Quality Management System of Ferenc Rakoczi II Transcarpathian Hungarian University: Summary and General Guidelines

1. Introduction: Purpose and Use of this Summary

This summary presents the quality management and internal quality assurance system of Ferenc Rakoczi II Transcarpathian Hungarian University as an institutional system of governance, academic responsibility, operational processes, evidence use and continuous development. Its purpose is not to provide a narrow description of a manual or a catalogue of separate regulations. It explains how the University manages the quality of education, research-related academic activity and the supporting services that make higher education reliable, transparent and responsive to students, staff, partners and society.

The University approaches quality as a shared institutional responsibility. Educational quality is created through the combined work of strategic leadership, academic governance bodies, quality assurance structures, departments, programme guarantors, academic staff, administrative units, student organisations and external stakeholders. It is also shaped by the everyday conditions of learning: the relevance of educational programmes, the clarity of syllabi, the fairness of assessment, the competence and integrity of staff, the availability of learning resources, the reliability of student records, the accessibility of information, the effectiveness of feedback mechanisms and the willingness of the institution to improve on the basis of evidence.

This system-oriented presentation is intended for external readers, accreditation experts, institutional partners, decision-makers, academic staff, students and other stakeholders who need to understand how quality is organised and maintained at the University. It may be used in accreditation preparation, partnership discussions, internal orientation, quality-related communication and institutional planning. It is written as a standalone summary that explains the logic of the system even for readers who have not consulted the full Quality Management Handbook or its appendices.

The quality management system connects strategic objectives with daily educational practice. At the strategic level, it expresses the University's mission, regional responsibility, public accountability and commitment to academic standards. At the operational level, it regulates programme design, programme approval, course delivery, teaching and learning support, student assessment, final certification, student rights, staff development, information management, feedback, internal monitoring and external quality assurance. The strength of the system lies in the connection between these levels: policy is translated into procedures, procedures generate evidence, evidence informs decisions, and decisions support improvement.

The University's internal quality assurance system also balances compliance and enhancement. Compliance ensures that programmes, procedures and qualifications meet Ukrainian higher-education requirements, institutional regulations and recognised standards of academic credibility. Enhancement ensures that the University does not treat quality assurance as a one-time act of formal confirmation. Instead, programmes and processes are expected to be reviewed, updated and strengthened through stakeholder input, student feedback, staff development, career tracking, accreditation feedback and management analysis.

The documentary framework of the system is provided by the Quality Management Handbook and its appendices. Appendix 1 functions as the model of the educational quality assurance system, while

Appendix 2 serves as the register of the regulatory instruments through which the system operates. These documents are important not as an end in themselves, but because they give practical form to institutional quality policy. They define responsibilities, protect rights, create predictable procedures, support evidence collection and make the system auditable and transparent.

For that reason, the following sections present the functioning of the University's quality management system by theme. They show how the institution defines quality, how responsibilities are distributed, how educational programmes and courses are managed, how students and staff participate, how evidence is generated and used, how administrative and digital support processes contribute to educational quality, and how external quality assurance and accreditation are integrated into continuous improvement.

2. Institutional Quality Policy and Strategic Orientation

The quality policy of Ferenc Rakoczi II Transcarpathian Hungarian University is a public institutional commitment to the quality, integrity and continuous development of higher education. It frames quality not as a single administrative requirement, but as a defining feature of the University's mission and public responsibility. The policy requires that educational activity be relevant to academic standards, professional expectations, student needs, regional development and the wider social environment in which the University operates.

The system rests on the principle that educational quality must be deliberately managed. Strong educational outcomes cannot be assumed simply because curricula exist or classes are delivered. They require coherent programme design, clearly formulated learning outcomes, appropriate teaching methods, reliable assessment, qualified staff, accessible resources, transparent rules, student participation, accurate records and regular evaluation. Quality policy therefore provides the strategic direction for a structured set of procedures that support planning, implementation, monitoring and improvement.

Student-centredness is one of the central principles of the system. Students are not treated merely as recipients of services, but as participants in education and as stakeholders in quality assurance. This principle is expressed through the right to choose elective disciplines, the use of individual study plans, access to appeals, academic mobility, practical training, recognition of non-formal and informal learning, scholarship provision, distance learning arrangements, protection against bullying and mobbing, student questionnaires and student self-government. These instruments help ensure that education is not only formally organised, but also responsive, fair and understandable to students.

Transparency and accountability are equally important. The University maintains a regulatory framework that makes responsibilities, procedures and decision-making routes visible. Transparent rules allow students to understand how assessment, appeals, mobility, recognition, scholarships and final certification work. They also allow staff to understand expectations concerning teaching, research ethics, professional development, rating evaluation and academic titles. For external partners and accreditation experts, transparency demonstrates that the University has a functioning internal system rather than informal or ad hoc arrangements.

Academic integrity and ethical conduct are treated as foundations of quality. The system links educational quality with scientific ethics, honest assessment, responsible authorship, respect for students and colleagues, protection against harassment, conflict-resolution procedures and transparent recognition of achievement. This ethical dimension is essential because quality assurance loses credibility if

assessment, research, staff evaluation or student relations are not trusted. Integrity gives authority to qualifications, protects institutional reputation and strengthens the learning environment.

Stakeholder engagement gives the quality policy an outward-looking orientation. Educational programmes must remain academically sound, but they must also respond to professional fields, labour-market expectations, community needs and the experience of graduates. The system therefore creates channels through which students, alumni, employers, professional communities, partner institutions and other stakeholders can contribute to the development, review and updating of programmes. Stakeholder input helps the University avoid isolation and ensures that quality assurance is informed by real educational and professional outcomes.

Continuous improvement is the developmental principle that binds the system together. The University collects information through student questionnaires, staff satisfaction surveys, stakeholder involvement, career tracking, appeals, programme monitoring, accreditation procedures and institutional data. These forms of evidence should not be collected only for formal reporting. They are intended to support decisions about programme renewal, teaching improvement, student support, staff development, digital resources, administrative processes and strategic priorities. In this sense, quality policy is not static; it is a commitment to repeated institutional learning.

The strategic orientation of quality management also reflects the University's responsibility to connect academic identity with regional and social needs. As a higher education institution operating in Transcarpathia, Ferenc Rakoczi II Transcarpathian Hungarian University contributes to the availability of professional education, research culture, linguistic and cultural sustainability, and community development. Quality assurance supports this mission by ensuring that programmes are credible, graduates are well prepared, staff are professionally active, and institutional decisions are grounded in evidence and accountability.

