proposals and recommendations for the next year*

7.5. INDICATOR

Annual reports on the implementation of priorities and KPIs are reviewed and approved by the collegial body of the educational organization**

Supporting questions:

❖ *Does the educational organization have a document confirming the priorities and KPIs for the reporting year? (*

❖ *Has the final report on the implementation of annual priorities and KPIs been developed and discussed at the meeting of the collegial body?*

❖ *Is the fact that this report was officially approved by the decision of the collegial body documented by a protocol or resolution?*

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *protocol of the collegial body on the discussion of the report on the implementation of annual priorities and KPIs;*

✓ *resolution of the collegial body or order of the head confirming the report and results*

8. CRITERION: Admission parameters are formed on the basis of the research and scientific leadership potential of the educational organization, scientific and social needs in society, and labor market analysis

Note: *Admission parameters are determined on the basis of the scientific potential of the higher education and scientific organization, scientific and social needs in society, and the results of labor market analysis, and the human and resource capabilities of the educational institution are assessed when determining admission quotas and areas.*

8.1. INDICATOR

Labor market analysis and forecasting data are used to determine admission parameters (results of previous activities, results of researchers who defended their scientific research work)

Supporting questions:

❖ *Were labor market needs and regional personnel demand analyzed when determining recruitment parameters?*

❖ *Have the results of researchers who defended their research work in previous years been analyzed and taken into account when forming admission parameters?*

❖ *Have the admission quotas been revised based on labor market forecasts, priority areas of science and technology development?*

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *approved version of the analytical information (report) prepared based on labor market needs and forecasts*

8.2. INDICATOR

The potential of candidates of sciences, doctors of philosophy (PhD) and doctors of sciences conducting research in relevant specialties has been analyzed and taken into account when forming admission parameters*

Supporting questions:

❖ *Has a list of PhDs and doctors of sciences been formed and do their scientific areas correspond to the educational programs being accepted?*

❖ *Has the potential of these researchers been analyzed and taken into account when determining admission parameters?*

❖ *Are there official documents confirming that decisions on admission quotas and specialties were approved based on an analysis of scientific potential?*

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *analysis of the potential of candidates of sciences, PhDs and doctors of sciences in relevant specialties (table/list) (Table 8);*

✓ *analytical conclusion justifying the admission parameters, taking into account the possibilities of scientific supervision*

8.3. INDICATOR

The scientific and social needs of society are taken into account when determining the admission parameters

Supporting questions:

❖ *To what extent are admission quotas and areas formed in accordance with the priority scientific-technical, socio-economic development needs of the country?*

❖ *How are the proposals and needs of ministries, sectoral organizations, employers, scientific institutions or regional administrations taken into account?*

❖ *What evidence can be used to justify the fact that the scientific research topics of doctoral students admitted over the past 3 years are aimed at solving urgent problems of society, economy or social spheres?*

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *analytical information on the scientific and social needs of society;*

8.4. INDICATOR

The resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers No. 304 "On measures to further improve the system of postgraduate education" on the formation of admission quotas was followed

Supporting questions:

❖ *Are admission quotas for postgraduate education formed annually in accordance with the procedure established by the Cabinet of Ministers?*

❖ *When forming admission quotas, were scientific potential, the number of scientific supervisors, material and technical base and existing scientific areas taken into account?*

❖ *Were the approved admission quotas agreed with the authorized bodies and approved by an official order or resolution and publicly announced?*

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *internal order on setting admission quotas;*

✓ *correspondence table showing compliance of admission parameters with the requirements of Resolution No. 304*

8.5. INDICATOR

The admission results were analyzed and proposals were developed to improve admission parameters for the next year**

Supporting questions:

❖ *How were the results of admission to postgraduate education analyzed in the reporting year (in terms of planned and actual admission, selection indicators, areas)?*

❖ *What were the problems and limiting factors identified during the admission process (low demand, staffing base, lack of academic supervisors, etc.)?*

❖ *Based on the results of the analysis, what specific proposals have been developed to change or improve the admission parameters (admission quota, specialties, forms) for the next academic year?*

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *analytical information on the results of admission (Table 9);*

✓ *proposals and recommendations for improving the admission parameters for the next year.*

9. CRITERION: The educational program is aimed at ensuring the achievement of the expected research results within the duration specified in the research plan

Note: *It is assessed whether the implementation of scientific and research activities within the framework of the educational program is carried out within the specified deadlines, research goals and objectives are clearly defined, their implementation is monitored, and a planning, evaluation and reporting system is established that ensures the gradual achievement of the expected scientific results.*

9.1. INDICATOR

There is an annual research plan for the implementation of scientific research activities and clearly defined goals and objectives

Supporting questions:

❖ *Does the organization have an annual research plan for the implementation of scientific research activities within the framework of postgraduate education (PhD/DSc) and has it been officially approved?*

❖ *Does the annual research plan set out clear goals, objectives, priority areas and expected results of scientific research activities?*

❖ *Is this annual research plan aligned with the postgraduate education areas, dissertation topics and the strategic scientific development documents of the organization?*

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *An annual research plan for scientific research activities and a description of the research areas that underpin the established goals and objectives*

9.2. INDICATOR

There is a system for monitoring the performance and results of scientific research activities

Supporting questions:

❖ *Does the organization have a separate system, regulation or responsible unit for continuous monitoring of the performance of scientific research (SRI) activities?*

❖ *In what order and with what frequency is the implementation of planned indicators (topics, deadlines, results, publications, patents) for scientific research monitored?*

❖ *Are decisions (reports, orders, protocols) made on improving scientific activities based on the results of monitoring and are they documented?*

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *internal regulations or procedures for monitoring research and development activities and interim/final reports reflecting the monitoring results*

9.3. INDICATOR

Research results formalized in the form of scientific articles, monographs, theses or patents**

Supporting questions:

❖ *How many scientific articles, monographs, theses or patents have been formalized by doctoral students and independent researchers over the past 3 years?*

❖ *Do these scientific results correspond to the scientific areas specified in the dissertation topics and educational programs?*

❖ *Have the scientific results been published in reputable national or international publications or registered as patents in the prescribed manner?*

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *list of scientific articles, monographs, theses or patents (with bibliographic information).*

9.4. INDICATOR

Research results have been implemented (used in science, education, practice or methodological work)**

Supporting questions:

❖ *In which specific area (educational process, production, scientific activity or methodological support) have the research results been implemented?*

❖ *In which organization's activities have these research results been used and what was the form of application?*

❖ *What specific results have been achieved as a result of implementing the research results into practice?*

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *act or certificate on the implementation of research results;*

✓ *document confirming application in practice, methodological manual or contract*

9.5. INDICATOR

Research activities were constantly monitored by scientific supervisors (consultants)**

Supporting questions:

❖ *How often and in what form did the scientific supervisor (consultant) monitor the implementation of the doctoral student's individual work plan?*

❖ *Were the doctoral student's research results (articles, theses, experiments, chapters) reviewed by the scientific supervisor and given a written or oral conclusion?*

❖ *Were specific recommendations given to the doctoral student regarding the shortcomings identified by the scientific supervisor (consultant), and how was their implementation recorded?*

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *reports or conclusions of scientific supervisors (consultants) and individual work plans or meeting minutes reflecting supervision and advice*

9.6. INDICATOR

A department/department or collegial body discussion was held on the results of the research work**

Supporting questions:

❖ *At which department, department or collegial body meeting were the results of the research work discussed and when was the discussion held?*

❖ *What conclusions and recommendations were made on the research results during the discussion?*

❖ *How did the decisions made affect the subsequent stages of the research work (publication, defense, implementation)?*

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *minutes of the meeting of the department/department or collegial body and a conclusion on the results of the discussion (decision, recommendations).*

9.7. INDICATOR

There are scientific achievements (grants, awards, results) in scientific research work appropriate to the specialization**

Supporting questions:

❖ *What research projects (grants) have been implemented in the last 5 years in accordance with the specialization of the educational program?*

❖ *What scientific results (publications, patents, technologies) have been created by professors and academic supervisors in this specialization?*

❖ *Are there any scientific achievements (state or international awards, competition wins) within the framework of the educational program and what results are they based on?*

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *documents confirming the achievement of scientific achievements and analytical information summarizing them (list)*

10. CRITERION: Systematic monitoring of existing educational programs and implementation of measures to increase and improve their effectiveness

Note: *The effectiveness of educational programs is assessed by systematically monitoring them, clearly defining evaluation criteria and methods, developing measures to eliminate identified shortcomings based on the results of monitoring, and posting the results in an electronic information system.*

10.1. INDICATOR

The procedure and criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of educational programs have been developed**

