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Under sections 9 (1) (b) (3) and 17 (1) (k) of Act No. 111/1998 Sb., to regulate higher education institutions and to change and amend other laws (the Higher Education Act), as amended, the Academic Senate of Charles University has adopted the following Code of Rules for Educational Activities Evaluation by Students and Graduates of Charles University as an internal regulation of the University:

Article 1 Introductory Provisions

This Code determines the rules for the evaluation of educational activities by students and graduates of Charles University ("the University").

Article 2 Objectives of the Evaluation

The objectives of the evaluation of teaching by students and graduates are:

a) to contribute to the strengthening of the academic environment by improving pedagogical activity at the University and to improve the preparation, organisation, content, progress, and linking of study in different programmes of study, as well as the related supporting services;

b) to provide feedback on the quality of educational activities to the academic community;

c) to provide a basis for ensuring the quality of the activities of faculties and the University and its internal evaluation.

Article 3 Types of Evaluation

The evaluation of teaching by students and graduates of the University takes the form of:

a) the evaluation of teaching in programmes of study by students;

b) the evaluation of the provision of educational activities and other related supporting activities by students; and

c) the evaluation of study by graduates.

Article 4 Evaluation of Teaching in Bachelor’s and Master’s Programmes of Study

1. The evaluation of teaching in Bachelors and Master’s programmes of study is organised by the faculty as a generally accessible survey divided according to individual programmes of study; all students who have attended classes in the respective semester or academic year may participate in such evaluation.

---

1 Translator’s note: Words importing the masculine include the feminine, and unless the context otherwise requires, words in the singular include the plural and words in the plural include the singular.

2 For example, for the evaluation of programmes of study according to the rules of the system for ensuring the quality of the University and its internal evaluation.
2. Compulsory and elective subjects are subject to evaluation. Optional subjects may also be evaluated.

3. An evaluation is carried out at least once per academic year; the period under evaluation is usually a semester or semesters.

4. The subject matter of evaluation is usually:
   a) the quality of the provision and implementation of the study subjects, in particular clearly defining objectives and requirements, ensuring the organisation of courses, how inspiring the nature of instruction was, and opening space for discussion, linking instruction to other study subjects, and how to present issues and teach them clearly and comprehensively, the capability to communicate with students, and how demanding the requirements are.
   b) the quality of teaching of individual teachers or teachers of the given unit, in greater detail the ability to engage and motivate students, organisational skills, the selection of relevant teaching materials, the ability to present issues and teach them clearly and comprehensively, and how to communicate with students.

5. The guarantors of programmes of study, designated teachers, students designated by the academic senate of the faculty and staff designated by the dean of the faculty participate in the preparation of the content of the evaluation.

6. Designated students, teachers, and other staff participate in the organisation of the evaluation and processing of the data gathered.

7. The guarantors of programmes of study, staff designated by the dean of the faculty, heads of units concerned, designated teachers and students designated by the academic senate of the faculty participate in the interpretation of the results of the evaluation.

8. Students have a right to participate in an evaluation without disclosing their identity.

9. The assessment is in written or electronic form.

10. Questions with a given scale are used in the evaluation and space is also provided for the free verbal expression of comments and remarks.

11. It is necessary to carefully consider the reliability of data gathered, and to exclude the multiple participation of one student in the evaluation of one subject of study.

12. Evaluation results always contain information on the number of the survey participants and the number of students enrolled.

13. Faculties publish evaluation results and their interpretation on their websites; the provisions of paragraphs (14) and (15) are not prejudiced thereby. The comments of guarantors of programmes of study, heads of the establishments concerned, or other persons regarding the verbal comments published in the area of their responsibility are made public in the same manner.

14. Results concerning individual teachers may be made public only if at least 10 per cent but not fewer than five students of those who registered for the study subject in question made comments regarding the teacher in question in the survey. A different percentage or number of students may be determined by an internal regulation of the faculty in cases justified by the number of students enrolled.

15. The free verbal expression of facts under paragraph (4) (b) regarding individual teachers may be made public irrespective of the requirements set by paragraph 14, but only if the comments are not anonymous; it is necessary to check who the author of the comment is before making it public. An internal regulation of the faculty may determine a different procedure for dealing with verbal expressions and verification of authors’ identity.

16. Teachers have a guaranteed right to publish their comments on the results or on verbal expressions concerning them in the same way.

17. The details concerning the preparation, schedule, organisation, designation of persons, collection and processing of data, interpretation, place and date of publishing of the results of the evaluation at the faculty are determined by an internal regulation of the Faculty or a dean’s measure.

18. The recommended organisation, form, and method of evaluation required to ensure the quality and comparability of results within the framework of the University may be determined by a Rector’s measure.