3. Mission, Regional Role, and Quality Culture

The University's quality management system serves a mission that is both academic and social. It supports the development of knowledge, professional competence, ethical responsibility and the capacity of graduates to contribute to their communities and fields of work. Quality assurance therefore has a purpose beyond administrative compliance. It enables the University to demonstrate that its educational activity is aligned with its mission, that qualifications are meaningful, and that students experience higher education within a structured and supportive academic environment.

The regional role of the University gives quality management particular importance. In a multilingual and culturally specific environment, higher education contributes not only to individual advancement but also to the sustainability of educational opportunity and professional capacity in the region. Programme relevance, language competence, academic mobility, adult education, career tracking and stakeholder cooperation all help the institution respond to changing social and labour-market conditions while preserving academic standards.

Quality culture means that quality is understood as part of normal institutional behaviour. The University cannot rely only on formal rules, because regulations become effective only when they are implemented with understanding and responsibility. A quality culture is created when teachers design courses with clear outcomes and fair assessment, students participate responsibly and provide meaningful feedback, programme guarantors use evidence to update curricula, administrative units maintain accurate information, and leadership makes decisions that connect resources with strategic quality goals.

The system promotes a culture of shared responsibility rather than a culture of inspection. The Higher Education Quality Assurance Council and the Higher Education Quality Assurance Department coordinate and support quality-related work, but the system is not owned by one office alone. Departments, academic staff, student bodies, administrative services and external partners all contribute. This distributed responsibility is necessary because the quality of education is produced across many points of contact: curriculum design, classroom teaching, supervision, practical training, assessment, communication, records, digital platforms and student support.

The ethical climate of the University is an integral part of quality culture. Procedures for resolving conflicts, preventing bullying and mobbing, supporting academic integrity and regulating scientific ethics help protect a respectful environment. Such mechanisms reduce the risk that students or staff experience arbitrary treatment, intimidation, unfair assessment or unclear decision-making. They also provide evidence that the institution regards dignity, fairness and trust as conditions of educational quality.

Student participation strengthens quality culture because it adds the learner perspective to institutional decision-making. Students experience the coherence of programmes, the clarity of timetables, the fairness of assessments, the accessibility of teachers, the usefulness of practical training and the reliability of administrative services. Their opinions, expressed through questionnaires, student self-government, appeals and informal academic dialogue, provide information that cannot be fully replaced by managerial indicators. A mature quality culture treats student voice as a resource for improvement, not as a threat.

Staff participation is similarly essential. Academic staff are the primary designers and deliverers of learning. Their professional development, satisfaction, workload, research activity and ethical conduct affect the quality of programmes and student learning. The system therefore includes competitive staff selection, professional development, staff satisfaction measurement, rating evaluation, attestation, awards and recognition of academic titles. These processes support both accountability and motivation, which are necessary for a sustainable quality culture.

Quality culture also depends on institutional memory. Decisions, survey findings, programme reviews, appeals, accreditation recommendations and improvement actions must be documented and followed up. Without institutional memory, similar problems recur and improvements remain informal. The documentary framework, quality assurance bodies and administrative records help the University retain knowledge of what has been decided, what evidence supported the decision, and what further action is needed.

4. Architecture of the Quality Management System

The quality management system of Ferenc Rakoczi II Transcarpathian Hungarian University is organised as a connected architecture of policy, governance, processes, responsibilities, evidence and documents. Its architecture reflects the logic of internal quality assurance in higher education: the institution defines objectives, assigns responsibilities, implements procedures, collects information, evaluates results, introduces improvements and prepares for external review. Each element is necessary, but the system becomes effective only when the elements operate together.

At the policy level, the system defines the University's commitment to quality, student-centred learning, academic integrity, stakeholder involvement, transparency, evidence-based governance and continuous improvement. This level gives normative direction to the whole system. It explains why quality

assurance is necessary and what values should guide decisions. Policy also connects quality management to institutional mission, regional responsibility and public accountability.

At the governance level, the system distributes authority among leadership bodies and operational structures. Senior leadership sets strategic direction and provides conditions for implementation. The Rectorate and vice-rectors connect quality objectives with educational, scientific, methodological, administrative and resource-related decisions. The Academic Council provides academic legitimacy through approval and oversight of programmes, regulations, academic titles and strategic academic issues. Quality assurance bodies coordinate monitoring and improvement. Departments and programme guarantors take responsibility for programme-level quality.

At the process level, the system regulates the educational life-cycle from programme development to graduate outcomes. It includes programme design, approval, implementation, monitoring, updating, course-level methodological support, timetabling, student assessment, final certification, credit recognition, individual study plans, practical training, mobility, distance learning, student support, appeals, staff development, research ethics, surveys, career tracking and accreditation preparation. These processes are not separate administrative islands; they form a chain through which quality is planned, delivered and reviewed.

At the evidence level, the system generates information from multiple sources. Student questionnaires provide feedback on teaching and satisfaction. Staff satisfaction surveys identify conditions affecting teaching and research performance. Career tracking connects programmes to graduate outcomes. Stakeholder engagement brings employer, alumni and professional perspectives into programme development. Appeals and conflict procedures reveal possible weaknesses in assessment or communication. Accreditation feedback offers an external reference point. Institutional data from student records, timetables, information systems and administrative units support monitoring and decision-making.

At the documentary level, the system is operationalised by regulations, procedures, records, programme documentation, survey reports, minutes, decisions and accreditation materials. Documentation ensures that processes are repeatable, responsibilities are traceable and evidence is available for internal and external review. It also protects users by reducing uncertainty. A student can know how to appeal an assessment; a programme guarantor can know how to update a programme; a department can know what course documentation is required; a staff member can know how professional development and evaluation are organised.

The architecture of the system can be understood as a continuous improvement cycle. Planning includes strategic objectives, programme design, learning outcomes, resource planning and staff development. Implementation includes teaching, assessment, practical training, mobility, student support and administrative services. Monitoring includes surveys, programme review, stakeholder consultation, appeals, career tracking and staff evaluation. Improvement includes programme updates, methodological renewal, corrective actions, staff training, resource development and management decisions. External quality assurance tests and strengthens this cycle.

This architecture also recognises that quality management includes both academic and support processes. Teaching and research are central, but their quality depends on administrative reliability, digital infrastructure, library and information resources, communication, adult education, student records, timetables and career tracking. The system therefore treats support units as participants in educational quality. Their work helps make the academic process predictable, accessible and sustainable.