Supporting questions:

❖ *What is the internal document that establishes the procedure and criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of the educational program?*

❖ *How do you confirm that the assessment criteria correspond to the expected learning outcomes and competencies of the educational program?*

❖ *Are the evaluation results regularly analyzed and are the educational program improved based on the results?*

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *Internal regulatory document defining the criteria and methods for assessing the effectiveness of educational programs.*

10.2. INDICATOR

Systematic monitoring and analysis processes for the educational program are consistently carried out at a frequency determined by the educational organization**

Supporting questions:

❖ *Are there internal document(s) defining the monitoring and analysis processes for the educational program?*

❖ *At what frequency and by whom are the monitoring and analysis carried out?*

❖ *Are measures determined on the basis of the analysis results to address identified shortcomings and opportunities for improvement?*

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *Monitoring and analysis plan and analytical materials or reports on the implementation of the plan.*

10.3. INDICATOR

Monitoring and analysis results are discussed at internal meetings on research quality and appropriate decisions are made**

Supporting questions:

❖ *On what criteria and at what frequency are monitoring and analysis of research quality carried out?*

❖ *In which internal bodies or meetings are the monitoring and analysis results discussed?*

❖ *What specific decisions or measures were taken to improve the quality of research as a result of the discussion?*

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *minutes of internal meetings (department, academic council, etc.) and decisions made on the results of monitoring (order or annex to the minutes)*

10.4. INDICATOR

Measures to eliminate identified problems and shortcomings are systematically developed based on the results of monitoring and analysis, and the implementation status of these measures is monitored**

Supporting questions:

❖ *Through what documents or plans are measures to eliminate identified problems and shortcomings formalized?*

❖ *By what deadlines and by whom are measures to be implemented?*

❖ *In what order is the implementation status and effectiveness of measures monitored and reported?*

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *Plan of measures to eliminate identified problems and shortcomings and implementation status.*

10.5. INDICATOR

The results of monitoring and analysis of the educational program are permanently placed in the electronic information system and are publicly available**

Supporting questions:

❖ *Through which platform or tools are the results of monitoring and analysis of the educational program made available to the public?*

❖ *How are the procedures and frequency of publicly available results determined?*

❖ *Is there a systematic way for candidates, employers and other interested parties to access these results?*

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *Register of publicly available monitoring materials*

11. CRITERION: The content of the educational program includes research activities during the study process and is aimed at preparing researchers for research activities

Note: *The content of educational programs assesses activities aimed at forming the research potential of researchers and developing independent research skills, as well as the implementation of scientific ethics requirements.*

11.1. INDICATOR

A research plan and mechanisms for their implementation have been developed to ensure the participation of researchers in research activities

Supporting questions:

❖ *How is the participation of researchers in research activities planned*

❖ *In what forms are the mechanisms for involving researchers in research activities implemented?*

❖ *How are the results of researchers' participation in research monitored and evaluated?*

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *research implementation plan (annual and phased);*

✓ *information on internal procedures or regulations determining the mechanisms for involving researchers in research activities*

11.2. INDICATOR

A system of guidance and advice by scientific supervisors (consultants) has been established for scientific research

Supporting questions:

❖ *Are regular consultation and guidance meetings with scientific supervisors (consultants) organized during the scientific research process?*

❖ *Are the activities of scientific supervisors (consultants) regulated by internal regulatory documents? (Are the rights and obligations, responsibilities of the supervisor defined)*

❖ *Are the results of scientific supervision and consultations monitored and reflected in relevant documents?*

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *procedure for organizing the activities of scientific supervisors (consultants) (regulations or instructions);*

✓ *work schedule with scientific supervisors (consultants) or minutes confirming the consultations*

11.3. INDICATOR

There is a system for evaluating and reporting on the research work of scientific researchers

Supporting questions:

❖ *On what criteria and with what frequency is the research work of scientific researchers (PhD, DSc, independent researchers) evaluated?*

❖ *In what order are reports on the research work performed by scientific researchers submitted and by whom are they reviewed?*

❖ *How are decisions on the results of the evaluation and reporting (recommendations, warnings, transfer to the next stage) formalized and recorded?*

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *criteria for evaluating research work and reporting procedures;*

✓ *periodic (interim/annual) reports of researchers or their register*

11.4. INDICATOR

Opportunities for researchers to participate in scientific meetings, conferences and seminars are created

Supporting questions:

❖ *How is the participation of scientific researchers (PhD, DSc, independent researcher) in republican and international scientific conferences, seminars and workshops supported by the higher education or scientific organization?*

❖ *What results have been achieved in terms of the number and content of scientific researchers' participation in conferences and workshops (lectures, theses, posters) over the past 3 years?*

❖ *Is there a plan, announcement and financial opportunities for scientific researchers to participate in internal (university or organization-wide) and external (republican, international) scientific events?*

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *procedure for supporting participation in scientific events (order or plan);*

✓ *certificates confirming the participation of scientific researchers in conferences/seminars*

11.5. INDICATOR

Training in research methodology and scientific analysis methods is provided during the educational process**

Supporting questions:

❖ *Is the subject (module) on research methodology and scientific analysis methods included in the curricula and programs and is it taught as a mandatory subject?*

❖ *Are doctoral students provided with practical training in research design, data processing, statistical and qualitative analysis methods within this discipline?*

❖ *Do the professors and teachers conducting the training have academic degrees and sufficient scientific and pedagogical experience in research methodology and scientific analysis?*

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *working program for conducting training on scientific research methodology and analysis methods*

11.6. INDICATOR

Annual analytical reports on the development of scientific research activities are prepared within the educational program**

Supporting questions:

❖ *Are annual analytical reports on the status of scientific research activities within the educational program regularly prepared and approved?*

❖ *Are the main indicators of scientific research activities (dissertations, scientific articles, projects, grants, scientific supervision) systematically analyzed in the annual analytical reports?*

❖ *Are specific proposals and measures developed to improve the educational program and scientific research activities based on the results of the analytical report?*

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *annual analytical report on scientific research activities under the educational program;*

✓ *minutes of the department/department or collegial body on the results of the discussed report*

III. Organization of the research process and assessment of research results

Note: *The systematic activity that is assessed includes directing the research process to achieve the established research results in accordance with the goals and objectives of the educational programs, adherence to the principles of academic integrity.*

12. CRITERION: The educational program has a procedure for assessing the activities of researchers and the assessment methods are aimed at determining the extent to which the established research results have been achieved

Note: *The assessment is made of whether the procedure for assessing the activities of an educational organization is clearly defined, the assessment methods and criteria in it are aimed at determining the level of achievement of the research plan and the expected scientific results, and the systematic implementation of the assessment processes.*

12.1. INDICATOR

The procedure and mechanism(s) for its implementation have been developed for the effective organization of the assessment processes of researchers

Supporting questions:

❖ Which regulatory or internal document regulates the procedure for assessing the scientific and educational activities of researchers and what criteria is it based on?

❖ By whom, at what frequency and through what mechanism is the process of assessing the activities of researchers carried out?

❖ What management or organizational decisions are made based on the assessment results and are they documented?

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *The procedure for assessing the activities of researchers (statute, regulation or internal procedure) and methodological instructions defining the assessment mechanisms and stages*

12.2. INDICATOR

A system of regular monitoring and evaluation of the effectiveness of the activities of researchers by scientific supervisors (consultants) has been established

Supporting questions:

❖ In what order are the scientific plans and calendar work schedules of researchers approved by scientific supervisors (consultants) and how is their implementation monitored?

❖ How often are the results of the scientific activities of researchers (articles, dissertation chapters, reports) evaluated and where are the evaluation results recorded?

❖ On what criteria is the effectiveness of the work of scientific supervisors (consultants) with researchers analyzed and decisions are made on these results

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *procedure (regulation, regulation) for evaluating and monitoring the activities of scientific supervisors (consultants);*

✓ *evaluation conclusions or monitoring results provided by scientific supervisors*

12.3. INDICATOR

Is there a practice of submitting reports on the results of the scientific activities of researchers at the end of the semester and the end of the year**

Supporting questions:

❖ Has the procedure for submitting semi-annual and annual scientific activity reports by postgraduate students (PhD, DSc, independent researchers) been approved?

❖ Are the semi-annual and annual scientific reports submitted by researchers regularly reviewed and evaluated by the scientific supervisor, department and (or) academic council?

❖ Are the results of scientific activities (articles, conferences, dissertation chapters, grants, patents) in the reports of researchers confirmed by real evidence?

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *procedure for submitting semi-annual and annual scientific reports and their samples or register*

12.4. INDICATOR

Based on the results of the report, recommendations and measures were developed to improve research efficiency**

Supporting questions:

❖ Have analytical reports been prepared on the results of research activities and what period do they cover?

