

**REPORT ON THE MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF CURRENT QA SYSTEM IN AZERBAIJAN STATE PEDAGOGICAL  
UNIVERSITY  
UNDERTAKEN BY Viktor Kordas & Lennart  
Ståhlexx May 2021**

**1. Introduction**

Issue as identified by ESG	Conformity	Non Conformity	Areas for improvement
<i>1. Policy for quality assurance</i>	The policy is a part of the strategic plan. It is a result of the EQAC project	The Rector is not mentioned as being responsible for the QA policy. But the QA centre is reporting directly to the rector	The Policy needs to be more transparent.
<i>2. Design and approval of programmes</i>	The structure for design and approval of programmes is on place. The views of students and stakeholders are taken care of.		
<i>3. Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment</i>	They are well aware of the importance of assessment. Each syllabus includes a section on assessment.		
<i>4. Teaching staff</i>	ASPU do take care of the teaching staff and ensures for their development as teachers. The recruitment process is well documented.		
<i>5. Information management</i>	No information management system is on place.		They seem to collect a lot of data that can be the content of an information management system.
<i>6. Public information</i>		Very traditional. Not transparent	The public information needs to be developed.
<i>7. On-going monitoring and periodic review of programmes</i>	There are procedures for periodic reviews of programmes		

## **2. General recommendation and conclusion**

The Pedagogical university is well on its way to develop a QA system. The QA policy needs to be more transparent and not hidden in strategic documents. There is no real QA strategy and the university needs to work for creating a well composed document.

The QA Centre should be given a more central role and advising the faculties about their

QA work. The responsibility for QA work should relay on the faculties and or departments.

The university is aware of the importance of qualified teachers and have regular trainings of the teachers. It is not clear how the need of the individual teacher is taken care of. The recruitment process seems to be solid.

When it comes to information management the university does not have an entire system but several relevant data are collected and analyzed.

We are not convinced that the quality of the programmes is measured by the result from a student satisfaction survey. And “student satisfaction” is a term that I borrowed from the business world and do not belong to the academic world at all.

The annual QA report to the Rector is not just a self-assessment report. It should be a well-analysed report based on report from the faculties. The QA office should have the responsibility for writing this document as a report to the Rector and the university board/scientific board.

### **Existence of the documents**

### **Monitoring questions:**