5. Governance, Responsibilities, and Institutional Actors

Senior leadership provides the strategic authority for the quality management system. The President, Rector and Rectorate create the conditions under which quality policy becomes institutional practice. Their responsibilities include aligning quality objectives with the University's mission and development strategy, ensuring that quality assurance bodies have authority and resources, supporting external accountability, and encouraging a culture in which evidence and improvement are valued. Leadership also has a corrective role when monitoring results, accreditation feedback or stakeholder concerns indicate the need for institutional action.

Vice-rectors provide specialised leadership across the major domains of institutional quality. Quality assurance is connected with education, methodology, science, research, finance, infrastructure, communication and international cooperation. The vice-rectors' roles therefore help prevent fragmentation between academic priorities and operational conditions. For example, programme renewal may require methodological support, staff development, stakeholder engagement, digital resources and administrative coordination. Specialised leadership helps these elements operate as one system.

The Academic Council is a central body of academic governance. It gives institutional decisions academic legitimacy by considering and approving regulations, educational programmes, academic titles and other matters that affect the quality and credibility of education and science. The Academic Council's role is important because higher education quality cannot be reduced to managerial efficiency. It requires academic judgement about curricula, staff qualifications, research standards, learning outcomes and the value of qualifications.

The Higher Education Quality Assurance Council functions as a coordinating and advisory body for internal quality assurance. It supports systematic discussion of quality policy implementation, monitoring results, programme development, survey findings, accreditation readiness and improvement measures. Its value lies in bringing quality-related information into a forum where academic and administrative perspectives can be considered together. This helps the University move from isolated observations to institutional learning.

The Higher Education Quality Assurance Department provides operational support for the system. It contributes to the maintenance of quality-related documentation, the organisation of surveys, methodological support for programme development and review, preparation of analytical materials, coordination of accreditation evidence and communication among departments, programme guarantors, student bodies and leadership. Its role is analytical and developmental as well as administrative: it helps transform information into usable quality evidence.

Departments are the primary academic units where programmes are implemented. They organise teaching, supervise course documentation, support staff development, consider student learning issues, participate in assessment and contribute to programme review. Because students experience educational quality largely through departments and teachers, departmental responsibility is essential. Departments must ensure that institutional rules are not merely known, but applied in the academic practices of each discipline.

Programme guarantors and specialty support groups provide programme-level accountability. A programme guarantor ensures that an educational programme has coherent objectives, relevant learning outcomes, appropriate curriculum structure, qualified teaching staff, clear assessment arrangements, stakeholder involvement and evidence-based updating. The specialty support group strengthens this

responsibility by bringing together academic expertise needed to maintain the programme. This structure prevents programme quality from becoming anonymous or dispersed across unrelated courses.

Administrative and support units make the academic system reliable. The Division of Students' Contingent supports admissions, enrolment, student records, academic and examination administration and other student services. The career tracking unit gathers information about graduates and employability. The Centre for Education of Adults connects the University with lifelong learning and community needs. The Puskás Tivadar Centre of Informatics supports digital infrastructure, information systems and distance learning. Library, communication and media units contribute to information access and public transparency. Their work is quality-management work because it supports the conditions under which education can be delivered consistently.

Student self-government bodies represent student interests and contribute to feedback, consultation and rights protection. They help the University understand student experience, communicate student concerns and strengthen the legitimacy of quality-related decisions. The Scientific Association of Students and Young Researchers supports research culture, student scholarly activity, academic events, networking and the development of young researchers. Both bodies show that students participate not only as learners but also as partners in academic life and quality culture.

External stakeholders provide perspectives that the University cannot generate internally. Employers, alumni, professional communities, partner institutions, public authorities and accreditation experts help assess whether programmes remain relevant, whether graduates possess needed competences and whether institutional quality assurance meets wider expectations. Their involvement supports programme updating, practical training, mobility, career tracking and external accountability.

6. Process-Based Quality Management

The University's quality management system is process-based. This means that quality is not measured only at the end of education, for example by the award of a diploma or the result of accreditation. It is managed through the processes that produce educational outcomes. Programme design, course development, teaching, learning support, assessment, student progression, staff recruitment, professional development, information management, stakeholder feedback and external review are all treated as processes that must have responsible actors, procedures, evidence and improvement mechanisms.

A process-based system begins with planning. Educational programmes are developed through analysis of standards, institutional mission, disciplinary requirements, learning outcomes, labour-market expectations and stakeholder input. Planning also includes the preparation of curricula, course structures, credit distribution, staffing arrangements, practical training opportunities, teaching resources and mechanisms for student choice. This planning stage determines whether programmes are coherent and whether the University can deliver what the programme promises.

Implementation takes place through teaching, learning and support activities. Courses are delivered according to syllabi and methodological materials. Timetables organise student and teacher workload. Distance learning and digital platforms provide additional forms of access. Practical training connects learning with professional environments. Curators of academic groups support communication and adaptation. Administrative units maintain records and provide student services. In a process-based system, each of these activities is part of educational quality rather than a separate technical task.

Monitoring checks whether implementation is effective. The University uses student questionnaires, staff satisfaction surveys, stakeholder feedback, programme monitoring, appeals, conflict-resolution processes, career tracking, staff evaluation and accreditation preparation to identify strengths and risks. Monitoring must be evidence-based and contextual. Survey results, employment data and assessment outcomes require interpretation by responsible bodies, because data become meaningful only when they are connected to programme objectives, student needs and institutional decisions.

Corrective and developmental action follows monitoring. When evidence identifies a weakness, the system should lead to a response: revision of an educational programme, improvement of course materials, clarification of assessment criteria, staff training, adjustment of timetables, strengthening of student support, improvement of digital infrastructure or revision of an administrative procedure. Improvement actions should be documented so that the University can show not only that evidence was collected, but that it was used.

Process ownership is critical. Each process must have a responsible actor or unit. Programme guarantors own programme coherence. Departments own teaching implementation and academic standards in their disciplines. Teachers own course-level quality and assessment integrity. Administrative units own records, timetables and student services. Quality assurance bodies support monitoring and analysis. Leadership owns strategic decisions and resource allocation. Student bodies and stakeholders contribute evidence and consultation. Clear ownership reduces ambiguity and prevents quality risks from being ignored.

The process-based approach also strengthens consistency across the institution. Different disciplines may have different academic traditions, but quality assurance requires common expectations for programme documentation, learning outcomes, assessment transparency, student support, appeals, staff development and feedback use. Institutional regulations and quality assurance support help ensure that disciplinary diversity does not become procedural inconsistency.

Process management includes document control. Regulations and procedures must be current, approved, accessible and connected to the processes they govern. Outdated or unclear documents create risk because users may apply different rules to similar situations. The documentary register of the system helps identify the official regulatory instruments for educational process, student rights, staff quality and scientific activity. It also shows how individual procedures contribute to the system as a whole.