❖ Have these reports identified problems and shortcomings that hinder the improvement of research efficiency?

❖ Have specific recommendations and an action plan for their implementation been developed and approved based on the identified problems?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *recommendations and action plan developed based on the report results, as well as a report from the department/division or collegial body on the results discussed*

12.5. INDICATOR

The results of scientific work (articles, monographs, conference presentations, patents) are taken into account in the evaluation system**

Supporting questions:

❖ On the basis of which internal document and by what criteria are the results of scientific work (article, monograph, patent, etc.) evaluated?

❖ By which collegial body (council, commission) and at what frequency is the evaluation process carried out?

❖ How are the assessment results taken into account in the individual plans, certification, or incentive processes of a student (doctoral student, researcher)?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *the results of scientific work are reflected in the evaluation system(s);*

✓ *register (reports) of scientific achievements of researchers*

12.6. INDICATOR

Based on the assessment results, individual recommendations are given to researchers**

Supporting questions:

❖ On what criteria and how regularly is the scientific activity of researchers evaluated?

❖ What specific individual recommendations are given to the researcher based on the assessment results and in what document are they reflected?

❖ Is there a mechanism for monitoring and re-evaluating the implementation of the individual recommendations given?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *written conclusions of individual recommendations given by the scientific supervisor (consultant);*

✓ *plan for individual development or improvement of scientific activity*

13. CRITERION: The educational program establishes the rules of academic freedom and honesty and the presence of an effective system for preventing situations that contradict them

Note: *The formal establishment of the principles of academic freedom and honesty, measures aimed at preventing conflicts of interest in scientific research activities, scientific supervision, publication of results and the presence of a system for eliminating cases of falsification of data are assessed*

13.1. INDICATOR

The educational organization has procedures (rules) and (or) guidelines on academic integrity, ethics, and freedom

Supporting questions:

❖ Are regulatory and legal documents (regulations, procedures, codes, or guidelines) on academic integrity, scientific ethics, and academic freedom approved and implemented in the educational organization?

❖ Are the principles of plagiarism, falsification of data, conflict of interest, independent research work and academic freedom clearly defined in these documents?

❖ Are the principles of familiarization with these rules and compliance with them monitored by doctoral students, independent researchers and scientific supervisors?

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *Code of academic integrity and ethics (or internal regulations) and internal procedures for its implementation*

13.2. INDICATOR

There is an anti-plagiarism system to prevent, detect and eliminate violations of plagiarism and other academic integrity rules

Supporting questions:

❖ Does the organization have a formal anti-plagiarism system that ensures the checking of scientific works (dissertations, articles, monographs, etc.) for plagiarism and is it being applied in practice?

❖ Have internal regulatory documents regulating issues of academic integrity, plagiarism and intellectual property been approved and are they mandatory for doctoral students and scientific supervisors?

❖ What measures (rejection, rework, disciplinary action, etc.) will be taken in cases of plagiarism detection? Are these measures in place and are they being implemented in practice?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *Procedure for using the anti-plagiarism system (instructions or regulations) and sample or register of reports on its inspections*

13.3. INDICATOR

The principles of academic integrity are systematically integrated into the processes of curriculum development, teaching, assessment, and research activities**

Supporting questions:

❖ Through what normative and methodological documents are the principles of academic integrity taken into account in the development of educational programs?

❖ How are mechanisms for preventing plagiarism, academic fraud, and conflicts of interest introduced in the teaching and assessment processes?

❖ How is compliance with academic integrity requirements monitored and documented in the research activities of doctoral students and independent researchers?

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *sections on academic integrity in the educational program and subject syllabi;*

✓ *methodological guidelines defining academic integrity requirements in the development of educational programs, teaching, assessment, and research activities*

13.4. INDICATOR

There is a transparent procedure for considering cases of violations of academic integrity rules and determining liability measures**

Supporting questions:

❖ How are cases of violations of academic integrity rules identified and officially recorded?

❖ Which commission or responsible body considers appeals or identified cases of violations of academic integrity, and what is the decision-making mechanism?

❖ Are the disciplinary measures to be applied to individuals who violate the rules of academic integrity predetermined and are they announced in a way that is open and understandable to all interested parties?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *academic integrity disciplinary proceedings procedure (regulations or regulations) and minutes of decisions of the commission on violations of the rules*

13.5. INDICATOR

The ownership of copyright and intellectual property rights for scientific works, innovative ideas or inventions created by researchers is clearly defined

Supporting questions:

❖ Is the ownership of copyright and intellectual property rights for scientific works, innovative ideas or inventions created by researchers determined by official documents?

❖ Is the procedure for registering copyright and intellectual property rights for scientific results created by researchers regulated by internal documents in the higher education institution or scientific organization?

❖ Are the rights and obligations between the researcher and the scientific supervisor (or organization) regarding the use, ownership and commercialization of intellectual property established in writing?

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *internal procedure (regulations) on intellectual property and copyright;*

✓ *agreements on copyright or intellectual property concluded with researchers*

13.6. INDICATOR

Regular training (seminars, lectures) is organized for researchers and scientific supervisors (consultants) on academic integrity, ethics, plagiarism, proper use of artificial intelligence, copyright, and conflict of interest**

Supporting questions:

❖ How regularly are trainings (seminars, lectures) organized for postgraduate students and their scientific supervisors (consultants) on academic integrity, ethics, plagiarism, use of artificial intelligence, copyright and conflict of interest?

❖ Are the permitted and prohibited cases of using artificial intelligence tools (ChatGPT, translation and editing systems, etc.) in scientific activities clearly explained in these trainings and are there internal regulatory documents on this?

❖ To what extent is the participation of students and scientific supervisors participating in the trainings documented (list, order, certificate, photo/video materials) and are the results of these events monitored?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *plan of trainings/seminars on academic integrity, ethics, plagiarism, proper use of artificial intelligence and list of participants and certificates*

13.7. INDICATOR

A person or commission responsible for academic integrity, ethics, and freedom has been established**

Supporting questions:

❖ Has a person or permanent commission responsible for academic integrity, ethics, and academic freedom been established in the organization by an official order?

❖ Are the duties, functions, and responsibilities of this person or commission defined in internal regulatory documents?

❖ Are practical activities (monitoring, review, explanatory work) on academic integrity and ethics regularly carried out and documented by the responsible person or commission?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *order on the organization of the activities of the responsible person or commission and annual report or work plan on the effectiveness of activities*

14. CRITERION: Availability of the opportunity to receive feedback from applicants on the assessment results

Note: *Regular study of applicants' feedback on the assessment processes and results, analysis of their suggestions and objections, and the establishment of measures to improve research activities based on this information, as well as the*

implementation of an open and transparent appeal mechanism for the assessment results, are assessed

14.1. INDICATOR

A procedure has been developed for collecting, reviewing and analyzing applicants' suggestions, feedback and complaints regarding the evaluation results, as well as determining the responsible executors for implementing these issues

Supporting questions:

❖ How is the mechanism for receiving suggestions, feedback and complaints from applicants regarding the evaluation results organized (in writing, electronically, via the platform)?

❖ By whom, within what period and in what order are the received suggestions and complaints considered, and are decisions formalized?

❖ Are appeals received regarding the assessment results analyzed and, based on their results, measures are taken to improve the educational process?

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *procedure for collecting, reviewing and analyzing proposals, opinions and complaints of students regarding the assessment results (statute or regulation) and an order on determining the responsible executors for these processes*

14.2. INDICATOR

The developed procedure establishes the forms, deadlines for submitting complaints, the procedure for their consideration and the decision-making mechanism

Supporting questions:

❖ Are clear forms and channels (written, electronic, via the portal) for submitting complaints by students (doctoral students, independent researchers) and employees established and are they publicly announced?

❖ Are clear deadlines (in days) and responsible units for receiving, considering and making a final decision on complaints indicated in the procedure?

❖ Is there a mechanism for formally informing the complainant about the decision made on the complaint and for re-applying if they are dissatisfied with the decision?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *internal instructions setting out the complaint submission and review mechanisms and a sample complaint application (online/offline*

14.3. INDICATOR

Suggestions, feedback, and complaints are accepted in convenient conditions for applicants and in forms appropriate to their needs, and the process of considering them is carried out based on the principles of transparency, accountability, and avoidance of conflicts of interest**

Supporting questions:

❖ What clear and convenient mechanisms (electronic, written, anonymous) have been introduced for applicants (PhD, DSc, independent researchers) to submit suggestions, feedback, and complaints?