**Article 5 Evaluation of Teaching in Doctoral Programmes of Study**

1. The evaluation of teaching in doctoral programmes of study is organised by the faculty according to individual programmes of study.
2. An evaluation is carried out at least once every three years.
3. The provisions of Article (4) (4) apply to the evaluation under this Article accordingly.
4. The provisions of Article (4) (5) to (18) apply to the evaluation under this Article accordingly; in such cases the Subject-Area Board of the doctoral programme of study should be used instead of the guarantors of programmes of study in paragraphs (5), (7) and (13).

---

3 Article 5 (5) of the Code of Study and Examination of Charles University.
4 Article 22 (9) to (11) of the Constitution of the University.
5 Article 22 (12) of the Constitution of the University.
Article 6 Evaluation of Ensuring Study and Other Related Supporting Activities

1. The evaluation of ensuring study and other related supporting activities is organised by the University or faculty as generally accessible research; all students of the University or of the respective faculty may participate in such evaluation.
2. The University carries out the evaluation of ensuring study and other related supporting activities at least once every five years.
3. The provisions of Article (4) (11) apply to the evaluation under this Article accordingly.
4. If the evaluation is organised by the University, its results are discussed with the relevant faculty.
5. Details concerning the preparation, elements, content focus, schedule, organisation, processing, and interpretation of the results of the evaluation are determined by a Rector’s measure if the research is organised by the University, or by a dean’s measure if it is organised by a faculty.
6. It may be determined in a regulation of the faculty that the evaluation of ensuring of study and other related supporting activities is a part of the evaluation under Article (3) (a).

Article 7 Evaluation of Study by University Graduates

1. The University organises the evaluation of study by University graduates as qualitative or quantitative research.
2. The University carries out the evaluation of study by graduates at least once every five years.
3. The aims, subject-area focus, subject matter of evaluation, number and structure of graduates addressed, and form of processing of the results are determined in the research project. The elements of the project are discussed with faculties and higher education institutes.
4. The graduates are addressed according to the contact details provided in the register of students.
5. The research is carried out in a manner ensuring anonymity for responding graduates.
6. The provisions of Article (4) (11) apply to the evaluation under this Article accordingly; in such cases a graduate should be used instead of a student.
7. The results of the research are discussed with the faculties.
8. Faculties may carry out their own evaluations of study by graduates. The details concerning the preparation, elements, content focus, schedule, organisation, processing, and interpretation of the evaluation may be determined by an internal regulation of the faculty or by a dean’s measure.

Article 8 Using the Results of Evaluation

1. The results of the evaluation of educational activities by students and graduates are used in accordance with the objectives stated in Article 2.
2. The results of evaluations organised by the University or faculties are taken into consideration when an application for the accreditation of a programme of study is prepared, when a programme of study is approved within institutional accreditation, in the evaluation of a programme of study, and when strategic documents mentioned in the Rules for the System of Internal Evaluation and Quality Assurance of the University are prepared.
3. The results of evaluations carried out at the faculty are discussed in particular by the heads of the concerned units who, if necessary, take measures within their competence to improve the quality of the educational activity, and by the academic senate of the faculty.
4. The dean provides the academic senate and the Rector with a structured report about the progress of the evaluation of educational activities by students and graduates carried out at the faculty in the relevant academic year and the use of the results of the evaluation. A model report is determined by the Rector’s measure commented on by the Internal Evaluation Board.
5. On the basis of the faculties’ reports and the results of research carried out by the University, the Rector submits the summary report on the evaluation of educational activities by students and graduates for the relevant academic year to the Internal Evaluation Board and the Academic Senate of the University.

Article 9 Evaluation of Educational Activities at Higher Education Institutes and Other Parts of the University

For the evaluation of educational activities at higher education institutes, or other parts of the University, the provisions of the preceding articles apply accordingly. If the preceding provisions mention the dean, the director of a higher education institute or other part of the University is also understood.

---

7 Article 9 (4) (a) of the Constitution of the University.
8 Under the Rules for the System of Internal Evaluation and Quality Assurance of the University.
9 Article 2 of Appendix No. 1 to the Constitution of the University.
10 Articles 3 and 4 of Appendix No. 1 to the Constitution of the University.
Article 10 Final Provisions

1. The Rules of Assessment of Teaching by Students of Charles University in Prague registered by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports on September 3, 2001, as amended is hereby repealed.
2. This internal regulation was approved by the Academic Senate of the University on December 9, 2016.
3. This internal regulation comes into force on the date of registration by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports.\footnote{36 of the Higher Education Act. The registration was completed on 14 December 2016.}
4. This internal regulation becomes effective on the first day of the calendar month following the date of coming into force.
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