The value of process-based quality management is that it makes quality sustainable. A result obtained once is not enough; the University must be able to reproduce quality across cohorts, programmes, departments and academic years. Repeatable processes, responsible actors and evidence-based improvement make quality less dependent on individual improvisation and more embedded in institutional practice.

7. Quality Assurance of Educational Programmes

Programme-level quality is one of the core responsibilities of the internal quality assurance system. Educational programmes define the qualification profile, learning outcomes, curriculum structure, credit distribution, teaching responsibilities, assessment logic, practical training components and graduate competences. If a programme is weakly designed or insufficiently updated, course-level effort alone cannot fully compensate. The system therefore treats programme development and review as strategic academic processes.

Programme design begins with the relationship between mission, standards and outcomes. Each programme must express what graduates are expected to know, understand and be able to do. Learning outcomes should correspond to higher-education standards, disciplinary expectations, professional requirements and stakeholder needs. They should also be realistic in relation to the curriculum, staff expertise, resources and forms of assessment. The programme guarantor and specialty support group play a central role in ensuring this alignment.

Programme approval and updating require academic judgement and institutional coordination. Departments contribute disciplinary expertise. Programme guarantors coordinate the programme concept and documentation. Stakeholders provide perspectives on relevance and professional expectations. Quality assurance structures support methodological consistency. Academic governance bodies provide approval and legitimacy. This combination ensures that programmes are neither purely administrative products nor isolated departmental initiatives.

Stakeholder engagement is an operational mechanism of programme quality. Students can comment on workload, learning conditions and assessment. Graduates can explain how useful the programme has been in employment or further study. Employers can identify competence needs and professional trends. Partner institutions and professional communities can contribute comparative perspectives. Stakeholder feedback should be documented and considered during programme review, especially when learning outcomes, course content, practical training or elective opportunities are updated.

Programme monitoring should consider multiple forms of evidence. Student performance, assessment results, student feedback, appeals, practical training reports, employer comments, graduate tracking, staff evaluation, accreditation recommendations and changes in legal or professional standards may all indicate whether a programme remains effective. Monitoring is not simply a search for deficiencies; it is also a way to identify strengths that can be developed further or shared across programmes.

Programme updating protects the relevance of education over time. Disciplines evolve, labour-market requirements change, technologies develop, legal frameworks shift and student expectations are transformed. The system therefore requires mechanisms for revising curricula, learning outcomes, course lists, credit distribution, assessment methods, practical components and methodological support. Updates should be planned, justified by evidence and approved through institutional procedures.

Programme guarantors provide the continuity necessary for this cycle. Their role includes coordinating programme documentation, monitoring the achievement of outcomes, ensuring that staff competences match programme needs, preparing for accreditation, cooperating with departments and quality assurance units, and leading stakeholder engagement. By assigning responsibility to a guarantor and support group, the University creates a clear point of accountability for each programme.

Programme quality also depends on the coherence between compulsory and elective components. Compulsory courses ensure that all students achieve the essential outcomes of the qualification. Elective disciplines allow students to personalise learning and develop additional competences. The system must therefore ensure that elective choice is meaningful, transparent and compatible with programme aims. The individual study plan records how the student's educational trajectory fulfils programme requirements.

Practical training is part of programme-level quality because it tests the connection between academic learning and professional application. Well-organised practice requires clear objectives, agreements with host organisations, supervision, safety arrangements, reports and assessment. Feedback from practical training sites can inform programme improvement and strengthen stakeholder cooperation.

Practical training also helps students understand professional expectations and develop employability-related competences.

Academic mobility and recognition procedures support programme openness. When students study at partner institutions or bring prior learning from other contexts, the University must compare learning outcomes, credits and programme requirements transparently. Re-crediting, recognition of non-formal and informal learning, and mobility arrangements allow flexibility while preserving standards. These procedures show that programme quality can be compatible with diverse learning pathways.

External accreditation provides an independent test of programme quality. Accreditation preparation should be the presentation of a continuously functioning system, not a temporary collection of documents before a visit. Programme guarantors, departments, quality assurance units, student representatives and administrative services all contribute evidence. When the internal system works regularly, external review becomes an opportunity for confirmation, comparison and developmental feedback.

8. Course-Level Quality, Teaching, Learning, and Assessment

Course-level quality translates programme objectives into the daily experience of students. A programme may have appropriate learning outcomes, but those outcomes are achieved through particular courses, teaching methods, assignments, consultations, practical tasks, reading materials and assessments. The University therefore regulates educational and methodological support for academic disciplines so that courses are planned, documented and aligned with programme goals.

A high-quality course requires a clear syllabus or course description. Students should know the purpose of the discipline, expected learning outcomes, topics, workload, forms of teaching, independent work, reading requirements, assessment criteria, deadlines and rules of communication. Teachers should be able to show how the course contributes to programme outcomes and how assessment verifies the intended learning. Departments and programme guarantors review course documentation to maintain coherence across the programme.

Teaching quality depends on methodological preparation as well as disciplinary competence. Lectures, seminars, laboratory work, practical sessions, online activities and independent learning tasks should be organised in ways that support student engagement and the achievement of outcomes. Methodological materials, recommendations, electronic resources and consultation arrangements help students understand expectations and help teachers maintain consistency. Such documentation is a quality tool because it makes teaching transparent and reviewable.

Assessment is one of the most sensitive areas of quality assurance. It must be fair, transparent, aligned with learning outcomes and appropriately documented. Students need to know how their work will be evaluated and what criteria will be applied. Teachers need reliable procedures for grading and feedback. Departments need assurance that assessment standards are comparable. The institution needs confidence that grades and qualifications reflect genuine achievement.

The appeal procedure protects assessment credibility. A student who believes that an assessment procedure or result was unfair must have access to a clear, impartial and documented review process. Appeals serve two functions. They protect individual rights, and they provide evidence of possible weaknesses in assessment design, communication or implementation. When appeal patterns are analysed, they can lead to improvement in assessment criteria, examiner guidance, course documentation or student information.

Final certification and examination commissions connect assessment with the public value of qualifications. Examination commissions should operate according to established rules for composition, authority, documentation, decision-making and communication of results. Qualification theses, course papers and final examinations should demonstrate that students have achieved programme outcomes. Transparent procedures protect the credibility of diplomas and professional qualifications.