❖ Are the procedure, deadlines, and responsible persons for considering incoming applications established in open and official documents and communicated to applicants?

❖ What practical measures are used to ensure transparency, accountability, and prevent conflicts of interest when considering applications (composition of the commission, protocols of neutrality)?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *a document confirming the possibility of expressing opinions via electronic applications (portal, LMS, special e-mail);*

✓ *Relevant department/person and its activities for transparency and prevention of conflicts of interest*

14.4. INDICATOR

Applicants' complaints regarding the assessment process and results are considered and systematically analyzed by the appeals commission of the educational organization**

Supporting questions:

❖ Has an appeals commission been established in the educational organization to consider complaints regarding assessment results and are its activities regulated by regulatory documents?

❖ Are there any complaints from applicants regarding the assessment results over the past 3 years and have they been considered by the appeal commission in accordance with the established procedure?

❖ Are the results of the appeal commission's decisions summarized and are analyses and conclusions developed to improve the assessment process?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *regulations or orders on the establishment and activities of the appeal commission and minutes of their meetings (sample)*

14.5. INDICATOR

Reports are prepared on the analysis results and measures are determined to improve the assessment process, and necessary changes are made to the assessment procedure and criteria**

Supporting questions:

❖ Are there analytical reports prepared based on the assessment results and what periods do they cover?

❖ What measures have been established to eliminate the problems and shortcomings identified during the assessment process and what documents are they supported by?

❖ On what basis (analysis, monitoring, external expert opinions) were the changes made to the assessment procedure and criteria?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *periodic (annual/semi-annual) report on the analysis of proposals and complaints;*

✓ *documents confirming changes made to the evaluation procedure and criteria*

IV. Field of activity of the applicants

Note: *The formal procedure for assessing the activities of researchers is established, aimed at determining the level of achievement of the research plan and expected scientific results, as well as the systematic implementation of assessment processes and activities that determine measures to improve research efficiency on their basis*

15. CRITERION: Admission requirements for the educational program are clearly defined, admission to study is established in a transparent manner

Note: *It is studied whether admission requirements are developed in accordance with the goals and objectives of the research direction, and admission processes are implemented in a transparent, fair and impartial manner*

15.1. INDICATOR

The criteria and requirements for admission to the educational program are clearly defined, and there is a mechanism for openly communicating them to applicants and all interested parties

Supporting questions:

❖ Are the criteria and requirements for admission to the educational program (required documents for applicants, academic degree, language certificate, scientific developments, etc.) clearly defined in official documents?

❖ Are admission criteria and requirements published in open and freely accessible sources for applicants and interested parties (students, academic supervisors, departments, academic departments)?

❖ Is there a stable and working mechanism for communicating information on admission to the educational program (official website, announcements, electronic platforms, newsletters) and is it being used in practice?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *official document on the procedure for admission to the educational program;*

✓ *official source where admission requirements are published (website page, portal, information announcement)*

15.2. INDICATOR

Admission processes and criteria in accordance with current legislation

Supporting questions:

❖ Are admission processes for postgraduate education (PhD, DSc, independent study) organized in accordance with current regulatory and legal documents?

❖ Are the admission criteria set for applicants (seekers) announced in an open, transparent and legal manner?

❖ Are admission results and selection decisions formalized in the established manner and provided as open information for interested parties?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *reference to regulatory and legal documents in internal documents regulating admission processes;*

✓ *legal opinion or internal compliance statement on the compliance of the admission procedure with current legislation*

15.3. INDICATOR

There is an internal document on the composition and work of the admissions committee

Supporting questions:

❖ Is the composition of the admissions committee for postgraduate education (PhD, DSc, independent researcher) approved by order of the head of the organization and does its composition comply with current regulatory legal acts?

❖ Is there an internal document (charter or regulation) that clearly defines the duties, powers, procedure for work and responsibilities of the admissions committee?

❖ Are records and relevant accounting documents kept on the processes of accepting, reviewing and making decisions within the framework of the activities of the admissions committee?

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *order on the establishment of the admissions committee and approval of its composition and regulations or regulations regulating its activities*

15.4. INDICATOR

There is a mechanism for appeal and review of the admissions process and results

Supporting questions:

❖ Is the appeal procedure for an applicant (independent researcher, doctoral student) who is dissatisfied with the admissions results established by internal regulatory documents?

❖ Has an independent or special commission been established to consider appeal applications and has its composition been approved by order?

❖ Are decisions on the appeal results formalized and communicated to the applicant in writing or electronically?

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *appeal and review procedure (regulation or instruction) and a document confirming the activities of the commission (order or regulation)*

15.5. INDICATOR

Admission requirements to the educational program are systematically reviewed and updated on a regular basis, based on the research results of applicants and other relevant internal and external criteria**

Supporting questions:

❖ At what frequency and by which body (council/commission) are admission requirements to the educational program reviewed?

❖ What criteria are used to take into account the research results of applicants (articles, patents, grants, projects) when forming and updating admission requirements?

❖ How are the opinions of internal and external stakeholders (scientific supervisors, departments, employers, foreign experience, national and

international requirements) integrated into the process of updating admission requirements?

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *minutes of the collegial body confirming the revision of admission requirements and an order or resolution approving the updated version*

16. CRITERION: Compliance of admission parameters with the resources and capabilities of the educational organization

Note: *It is examined whether the admission, expulsion or extension of the term of study of applicants is carried out in a clearly defined manner based on legislation and internal regulatory documents, and the principles of transparency and protection of the interests of applicants are developed in these processes*

16.1. INDICATOR

Admission areas are determined in accordance with the material and technical base and human resources of the educational organization*

Supporting questions:

❖ Does the educational organization have the necessary laboratories, equipment and material and technical base to conduct scientific research in the existing admission areas and are they actually operating?

❖ Are there sufficiently qualified professors and academic staff (PhD, DSc, professor) who can provide scientific supervision in each admission area?

❖ Are the number of admission quotas and directions determined in accordance with the available material and technical resources and scientific personnel potential and is this supported by internal documents?

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *analytical report on the material and technical base and personnel potential of the educational organization;*

✓ *internal conclusion or protocol of the collegial body justifying the correspondence between the admission directions and available resources*

16.2. INDICATOR

The ratio of the number of scientific supervisors (consultants) to the number of applicants admitted to the doctoral education program complies with legislative documents

Supporting questions:

❖ According to current legislative documents, is the maximum number of doctoral students (PhD/DSc) assigned to one scientific supervisor (consultant) established?

❖ Is the total number of professors and teachers involved in doctoral education programs in the organization as scientific supervisors (consultants) sufficient in relation to the number of current doctoral students?

❖ Do the scientific level, workplace and workload of the scientific supervisor (consultant) determined for each doctoral student (PhD/DSc) comply with the regulatory requirements?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *list of scientific supervisors (consultants) and information on their academic degrees/fields;*

✓ *calculation table reflecting the ratio of the workload of scientific supervisors (consultants) and the number of applicants*

16.3. INDICATOR

Admission parameters are formed based on financial capabilities (budget, grants, contract revenues

Supporting questions:

❖ Are admission quotas for postgraduate education in the educational organization calculated based on available financial resources (budget, grant, contract)?

❖ Is it documented that admission parameters have been established for each educational field or scientific specialty based on an analysis of financial capabilities?

❖ Was the adequacy of financial support (scholarship, scientific supervision, material and technical base and other expenses) taken into account when determining admission parameters?

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *financial basis related to admission parameters (calculation of budget, grant, contract revenues);*

✓ *decision or order approving admission parameters taking into account financial capabilities*

16.4. INDICATOR

Admission parameters are aligned with the strategic plan (mission, strategy) and academic profile of the educational organization

Supporting questions:

❖ How are the priority scientific areas defined in the strategic plan and mission of the educational organization reflected in the areas of admission for doctoral studies (PhD/DSc) and independent researchers?

❖ On what basis are admission quotas and educational programs determined by the academic profile of the organization (scientific schools, laboratories, scientific potential, composition of scientific supervisors)?

❖ Have admission parameters (directions, quotas) been revised in recent years in accordance with the strategic plan or academic profile, and on what documents are these decisions based?

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *Analytical document justifying the alignment of the educational organization with its strategic plan (mission, strategy) and academic profile*

16.5. INDICATOR

An annual analysis of the status of admission parameters is carried out and, based on the results of the analysis, necessary changes are made to the admission parameters**

Supporting questions:

❖ What differences have been observed between the established admission parameters (plan) for postgraduate education (PhD, DSc, intern-researcher) and the number of those actually admitted over the past 3 years?

❖ Have the main factors that led to the non-fulfillment or overfulfillment of admission parameters (lack of scientific supervisors, relevance of topics, funding, quality of applicants, etc.) been analyzed annually?

❖ What changes have been made to the admission parameters (number, direction, form of education or specialization) based on the results of the annual analysis and with what documents are they formalized?

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *annual analytical report on the status of admission parameters;*

✓ *Order or decision confirming changes to admission parameters based on the results of the analysis*

17. CRITERION: The procedure for admitting, expelling, and extending the period of study of applicants is established

Note: *The existence of a system that ensures scientific, psychological and administrative support for students, the effective organization of their research activities, strengthening relationships with academic supervisors and supporting their professional development are studied*

17.1. INDICATOR

Internal document(s) (rules, procedure, regulations) on the movement of students are developed in accordance with regulatory legal acts on admission, transfer, reinstatement and expulsion of students

Supporting questions:

❖ Does the organization have approved internal regulatory documents regulating the processes of admission, transfer, reinstatement and expulsion of students?

❖ Are these internal documents developed in accordance with the requirements of current resolutions of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan on postgraduate education and relevant regulatory legal acts?

❖ Are the internal documents clearly defined in terms of the procedure for making decisions related to the movement of students (basis, authorized bodies, deadlines and forms of registration)?

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *regulations on the movement of students (procedure for admission, transfer, reinstatement, expulsion) and the order of the rector (director) approving this regulation*

17.2. INDICATOR

There is a possibility to file a complaint regarding the processes and decisions related to the movement of students

Supporting questions:

❖ Is the procedure for filing complaints in case of dissatisfaction with decisions made regarding the scientific activities and actions of researchers established by regulatory documents?

❖ Is the structure responsible for receiving and considering complaints (commission, department or official) clearly defined and are researchers aware of this?

❖ Are complaints submitted by researchers considered within the established deadlines and the results communicated in writing or electronically?

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *Procedure for considering applications and complaints of researchers (appeal regulations)*

17.3. INDICATOR

Researchers are informed about the internal document(s) (rules, procedure, regulations) on their actions, the processes and results of the actions of researchers**

Supporting questions:

❖ What internal documents regulate the actions of researchers (PhD/DSc) in the study process (admission processes, certification work, academic leave, reinstatement, etc.)?

❖ By what methods is information on these documents and processes communicated to researchers?

❖ What documents confirm that applicants have been notified of the results of their actions (certification decision, continuation or discontinuation of studies, stages of dissertation defense)?

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *internal document (regulation) establishing the mechanism for notifying applicants;*

✓ *relevant information posted on the official website or information system*

17.4. INDICATOR

Additional measures have been established to deal with students who have not completed their individual plan within the established period**

Supporting questions:

❖ Is there a mechanism for identifying and monitoring students who have not completed their individual plan within the established period?

❖ Are specific additional measures established to deal with students who have not completed the plan and are they documented?

❖ Is the effectiveness of the measures taken assessed and reported on?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *procedure or regulation for monitoring the implementation of the plan and eliminating shortcomings;*

✓ *individual action plan developed for specific students*

17.5. INDICATOR

Admission, transfer, reinstatement and expulsion from study are formalized by an appropriate order**

Supporting questions:

❖ Has a separate order been formalized by the rector (or head of the organization) for each applicant admitted to postgraduate education (PhD, DSc, independent research)?

❖ In cases of transfer, reinstatement or expulsion of doctoral students and independent researchers, is there an appropriate basis (commission conclusion, application, decision) and is it confirmed by an official order?

❖ Are all orders registered, numbered and attached to personal files in the prescribed manner?

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *copies of relevant orders (for the sample or final year) and the procedure for their registration and maintenance*

18. CRITERION: Availability of support and counseling services for researchers

Note: *The existence of a system that ensures scientific, psychological and administrative support for researchers, the effective organization of their research activities, strengthening of relations with scientific supervisors and support for their professional development are studied.*

18.1. INDICATOR

There is a center for psychological counseling and assistance for researchers

Auxiliary questions:

❖ Is there a separate unit or responsible person in the organization responsible for providing psychological counseling and assistance to researchers (PhD, DSc, independent researchers)?

❖ Is the activity of providing psychological counseling and assistance regulated by the internal regulatory documents of the organization?

❖ Has a practical work and accounting mechanism been established for the activities of psychological counseling and assistance provided to researchers?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *internal regulations or regulations on the activities of the psychological counseling and support center (department);*

✓ *order of the head confirming the establishment and management of the center*

18.2. INDICATOR

Scientific and psychological support services for researchers are established

Supporting questions:

❖ How is the system of scientific counseling and consultations for researchers (PhD, DSc, independent researchers) established?

❖ Are psychological support services available to students and how are they implemented?

❖ Is there a mechanism for informing students about the use of these services and recording applications?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *internal procedure or instruction on scientific and psychological support for students;*

✓ *order of the head of the department or service confirming the activities of the department or service*

18.3. INDICATOR

The scientific mentoring (academic guidance) system has been implemented and is functioning effectively**

Supporting questions:

❖ Is the scientific mentoring (academic guidance) system formalized by regulatory legal documents in the organization and how is it implemented?

❖ Is the individual scientific development of a doctoral student (or independent researcher) and dissertation work regularly monitored during the scientific mentoring process?

❖ By what indicators is the effectiveness of the scientific mentoring system assessed?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *document on the scientific mentoring system (internal regulations, procedures)*

18.4. INDICATOR

Data on the use of advisory services and the effectiveness of these services are regularly collected and analyzed**

Supporting questions:

❖ What advisory services are provided to postgraduate students (PhD, DSc, independent researchers) and what areas do they cover?

❖ In what form, at what frequency, and by whom is data on the use of advisory services collected?

❖ How is the effectiveness of advisory services analyzed based on the collected data and what improvement measures are taken based on the results?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *annual reports or statistical journals on advisory services activities and internal monitoring conclusions reflecting the results and analysis of the consultations*

18.5. INDICATOR

The level of satisfaction of applicants with advisory services is regularly studied and the system is improved on this basis**

Supporting questions:

❖ How and how regularly is the level of satisfaction of applicants with advisory services provided by the academic supervisor, consultant and departments studied?

❖ Where are the results of the study formalized and what specific decisions or improvement measures have been taken based on their analysis?

❖ What changes have been introduced in the advisory services system over the past 1–3 years based on the suggestions and objections received from applicants?

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *analytical reports based on the results of the study and a document developed on their basis to improve the system*

V. Human resources direction

Note: *Activities aimed at identifying the scientific potential, qualifications and competencies of employees, assessing the support system, staffing, professional development and incentive mechanisms for the effective organization of educational and research processes are evaluated*

19. CRITERION: Relevance of the skills, qualifications, and academic degrees of scientific supervisors and consultants to the specialization

Note: *The qualifications, academic level, and scientific direction of the academic supervisors and consultants working on the educational program are examined to ensure that they are in line with the specialization of the postgraduate educational program, as well as their ability to effectively manage research work.*

19.1. INDICATOR

Scientific supervisors (consultants) have appropriate academic degrees and titles in their specialties.

Supporting questions:

❖ Is the academic degree and title of the scientific supervisor (consultant) appropriate for the specialty of the doctoral student (PhD/DSc) being studied?

❖ Has the scientific supervisor (consultant) conducted scientific activities in this particular specialty in recent years?

❖ Does the scientific supervisor (consultant) have the right to provide guidance in this specialty in accordance with the established procedure?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *a list of diplomas and certificates confirming the academic level and title of scientific supervisors (consultants);*

✓ *internal document (order, resolution) with a list of academic supervisors (Table 10) and their specialties*

19.2. INDICATOR

The specializations of scientific supervisors (consultants) are in accordance with the direction of the educational program.

Supporting questions:

❖ Does the academic degree and specialization of the scientific supervisor (consultant) fully correspond to the direction specified in the postgraduate education program passport?

❖ Is the scientific activity of the scientific supervisor (consultant) over the past 5 years (dissertations, articles, projects) closely related to the direction of this educational program?

❖ Are the dissertation topics provided for in the educational program formulated in accordance with the scientific interests and research experience of the scientific supervisor (consultant)?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *a table or list of academic workloads indicating the specializations of the scientific supervisor (consultants) and their relevance to the educational program*

19.3. INDICATOR

Scientific supervisors (consultants) have publications in prestigious scientific journals with a high impact factor in the relevant research direction**

Supporting questions:

❖ Are the scientific articles published by the scientific supervisor (consultant) over the past 5 years consistent with the research direction of the doctoral student (PhD/DSc) they supervise?

❖ Are the scientific articles of the scientific supervisor (consultant) indexed in internationally recognized databases (Scopus, Web of Science) and published in journals with a high impact factor?