Course papers and qualification theses also support research-based learning. They require students to formulate topics, use evidence, apply methods, respect academic integrity, work with supervisors and present results. The system regulates supervision, submission, formatting, review, defence and evaluation so that independent student work can be assessed consistently. Plagiarism prevention and scientific ethics are directly relevant to this area.

Timetabling contributes to course-level quality because it shapes workload, access and predictability. A poorly organised timetable can create conflicts, excessive concentration of classes, room problems, difficulty attending consultations or barriers to elective choice. The timetable process therefore has quality-management significance. It helps ensure that educational activity is organised in a way that supports learning rather than obstructing it.

Distance learning and digital education extend course delivery beyond the physical classroom. The system must ensure that online or blended forms of education have clear communication channels, reliable platforms, appropriate materials, academic integrity safeguards, assessment procedures and technical support. Distance learning is not simply the transfer of tasks to an electronic environment; it requires intentional design and monitoring to protect quality.

Physical education, optional language study and other course-related opportunities contribute to holistic development. Foreign-language competence supports internationalisation, mobility, access to academic literature and employability. Physical education supports wellbeing, discipline and the broader student environment. The quality system recognises these areas because educational quality includes more than the narrow completion of disciplinary credits.

9. Student-Centred Learning, Student Rights, and Student Support

Student-centred quality assurance is a defining feature of the University's system. It requires that students have clear rights, understandable procedures, meaningful choices, access to support, protection against unfair treatment and channels for participation. Student-centredness does not mean lowering academic standards. It means organising education so that students can understand requirements, follow individual learning trajectories, receive fair assessment, participate in feedback and develop as responsible members of the academic community.

Elective choice is one of the main mechanisms of student-centred learning. Students should be able to select elective disciplines according to published rules, available information, deadlines and programme requirements. The system must ensure that elective choice is real rather than merely formal. Students need access to descriptions of available disciplines, and their choices must be recorded in individual study plans. Programme guarantors and departments must ensure that choice does not undermine the coherence of the qualification.

The individual study plan links institutional programme requirements with the student's actual learning path. It records compulsory and elective components, recognised credits, academic differences, mobility outcomes and progression conditions. It supports flexibility while preserving standards. For the

student, it provides clarity about what must be completed. For the University, it provides an official record for monitoring progression and graduation requirements.

Student appeals and conflict-resolution procedures protect fairness. Students must be able to challenge assessment procedures or results when there are grounds for doing so. They must also have routes for resolving disputes involving staff, students or administrative decisions. A clear process reduces the risk of arbitrary treatment and strengthens trust. It also provides information about areas where communication, assessment or institutional practice may require improvement.

Scholarship provision supports equity and motivation. Transparent criteria for scholarships help students understand how academic performance, social conditions or other recognised factors are considered. Scholarship procedures must be documented, consistent and open to review. In quality-management terms, scholarships are not merely financial transactions; they are instruments that support access, recognise achievement and contribute to student retention and engagement.

Academic mobility supports student development and institutional openness. Students may benefit from study at partner institutions, exposure to different academic environments, improved language competence and expanded professional networks. Mobility requires clear selection, learning agreements, recognition of results and communication before and after participation. Without transparent recognition, mobility can create uncertainty. With clear rules, it becomes a quality-enhancing experience.

Practical training is essential for competence-based education. Students need opportunities to apply knowledge, understand professional environments, receive supervision and reflect on practice. The quality system requires that practical training be organised with clear objectives, responsibilities, reporting and assessment. Host organisations and supervisors can provide feedback that helps evaluate the relevance of programmes and the preparedness of students.

Recognition of non-formal and informal learning supports lifelong learning and fairness. Students may acquire relevant competences through work, courses, professional activities, self-study or other learning experiences. The University can recognise such outcomes when evidence shows that they correspond to programme requirements. This approach values diverse learning pathways while maintaining academic standards through careful assessment of outcomes.

Protection against bullying and mobbing is a quality assurance matter because education cannot be effective in an atmosphere of intimidation, humiliation or hostility. The system defines procedures for prevention, reporting, consideration of cases, protection of parties and corrective measures. This protects dignity and psychological safety, and it also strengthens the ethical culture of the University.

Curators of academic groups provide a personal support mechanism. They help students understand institutional rules, communicate with departments, adapt to academic life and solve organisational difficulties. Especially for new students, the curator function can reduce information gaps and prevent disengagement. This role connects student support with the academic structure of the University.

Student questionnaires create a structured channel for evaluating teaching and measuring satisfaction. Surveys allow students to express views on teaching quality, assessment, communication, learning conditions and support. Their value depends on anonymity or confidentiality, regular administration, responsible analysis and visible improvement actions. Students are more likely to participate meaningfully when they see that feedback leads to discussion and change.

Student conduct rules balance rights with responsibility. A student-centred system also expects students to respect academic integrity, communicate appropriately, follow institutional rules, protect

University property, participate honestly in assessment and contribute to a respectful community. Quality assurance therefore supports both student rights and student responsibility.

10. Staff Development, Research Ethics, and Academic Standards

The quality of educational programmes depends directly on the competence, integrity and motivation of scientific-pedagogical staff. The University therefore treats staff quality as a core component of the internal quality assurance system. Staff-related procedures cover recruitment, recognition of credentials, professional development, satisfaction measurement, rating evaluation, attestation, awards, academic titles and scientific ethics. Together, they create a staff quality cycle that begins with selection and continues through development, evaluation, recognition and accountability.

Competitive selection for vacant scientific-pedagogical positions supports merit-based staffing. The procedure should define qualification requirements, application materials, evaluation criteria, decision-making bodies, employment contracts and documentation. Transparent recruitment protects the institution from arbitrariness and helps ensure that teachers have the academic, methodological and professional competences required by educational programmes. It also provides evidence for accreditation that staffing is appropriate and regulated.

Recognition of foreign documents on education, scientific degrees and academic titles supports international academic mobility while protecting standards. The Academic Council's role in recognition ensures that foreign credentials are evaluated carefully for authenticity, equivalence and relevance. This process is important because recognised qualifications may affect employment, programme staffing, academic titles and institutional credibility.

Professional development ensures that staff competence remains current. Higher education changes as disciplines evolve, digital tools develop, student needs change and teaching methods improve. Staff members therefore need opportunities for training, internships, seminars, conferences, methodological development, research activity and digital competence development. Departments and leadership should connect professional development with programme needs and quality priorities.

Staff satisfaction measurement contributes to evidence-based staff policy. Working conditions, workload, management communication, access to resources, opportunities for development and institutional climate all influence teaching and research performance. Surveys of scientific-pedagogical staff allow the University to identify strengths and difficulties in the professional environment. The results should be analysed and used to improve management practices, support services and professional development planning.