❖ Do the publications of the scientific supervisor (consultant) justify the scientific supervision activity in terms of authorship level (first author, corresponding author) and relevance of the topic?

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *list of publications of the scientific supervisor (consultants) (Web of Science, Scopus);*

✓ *full text of publications or supporting documents with DOI*

19.4. INDICATOR

Scientific supervisors (consultants) have certificates (information) about participation in foreign and local advanced training courses, as well as other scientific and practical conferences**

Supporting questions:

❖ Have the scientific supervisors (consultants) participated in foreign or local advanced training courses over the past 3 years and is this confirmed by documents?

❖ Has the scientific supervisor (consultants) participated in international or republican scientific and practical conferences, seminars, forums and trainings?

❖ Does the scientific supervisor (consultants) participate in advanced training and scientific conferences in accordance with the areas of postgraduate education and dissertation topics?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *certificates or diplomas confirming participation in advanced training, internships, scientific and practical conferences and seminars;*

✓ *list of courses and trainings conducted by the educational organization and an internal document confirming participation*

20. CRITERION: The educational program is provided with a sufficient number of specialists and administrative and managerial staff, their quality composition, qualifications and specialization meet the established requirements

Note: *The educational program is examined for the sufficient number, qualifications and position requirements of scientific researchers, managers and consultants, as well as management personnel providing educational and research processes*

20.1. INDICATOR

The level of staffing of specialists and administrative and managerial staff for the educational program meets the established staffing standards

(In this case, if a clear plan for the staffing of specialists and administrative and managerial staff for the new educational program is provided, the actual provision of specialists and administrative and managerial staff is not required)

Supporting questions:

❖ Does the number of professors, teachers and scientific supervisors for this educational program meet the established staffing standards?

❖ Is the provision of administrative and managerial staff (program head, department specialist, etc.) necessary for the management and coordination of the educational program sufficient?

❖ Are the positions, responsibilities and functional duties of the staff for this educational program formalized with approved documents?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *staffing table or staff distribution list (approved in accordance with the educational program);*

✓ *staffing plan for the new educational program, graph*

20.2. INDICATOR

The number of scientific assistants (laboratory assistants, methodologists, etc.) is provided in accordance with the educational programs

(In this case, if a clear plan for the composition of scientific assistants is presented for a new educational program, the actual provision of scientific assistants is not required)

Supporting questions:

❖ Is the number of scientific assistants (laboratory assistants, methodologists, engineers, etc.) sufficient in relation to the number and areas of existing educational programs (PhD, DSc)?

❖ Are the job duties of scientific assistants adapted to support the research and educational processes established in the educational programs?

❖ Are the qualifications and work experience of scientific assistants consistent with the content of the educational programs and scientific areas?

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *list of scientific assistants and their compliance with the approved staffing table for educational programs;*

✓ *plan for the composition of scientific assistants for the new educational program*

20.3. INDICATOR

A system of employee incentives and career growth has been introduced**

Supporting questions:

❖ Does the organization have a system of material and non-material incentives for employees and is it approved by internal regulatory documents?

❖ Are the criteria and procedure for promotion (career development) for scientific and pedagogical and scientific staff established?

❖ Are the promotion and career growth processes carried out on the basis of transparent assessment criteria and are employees aware of this?

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *Procedure for motivating employees (bonuses, awards, promotion mechanism) and work carried out to motivate staff*

21. CRITERION: Existence of a system of material and moral incentives for scientific supervisors and consultants

Note: *It is studied whether a system of material and moral incentives has been established for scientific supervisors and consultants depending on the effectiveness of their research activities*

21.1. INDICATOR

There is a procedure for paying bonuses and additional payments to scientific supervisors (consultants

Supporting questions:

❖ What regulatory and legal documents establish the procedure for paying bonuses and additional payments to scientific supervisors (consultants)?

❖ On what basis are the criteria for paying bonuses and additional payments determined?

❖ Are there real financial or organizational documents confirming that this procedure is being applied in practice?

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *internal procedure or instruction determining bonuses and additional payments to scientific supervisors (consultants);*

✓ *order of the rector (director) confirming this procedure*

21.2. INDICATOR

There is a system for assessing the effectiveness of scientific supervisor (consultant) activities

Supporting questions:

❖ Does the organization have an approved internal regulatory document (charter, regulation or procedure) on evaluating the activities of scientific supervisors (consultants) and is it applied in practice?

❖ Are clear criteria established for assessing the effectiveness of the activities of a scientific supervisor (consultant) (results of dissertation defense, compliance with deadlines, scientific publications, achievements of doctoral students, etc.)?

❖ Are the evaluation results taken into account when encouraging the activities of scientific supervisors (consultants), forming their ratings, or making management decisions?

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *internal document establishing the procedure for evaluating the activities of scientific supervisors (consultants);*

✓ *annual reports or monitoring conclusions confirming the results of the evaluation*

21.3. INDICATOR

Employees who are active in scientific activities are financially and morally encouraged**

Supporting questions:

❖ How are the criteria for identifying employees who have achieved high results in scientific activities established and on the basis of which regulatory document are they evaluated?

❖ What is the number of employees who have received financial or moral incentives for their scientific activities over the past 3 years and what are the types of incentives given to them?

❖ Are there internal mechanisms (commission, order, evaluation procedure) that ensure the transparency and regularity of the system of encouraging scientific employees?

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *procedure for encouraging employees who are active in scientific activities (bonuses, awards, certificates)*

22. CRITERION: Availability of opportunities to attract foreign scientific supervisors and consultants

Note: *The existence of opportunities to attract foreign scientific supervisors and consultants in order to expand international scientific cooperation in educational programs is studied*

22.1. INDICATOR

There are contracts with foreign scientific supervisors (consultants)**

Supporting questions:

❖ Has the organization concluded formal contracts or cooperation agreements with foreign scientific supervisors (consultants)?

❖ Are foreign scientific supervisors (consultants) actually involved in the scientific research of postgraduate students (PhD, DSc)?

❖ Are the results of cooperation with foreign scientific supervisors (consultants) documented?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *copies of agreements or memorandums with foreign scientific supervisors (consultants);*

✓ *internal orders or decisions of the organization, approved procedure for formalizing agreements*

22.2. INDICATOR

There are research works with the participation of foreign scientific supervisors (consultants)**

Supporting questions:

❖ Has a foreign scientific supervisor or consultant been officially assigned to the doctoral student (PhD/DSc) on the topic of scientific research?

❖ Is the participation of a foreign scientific supervisor (consultant) in the scientific research process confirmed by documents?

❖ Are research works with the participation of a foreign scientific supervisor (consultant) planned in the doctoral education program and are they actually being carried out?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *reports of research works carried out with foreign supervisors (consultants*

22.3. INDICATOR

There are joint scientific projects and research results with foreign scientific organizations (organizational employees)**

Supporting questions:

❖ Has the organization participated in joint scientific projects with foreign scientific or educational institutions?

❖ Were scientific results obtained within the framework of these joint scientific projects?

❖ Did the organization's employees or doctoral students directly participate in the joint projects?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *joint project contracts and agreements concluded with foreign scientific organizations (employees);*

✓ *list of reports or publications on joint projects*

22.4. INDICATOR

A system of remote consulting by foreign scientific supervisors (consultants) has been established

Supporting questions:

❖ Is the procedure for providing remote consultations with foreign scientific supervisors (consultants) formalized by the internal documents of the university (or scientific organization)?

❖ Is there evidence of online mentoring provided by foreign academic supervisors for postgraduate students (PhD/DSc/researchers)?

❖ Through which digital platforms and with what regularity will remote consultations be conducted, and is this process monitored?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *Instructions confirming the procedure for providing remote consulting (internal document)*

22.5. INDICATOR

There is a legal and financial basis for attracting foreign scientific supervisors (consultants)

Supporting questions:

❖ Does the organization have internal regulatory and legal documents that provide for the involvement of foreign scientific supervisors (consultants) in the doctoral (PhD/DSc) process?

❖ Has the procedure for concluding contracts with foreign scientific supervisors (consultants) and determining their powers and responsibilities been approved?

❖ Are the sources of payment or funding for the services of foreign scientific supervisors (consultants) clearly defined (extrabudgetary funds, grants, etc.)?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *internal documents (order, instruction) regulating the involvement of foreign scientific supervisors (consultants);*

✓ *documents confirming the availability of financial resources (budget, grant funds, contracts)*

VI. Logistics and technical support direction

Note: *The activities that are assessed include the implementation of educational programs, the organization of scientific research activities, and the sufficient provision of infrastructure, laboratories, equipment, information resources, and inclusive conditions that serve to create a favorable educational and research environment for researchers, and the practical basis for the effectiveness of educational and scientific activities*

23. CRITERION: The availability of scientific resources in the field of research, based on the nature of the specialty and the number of researchers, and the provision of electronic resources in accordance with the established requirements

Note: *The educational organization is studied for the provision of scientific literature, electronic databases, and modern information resources appropriate to the specialty for the implementation of scientific research activities*

23.1. INDICATOR

The scientific library fund covers all specialties and is constantly updated

Supporting questions:

❖ Does the scientific library fund contain a sufficient amount of scientific literature on all basic doctoral, doctoral and independent research specialties available in the organization?

❖ On what mechanism and from what sources has the scientific library fund been updated over the past 3 years?

❖ Do doctoral students and scientific researchers have access to international scientific information and resource databases (Scopus, Web of Science, etc.)?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *inventory of the library fund and update schedule.*

23.2. INDICATOR

Electronic library and databases are available

Supporting questions:

❖ Does the organization have an electronic library platform and is it constantly operational?

❖ Do students and researchers have the right to use international and national scientific databases?

❖ Is the procedure and statistics for using electronic resources (number of users, downloads) maintained?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *list of electronic libraries and scientific databases and procedure for use (internal instructions)*

23.3. INDICATOR

Online access to scientific resources is available

Supporting questions:

❖ Do researchers (PhD, DSc, independent researchers) have remote (online) access to international and national scientific databases?

❖ Has a 24/7 online access mechanism been introduced in the scientific organization or higher education institution through an electronic library, repository or information resource center?

❖ Is the access procedure for researchers to use scientific resources based on a login/password, IP address or unique identification documented and working in practice?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *online access system (login, password and access procedure) procedure*

23.4. INDICATOR

The share of international publications in the list of scientific literature complies with the requirements of legislative documents

Supporting questions:

❖ Does the share of international publications (Scopus, Web of Science, Springer, Elsevier, etc.) in the list of scientific literature recommended in the educational program meet the established standards?

❖ Do the international publications included in the list of scientific literature consist of sources published in the last 5-10 years, are relevant and relevant to the direction?

❖ Is the mandatory use of international scientific sources in doctoral (PhD/DSc) and scientific programs developed for independent researchers clearly stated in the documents?

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *report on the list of scientific literature and the share of international publications in it (Table 11)*

23.5. INDICATOR

Statistics on the activity of researchers using scientific sources are maintained**

Supporting questions:

❖ Are indicators of the use of scientific databases (Scopus, Web of Science, Google Scholar, etc.) by researchers systematically recorded?

❖ Is an analysis conducted among researchers on scientific sources (articles, monographs, dissertations) obtained through the library and electronic resources?

❖ Are the results of the activity of using scientific sources evaluated in relation to the scientific activities of researchers (articles, dissertation chapters, reports)?

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *statistics on the use of library and electronic resources;*

✓ *internal documents indicating measures and proposals based on the results of monitoring*

24. CRITERION: Creation of access to local and international information and databases (Scopus, Web of Science or other widely recognized indexed databases

Note: *The educational organization is studied for the creation of access to Scopus, Web of Science, Springer, Elsevier and similar international databases for researchers and scientists*

24.1. INDICATOR

The educational organization is officially subscribed to internationally recognized indexed databases

Supporting questions:

❖ Which internationally recognized indexed scientific databases does the educational organization officially subscribe to and what period does this subscription cover?

❖ What organizational and technical conditions have been created for doctoral students and scientists to use these databases?

❖ What practical results has the use of databases given in the process of preparing scientific research, dissertations and scientific articles?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *Subscription to internationally indexed databases (Scopus, Web of Science, etc.*

24.2. INDICATOR

Researchers have access to internationally recognized indexed databases

Supporting questions:

❖ Which internationally indexed databases does the organization have an official subscription to and are they open to researchers?

❖ What mechanism is used to ensure that researchers use these databases?

❖ What practical work has been done to train and guide researchers in the effective use of these databases?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *procedure and instructions for use*

24.3. INDICATOR

Training seminars on the use of international databases are held**

Supporting questions:

❖ Which international scientific databases (Scopus, Web of Science, etc.) have been organized for doctoral students, independent researchers and academic staff over the past 3 years?

❖ What was the composition of participants (PhD, DSc, independent researchers) and their scope (number and share) in conducting these training seminars?

❖ How did the seminars affect the effectiveness of scientific activity (publication of articles in international databases, indexing, citations)?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *program and schedule for planning and conducting training seminars*

24.4. INDICATOR

Usage statistics (researcher activity) are available and maintained on an ongoing basis**

Supporting questions:

❖ Through what information system or registry is the scientific and educational activity of researchers (PhD, DSc, independent researcher) within the educational program recorded and monitored?

❖ How regularly are statistics on researcher activity updated and who is responsible for maintaining them?

❖ How are the collected usage statistics used in practice to improve the educational program, make individual educational trajectory or control decisions?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *user statistics reports on the use of international databases*

24.5. INDICATOR

There is an internal instruction on international databases

Supporting questions:

❖ Has the organization approved an official internal instruction that determines the procedure for working with international scientific databases?

❖ Does the internal instruction clearly define the mechanisms for using international databases, posting scientific results, maintaining profiles and monitoring?

❖ Has this instruction been implemented as a mandatory document for doctoral students, independent researchers and scientific supervisors (is there an introduction, implementation and control)?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *internal instruction that determines the procedure for using international databases;*

✓ *Order of the rector (director) on approval of the instruction*

25. CRITERION: The level of provision of scientific and experimental laboratories, their provision with modern equipment, equipment, inventory, techniques, raw materials, etc. and the state of their use

Note: *The educational organization is sufficiently provided with modern laboratories, equipment, facilities and raw materials necessary for scientific research and practical work, and a system for their effective use is established*

25.1. INDICATOR

The equipment and their number in scientific and experimental laboratories correspond to all available specialties

Supporting questions:

❖ Is the list of available equipment sufficient to carry out educational and scientific research work in all specialties of postgraduate education?

❖ Is there special laboratory equipment in accordance with the curriculum and scientific research topics in the specialties and is it actually used?

❖ Is the number of laboratory equipment sufficient in proportion to the number of applicants (is there a possibility of queueing, unrestricted use)?

Substantiating evidence(s):

✓ *inventory list of laboratory(s) and a report indicating their correspondence to the specialties*

25.2. INDICATOR

The modernity, technical condition, and shelf life of equipment are constantly monitored and updated

Supporting questions:

❖ To what extent does the equipment used in the scientific and educational process comply with current scientific research and educational standards in the field?

❖ What procedures and responsibilities are established for constant monitoring of the technical condition of equipment and monitoring its shelf life?

❖ What is the plan and financing mechanism for updating, modernizing or replacing equipment?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *technical passports of equipment and documents confirming that they have passed technical inspection;*

✓ *report on technical maintenance (repair, preventive maintenance) works*

25.3. INDICATOR

The schedule of use of scientific and experimental laboratories and the participation of researchers are ensured

Supporting questions:

❖ On what basis is the use organized and to what extent is the participation of PhD/DSc researchers reflected in this schedule?

❖ In which laboratories, within what topics and in what form (experiment, test, measurement) do researchers (PhD, DSc, independent researchers) participate?

❖ To what extent are laboratory exercises and scientific experiments adapted to the individual scientific plans of the researchers and the topics of their dissertations?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *laboratory use schedule and lists of users (researchers);*

✓ *reports on the participation of researchers and monitoring results*

25.4. INDICATOR

Technical passports of equipment, devices and techniques are available, technical inspections are carried out, and maintenance (repair, preventive maintenance) work is documented**

Supporting questions:

❖ Are technical passports available for all equipment and techniques used in the scientific and educational process and are they stored in the prescribed manner?

❖ Has the equipment undergone a technical inspection within the established deadlines and has this situation been documented with appropriate acts or records?

❖ Are regular documents (logs, acts, orders) maintained on technical maintenance, repair and preventive work?

Supporting document(s):

✓ *technical passports of the equipment and documents confirming that it has undergone a technical inspection*

26. CRITERION: Adaptation of buildings and equipment for inclusive education, availability of special educational materials, access to information and communication technologies (hereinafter referred to as ICT

Note: *The educational organization examines whether the infrastructure and educational environment are adapted for persons with disabilities, and equal access to buildings, equipment, information resources and educational materials is created*

26.1. INDICATOR

The educational institution's buildings and classrooms, including corridors, ramps, elevators, doors and sanitary facilities, are adapted for persons with disabilities (seekers)

Supporting questions:

❖ Are the entrances to the educational institution's building equipped with ramps, handrails and non-slip surfaces for persons with disabilities?