Rating evaluation and attestation provide structured accountability. They allow the University to consider teaching activity, methodological work, research output, student supervision, publication, professional development, organisational contribution and adherence to academic standards. Evaluation should not be only punitive or bureaucratic. Its developmental value lies in identifying achievements, recognising excellence, clarifying expectations and determining professional-development needs.

Awards and recognition strengthen quality culture by making valued contributions visible. Recognition may relate to teaching excellence, research achievement, service, innovation, student support or institutional development. When awards are based on transparent criteria and documented evidence, they motivate staff and reinforce the behaviours that support institutional quality.

Academic titles require careful consideration because they affect academic credibility and institutional reputation. Procedures for considering candidates for academic titles should be transparent, evidence-based and academically rigorous. They should consider teaching, research, publications, supervision, professional reputation and contribution to the academic community. The Academic Council's involvement protects standards and reinforces the authority of academic governance.

Scientific ethics is the normative foundation of staff and research quality. The Code of Scientific Ethics defines expectations concerning research honesty, proper citation, avoidance of plagiarism and falsification, responsible authorship, conflict of interest, respect for colleagues and students, ethical handling of data and responsibility for the social consequences of research. These principles apply not only to research publications but also to teaching materials, student supervision and qualification theses.

Research culture contributes to educational quality. Students learn not only through lectures and examinations, but also through contact with active scholarship, research methods, academic events, publications and scientific associations. The Scientific Association of Students and Young Researchers supports this connection by encouraging student scientific activity, networking, presentation and publication. A strong research culture helps students develop independent thinking and strengthens the academic environment of programmes.

Staff quality assurance must be linked with programme quality. Programme guarantors and departments need to ensure that staff qualifications correspond to the disciplines they teach and that professional development supports programme objectives. Accreditation experts often examine whether staffing is adequate for programme outcomes. The University's staff procedures therefore contribute directly to programme credibility.

11. Information Management, Evidence, Feedback, and Continuous Improvement

Evidence-based governance is a core principle of the University's quality management system. Decisions about programmes, teaching, resources, student support, staff development and administrative processes should be informed by reliable information. Without evidence, quality assurance risks becoming subjective or symbolic. With evidence, the University can identify patterns, compare expectations with reality and plan improvements.

The system draws evidence from several channels. Student questionnaires evaluate teaching and student satisfaction. Staff satisfaction surveys examine the professional environment. Career tracking provides information about graduate outcomes and employability. Stakeholder engagement brings external perspectives into programme design and review. Appeals and conflict procedures reveal weaknesses in assessment, communication or institutional practice. Programme monitoring and accreditation feedback identify structural strengths and risks. Administrative data show progression, enrolment, timetabling, mobility, recognition and completion patterns.

Student feedback is especially important because students experience the system directly. They can identify whether course expectations are clear, teaching methods are effective, assessment criteria are understandable, timetables are workable, communication is accessible and support mechanisms function. Feedback should be collected responsibly, interpreted in context and discussed by departments, teachers, programme guarantors and quality assurance bodies. It should not be reduced to numerical ratings without qualitative understanding.

Staff feedback provides a different but equally important perspective. Teachers and researchers understand workload, resource needs, methodological challenges, student preparedness, administrative burdens and opportunities for professional growth. Staff satisfaction surveys can help leadership identify barriers to quality teaching and research. They also show that the University regards staff as participants in quality enhancement rather than only as objects of evaluation.

Career tracking connects education with longer-term outcomes. Graduate employment, further study, professional development and alumni perceptions offer evidence about the relevance of programmes. Such information can support programme updates, stakeholder discussions, admissions information and strategic planning. Career tracking should be interpreted carefully, because graduate outcomes are influenced by labour-market conditions as well as educational quality. Nevertheless, systematic graduate information is an important source of institutional learning.

Stakeholder feedback helps maintain relevance. Employers, professional communities, partner institutions, alumni and practice providers can identify emerging competence needs and comment on the preparedness of students. Their input should be considered during programme design and updating, practical training arrangements and accreditation preparation. Stakeholder engagement becomes meaningful when feedback is documented, discussed and connected to programme decisions.

Appeals, complaints and conflict cases provide important evidence even when they concern individual situations. Patterns in appeals may indicate unclear assessment criteria, inconsistent grading, insufficient communication or gaps in course documentation. Conflict cases may reveal weaknesses in roles, expectations or institutional culture. A quality system uses such information not only to resolve individual cases, but also to prevent recurrence.

Information systems and digital infrastructure support evidence management. Reliable student records, electronic communication, survey tools, learning platforms, document storage and management information systems help collect, organise and communicate quality-related data. Data quality is itself a quality issue. Inaccurate records can lead to unfair decisions about progression, scholarships, mobility, recognition or graduation. Secure and accessible systems are therefore essential.

Evidence must lead to analysis and action. The Higher Education Quality Assurance Council, the Higher Education Quality Assurance Department, departments, programme guarantors, leadership and student representatives all have roles in interpreting evidence. They must distinguish between isolated incidents and systemic problems, between perception and verified fact, and between compliance issues and developmental opportunities. Improvement actions should be specific enough to be implemented and monitored.

Continuous improvement requires follow-up. It is not sufficient to conduct a survey, hold a meeting or record a recommendation. The system must ask whether planned actions were implemented, whether they solved the problem, and whether further measures are needed. Follow-up creates institutional memory and demonstrates that quality assurance is a cycle rather than a sequence of disconnected activities.

Public and internal communication of quality-related information strengthens trust. Students and staff should know that feedback is considered. External stakeholders should be able to see that the University has quality policy, programmes, regulations and accreditation information. Communication must be accurate and current, because outdated or unclear information can undermine confidence even when internal processes are functioning.

12. Administrative, Digital, Communication, and Support Processes

Administrative and support processes are integral to educational quality. They do not replace academic standards, but they make the academic system reliable. Students cannot experience high-quality education if enrolment is unclear, records are inaccurate, timetables are unstable, assessment results are not documented, digital platforms fail, library resources are inaccessible or public information is outdated. The University's quality system therefore includes support units as active contributors to quality assurance.

The Division of Students' Contingent supports the student life-cycle from admission to completion. Its functions include organisational and administrative tasks, student records, academic and examination administration, enrolment and student services. In quality-management terms, the unit reduces administrative risk. Accurate records are necessary for individual study plans, elective choices, academic differences, scholarships, mobility, practical training, examination decisions, diplomas and honours. Administrative reliability protects fairness.