❖ Is the internal infrastructure (corridors, doorways, elevators, stairs) adapted for the free and safe movement of persons with disabilities?

❖ Are sanitary and hygienic rooms (toilets) equipped with special equipment for persons with disabilities?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *technical documents confirming the compliance of buildings and classrooms, corridors, ramps, elevators, doors and sanitary rooms with inclusive requirements;*

✓ *list of work carried out on adaptation work and monitoring reports*

26.2. INDICATOR

Special educational materials (books in Braille, visual materials), special equipment and assistive devices are available

Supporting questions:

❖ Are there specially adapted educational materials for students with disabilities?

❖ What is the status of provision of special technical devices that can be used by students with disabilities?

❖ Has the procedure for using special materials and technical devices, the responsible unit or persons been determined, and are there internal documents on this?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *approved list of special educational materials and equipment (Braille books, visual aids, special devices)*

26.3. INDICATOR

Access to ICT, electronic resources, software for inclusive education (audio-video resources, Braille, subtitles, etc.) has been created

Supporting questions:

❖ Are electronic resources and ICT tools available and used in the educational process for learners with disabilities?

❖ Are distance and e-learning platforms adapted to the requirements of inclusion?

❖ Have special technical and software tools been introduced to ensure inclusive education and have responsible persons been identified for them?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *List of ICT and electronic resources (audio-video materials, subtitles, Braille) and internal instructions on the procedure for their use*

26.4. INDICATOR

Psychological counseling services for students with disabilities have been established

Supporting questions:

❖ Has a responsible unit or specialist (psychologist) providing psychological counseling services been officially identified?

❖ Has a clear procedure been developed and implemented for students with disabilities to use psychological counseling services?

Is there evidence that psychological counseling services have been provided to students with disabilities over the past 1-3 years?

Supporting evidence(s):

✓ *Document regulating the activities of psychological and academic counseling services;*

✓ *reports and statistical data confirming the performance of consulting services*

CONCLUSION ON INTERNAL EVALUATION RESULTS

Based on the results of the internal evaluation, the level of compliance of the educational program with state educational standards, special state accreditation criteria, the national qualification framework, and professional standards is clearly and concisely expressed.

For example: The educational program was assessed as generally compliant with current state educational standards and accreditation criteria.

The identified strengths of the educational program, including key advantages, clarity and measurement of learning outcomes, labor market orientation, cooperation with employers, and the potential of academic supervisors (consultants), are briefly and clearly stated.

The identified weaknesses and risks, i.e. aspects that do not fully meet standards or indicators, problems with resources, personnel or infrastructure, imbalances between research results and practice, as well as risks observed in graduate outcomes, are clearly and clearly stated.

A conclusion is drawn based on the summarized results of the opinions of stakeholders (students, academic supervisors (consultants), employers and graduates).

Priority areas, key measures, and short- and medium-term changes that serve as an Action Plan for improving the educational program are clearly defined.

A general conclusion (Conclusion statement) is formed, expressing the official attitude of the educational organization based on the results of the internal assessment. It states the conclusion of the internal assessment on the recommendation of the educational program for special state accreditation, recommendation subject to the elimination of deficiencies, or revision due to the need for improvement.

The units responsible for the improvement work, the terms of subsequent internal monitoring, and the reassessment plan are briefly noted.

APPENDIX: FORM OF THE INTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT ON THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

The internal assessment report is formed in the following sequence:

1. Title page *(automatically formed by the platform)*;

2. Table of contents *(automatically formed by the platform)*;

3. Composition of the internal assessment commission members *(approved based on the provided **sample** and uploaded to the platform)*;

4. General information about the educational organization *(automatically formed by the platform based on the provided **sample**)*;

5. Information about the educational program undergoing special state accreditation *(automatically formed by the platform based on the provided **sample**)*;

6. Structure of the educational organization *(based on the provided **sample**, approved by the educational organization and uploaded to the platform)*;

7. Analytical data used to form the assessment results for the assessment areas, criteria and indicators of special state accreditation *(the above **tables 1-7** are uploaded to the platform after being filled in)*.

_____

name of educational institution

"A P P R O V E V"

_____
_____
_____

_____ Full name

"___" _____ 2026-y

“ _____ ”
_____

on special state accreditation of the educational program

INTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT

Area: _____.

Composition of the internal evaluation commission

t/r	Full name	Position

General information about the educational organization

Name:	
Year of establishment:	
Basis of organization:	*(normative legal document, license or others)*
Official email:	
Official website:	
Official phone number:	
Address (main):	
Address (additional):	
Information about the person responsible for state accreditation	
Full name:	
Position:	
Official email:	
Official work phone number:	

Information about a special state-accredited educational program

1.	Educational program code and name:	
2.	Degree-granting subject network:	
3.	The name of the educational program in English:	
4.	The name of the educational program in Russian:	
5.	Implementation in partnership (joint, franchise or other):	
6.	Language of instruction:	
7.	Form of instruction:	
8.	Volume of the educational program (ECTS credit or number of academic hours):	
9.	Duration of the educational program (years/semesters):	
10.	Level in the national qualifications framework:	
11.	Name of qualification(s):	
12.	Additional qualifications awarded:	
13.	Type of document issued at the end of the educational program and its sample:	*(confirmed upload)*
14.	Normative number of students:	
15.	Address of teaching the educational program:	
16.	Professional standard/qualification requirement (if any):	*(confirmed upload)*
17.	Curriculum (if any):	*(confirmed upload)*
18.	Subject (module) programs (if any):	*(confirmed upload)*

Structure of the educational organization

The organizational structure, divisions, departments and other structural units of the educational organization are indicated. Legal (non-legal) structural units of the educational organization are also indicated.

Table 1

Information on the contingent of applicants*

№	Specializations		Number of applicants						
	Code	name	1st stage		2nd stage		3rd stage		Total
			Basic	Required research.	Basic	Required research.	Basic	Required research.	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Basic doctoral studies									
1									
2									
...									
	Total								
Doctoral studies									
1									
2									
...									
	Total								
	All								

*Note: *This table is not filled in for newly established educational organizations.*

Table 2

When forming admission parameters, the potential of candidates of sciences, doctors of philosophy (PhD) and doctors of sciences conducting research in relevant specialties is analyzed.

№	Surname, first name, patronymic	Year of birth	Specialization code	Place of work, position, academic degree, academic title	Number of students who received academic degrees (persons)	Number of commercialized research project results (2022-2025)	Number of international recognitions	Hirsch index (h-index)	Number of publications			
									Total	Including		
										Last 3 years	In journals in prestigious international scientific and technical databases	Q1, Q2 level scientific journals
1.												
2.												
3.												
4.												

Table 3

Planned admission quota

№	Password	Name of specialty	Language of instruction	Allocated quota					
				1st year		2 years		3rd year	
				Thai.	Must.	Thai.	Must.	Thai.	Must.
Basic doctorate									
1									
2									
3									
...									
Doctorate									
1									
2									
3									
...									

Table 4

Table confirming that scientific supervisors (consultants) have the appropriate specialization and titles for scientific supervisor (consultant)

Field of specialization	Scientific advisor FISh.	Academic degree (PhD/DSc/Candidate of Science)	Academic title (associate professor/professor)	Expertise code	Leading research area	Number of supervised doctoral students	Note
1							
2							
3							
...							

Table 5

Information on the provision of a database of scientific literature by specialty

№	Name of specialty	Total number of scientific publications	Number of international publications	Share of international publications (%)	Number of electronic resources (database)	Major international databases (Scopus, WoS, etc.)	Last updated date	Funds allocated for updating (million soums)	Note
1									
2									
3									
...									

Table 6

Information on the subscription of the educational organization to international indexed databases

№	Name of specialization	Name of indexed database	Type of subscription (full/partial)	Basis
1				
2				
3				
...				

Table 7

Information on the supply of scientific and experimental laboratories and equipment

№	Name of specialization	Name of laboratory	List of equipment	Number of equipment	Level of use (for doctoral students/scientific research)	Note
1						
2						
3						
...						

ACTION PLAN FOR IMPROVING THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

№	Assessment direction	Criterion	Identified problem or need for improvement	Improvement measures	Implementation mechanism	Responsible unit / person	Implementation period	Required resources	Expected results

FOR NOTES

NATIONAL QUALITY ASSURANCE AGENCY FOR EDUCATION

UNDER THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN

Contact Information

+998 55 505 30 30

www.nqaae.uz

info@nqaae.uz

7, Universitet Street, Olmazor District,
Tashkent, Uzbekistan, 100174