Timetable management is a practical but important quality process. A transparent timetable supports attendance, workload distribution, room use, teacher planning and student access to consultations or electives. Changes should be communicated clearly and managed through established procedures. Timetabling also affects student satisfaction, because unpredictability can make learning more difficult even when teaching content is strong.

Digital infrastructure is central to modern quality assurance. The Puskás Tivadar Centre of Informatics supports information technology, telecommunications networks, maintenance, development and user assistance. This work enables distance learning, electronic communication, data storage, information systems, surveys, digital resources and online administration. Digital reliability is now part of educational reliability. Technical failure can affect access, assessment, feedback and institutional communication.

Distance learning depends on both pedagogy and infrastructure. Teachers need platforms, guidance and support for designing online or blended learning. Students need access, clear instructions and reliable communication. Assessment in digital environments requires attention to identity, academic integrity and documentation. Quality assurance must confirm that distance learning is organised according to educational objectives rather than improvised as a technical substitute for classroom activity.

Library and information resources support independent learning, research activity and academic integrity. Students and staff need access to literature, databases, catalogues, repositories, methodological materials and guidance on information use. Library services contribute to quality by supporting reading, research, citation practice, qualification theses and scientific activity. Information literacy is closely connected to academic standards.

Institutional communication and media activity support transparency and accountability. Public information about educational programmes, admission, regulations, opportunities, events, quality policy, accreditation and institutional achievements helps students and stakeholders make informed decisions. Internal communication supports implementation by ensuring that staff and students know procedures and deadlines. Communication quality is therefore both practical and reputational.

Career tracking is a support process with strategic quality value. By collecting information from graduates and cooperating with departments, leadership, student bodies and alumni structures, the career tracking unit helps the University understand graduate pathways. These data can inform programme development, practical training, stakeholder dialogue and public accountability. Career tracking connects education with outcomes beyond graduation.

Adult education extends the University's educational mission to lifelong learning. The Centre for Education of Adults can organise courses, projects and programmes for different age groups and professional needs. This contributes to regional development and labour-market responsiveness. It also creates additional contact with external stakeholders and adult learners whose experience can enrich the University's understanding of educational demand.

The Scientific Association of Students and Young Researchers supports student scholarly development. Its activities can include scientific events, networking, publication opportunities and advocacy for student researchers. This contributes to the research environment of programmes and encourages students to engage with academic standards, methods and ethics. Support for student research is a quality-enhancing process because it deepens learning and strengthens academic identity.

Student self-government is also a support structure. It represents student interests, communicates concerns, contributes to consultation and participates in institutional dialogue. Student representation helps ensure that quality assurance remains connected to the learner experience. It also encourages students to take responsibility for the academic community and to participate constructively in improvement.

Support processes require coordination. A student issue may involve a department, student records, a timetable, a scholarship decision, a mobility agreement, a digital platform and a curator. The quality system must therefore encourage cooperation among units rather than isolated problem-solving. Coordination reduces delays, inconsistencies and gaps in responsibility.

13. External Quality Assurance, Accreditation, and Public Accountability

External quality assurance provides an independent reference point for the University's internal system. Accreditation and external evaluation test whether educational programmes, staffing, resources, assessment procedures, stakeholder engagement and internal quality assurance mechanisms meet public expectations. The University uses its internal system to prepare for such evaluation, but external review should be understood as more than a compliance event. It is also a source of developmental feedback.

Accreditation readiness depends on continuous internal practice. If programme monitoring, stakeholder engagement, student feedback, staff development, assessment documentation and evidence management are maintained regularly, accreditation preparation becomes the organised presentation of real practice. If these processes are performed only shortly before an external review, quality assurance becomes superficial. The University's process-based system supports the continuous model.

Programme guarantors and departments have major responsibilities in external quality assurance. They must demonstrate programme relevance, coherent learning outcomes, qualified staff, appropriate course documentation, transparent assessment, stakeholder involvement, practical training arrangements and improvement actions. They also need to explain how evidence has influenced programme updates. Quality assurance units support them by providing methodological guidance, templates, coordination and institutional data.

Students and stakeholders contribute to accreditation credibility. External experts often seek evidence that students understand programmes, can exercise rights, participate in feedback and receive support. They may also consider whether employers and graduates participate in programme development. When student and stakeholder involvement is regular and documented, the University can demonstrate that quality assurance is participatory rather than purely administrative.

Leadership and academic governance provide the strategic context for external quality assurance. They must show how programmes fit the institutional mission, how quality policy is implemented, how resources are allocated, how staff development is supported and how improvement decisions are made. The Academic Council's approval of programmes, regulations and academic standards demonstrates the role of academic governance in maintaining quality.

External evaluation strengthens public accountability. The University awards qualifications that have social, professional and legal value. Students, families, employers, partner institutions and public authorities need confidence that these qualifications are based on credible educational processes. Internal quality assurance provides the evidence; external quality assurance provides independent confirmation and recommendations.

Alignment with recognised European principles of internal quality assurance is reflected in the system's attention to public quality policy, programme design and review, student-centred learning, transparent assessment, staff competence, learning resources, information management, public information and external review. This alignment supports international understandability and cooperation. It also helps the University communicate its quality system to partners outside Ukraine.

External feedback should be integrated into continuous improvement. Accreditation recommendations, expert observations and comparison with external standards can identify risks or opportunities that internal actors may not see. The University should treat such feedback as part of its evidence base, discuss it in appropriate bodies, assign responsibilities and monitor follow-up. In this way, external quality assurance becomes a driver of internal enhancement.

Public accountability also requires accessible information. The University should provide accurate public information about programmes, accreditation, regulations, institutional structure, student opportunities, quality policy and support services. This information helps prospective students, current students, partners and external reviewers understand the institution. Public information must be kept current, because transparency depends on reliability as well as availability.

The internal and external dimensions of quality assurance are mutually reinforcing. A strong internal system makes external review more credible and less disruptive. External review, in turn, tests and improves the internal system. Together they support trust in the University's educational mission and its capacity for responsible self-governance.

14. Documentary Basis of the System

The Quality Management Handbook and its appendices provide the documentary basis of the University's quality management system. Their function is to make the system visible, coherent and operational. They identify quality principles, institutional actors, regulated processes and the official instruments through which responsibilities are implemented. Documentation does not replace quality culture, but it gives quality culture a stable operational form.

Appendix 1 functions as the model of the educational quality assurance system. It connects general quality policy with the practical mechanisms through which education is planned, delivered, monitored and improved. Its significance lies in showing that educational quality is assured through governance, programme responsibility, teaching support, assessment, student participation, staff quality, resources, information management and external review. It provides the conceptual and procedural bridge between institutional policy and detailed regulations.

Appendix 2 functions as the register of regulations that operationalise the system. It groups the regulatory instruments into areas concerning the educational process, students, and scientific-pedagogical staff and scientific activity. This structure is important because it reflects the main determinants of educational quality: how programmes and teaching are organised, how students are supported and protected, and how staff competence and academic integrity are maintained.

The regulations on the educational process support programme and course quality. They cover the organisation of education, the internal quality assurance system, examination commissions, educational and methodological support, timetables, programme guarantors and support groups, conflict resolution, stakeholders, assessment appeals, programme development and updating, optional foreign-language study, curators of academic groups, course papers and qualification theses, re-crediting and academic differences, individual study plans, distance learning, physical education and the awarding of professional qualifications. Their common function is to make education coherent, transparent, assessable and capable of improvement.

The student-related regulations support rights, participation, flexibility and welfare. They regulate student conduct, scholarships, elective choice, practical training, recognition of non-formal and informal learning, academic mobility, prevention of bullying and mobbing, student questionnaires and diplomas with honours. Their quality-management function is to protect fairness, support individual learning trajectories, provide feedback channels, recognise achievement and create conditions for a respectful student environment.

The staff and scientific activity regulations support academic credibility. They include the Code of Scientific Ethics, staff satisfaction questionnaires, recognition of foreign educational and academic documents, staff selection, professional development, awards, rating evaluation and attestation, and the consideration of candidates for academic titles. Their quality-management function is to ensure that staff are qualified, professionally developing, ethically accountable and appropriately recognised.

The documentary framework should be interpreted functionally, not mechanically. A timetable regulation is a quality instrument because it affects workload and access. A scholarship regulation is a quality instrument because it affects equity and motivation. A staff award regulation is a quality instrument because it reinforces valued contributions. A conflict-resolution regulation is a quality instrument because it protects trust. A career tracking process is a quality instrument because it connects education with outcomes. The value of the framework lies in the way these instruments work together.

The following table maps the main quality assurance areas to responsible actors, processes, regulatory instruments and quality-management functions. It is intended as a compact analytical overview rather than a replacement for the detailed regulations.

Table 1. Quality assurance areas, responsibilities, processes, instruments and functions

Quality assurance area	Responsible actors	Main processes	Relevant regulatory instruments	Expected quality-management function
Institutional governance and quality policy	Senior leadership, Rectorate, vice-rectors, Academic Council, Higher Education Quality Assurance Council	Strategic direction, approval of regulations, monitoring of quality policy, resource decisions, institutional accountability	Quality policy, internal quality assurance regulation, governance provisions of the quality system	Aligns mission, strategy, public accountability and daily educational management
Educational programme development and updating	Programme guarantors, specialty support groups, departments, stakeholders, quality assurance department, Academic Council	Needs analysis, learning outcomes, curriculum design, stakeholder consultation, approval, periodic review	Regulations on programme development and updating; programme guarantor and support group; stakeholders	Ensures programmes are coherent, relevant, standards-based and evidence-informed
Teaching and methodological support	Teachers, departments, programme guarantors, quality assurance units	Syllabi, course packages, teaching materials, independent work, methodological renewal	Regulation on educational and methodological support for academic disciplines	Makes course expectations transparent and aligns teaching with programme outcomes
Assessment, final certification and appeals	Teachers, departments, examination commissions, appeal bodies, student records units	Current assessment, examinations, theses, professional qualification decisions, appeal review	Regulations on examination commissions; appeals; course papers and qualification theses; awarding professional qualifications	Protects fairness, reliability of grades and credibility of qualifications
Student rights, participation and feedback	Students, student self-government, quality assurance department, departments, curators	Student questionnaires, consultation, representation, conduct, rights protection	Regulations on student questionnaires; student conduct; curators; conflict resolution; bullying and mobbing prevention	Ensures student voice, dignity, responsibility and a safe learning environment

Quality assurance area	Responsible actors	Main processes	Relevant regulatory instruments	Expected quality-management function
Student learning trajectories and flexibility	Students, programme guarantors, departments, Division of Students' Contingent	Elective choice, individual plans, credit recognition, academic differences, non-formal and informal learning	Regulations on elective disciplines; individual study plan; re-crediting; recognition of non-formal and informal learning	Supports student-centred learning while preserving programme standards
Practical training and mobility	Programme guarantors, departments, practice supervisors, host organisations, mobility coordinators, students	Placements, supervision, reports, recognition of mobility results, external cooperation	Regulations on practical training; academic mobility; stakeholders	Connects learning with professional practice and international or inter-institutional experience
Staff recruitment and professional development	Leadership, departments, selection commissions, Academic Council, scientific-pedagogical staff	Competitive selection, contracts, professional development planning, credential recognition	Staff selection procedure; professional development regulation; recognition of foreign documents	Ensures qualified, developing and appropriately recognised teaching staff
Staff evaluation, ethics and academic credibility	Academic Council, departments, attestation bodies, staff, ethics-related structures	Scientific ethics, rating evaluation, attestation, awards, academic titles	Code of Scientific Ethics; rating evaluation and attestation; awards; academic title procedure	Protects integrity, motivates excellence and supports academic standards
Feedback, surveys and career tracking	Quality assurance department, career tracking unit, departments, students, staff, alumni, employers	Student surveys, staff surveys, graduate tracking, stakeholder feedback, analysis and follow-up	Regulations on student and staff questionnaires; stakeholder regulation; career tracking practices	Generates evidence for improvement rather than mere documentation
IT, information management and digital learning	Puskás Tivadar Centre of Informatics, administrative units,	Digital platforms, data storage, distance learning,	Regulation on distance learning; internal information-management provisions	Makes teaching, communication, monitoring and records reliable and accessible

Quality assurance area	Responsible actors	Main processes	Relevant regulatory instruments	Expected quality-management function
	teachers, students, quality assurance bodies	information systems, survey support		
Public communication and external accountability	Leadership, media and communication units, quality assurance bodies, programme teams	Public information, accreditation evidence, partner communication, institutional reporting	External quality assurance provisions; accreditation documents; public information practices	Builds stakeholder trust and supports compliance with national and European expectations

Documentary control is essential for system sustainability. Regulations should be current, accessible and communicated to the people who use them. When documents are revised, users need to know which version is authoritative. Records of decisions, survey results, programme updates, appeals, accreditation responses and improvement actions should be retained appropriately. This allows the University to demonstrate continuity and evidence-based governance.

The documentary framework also supports institutional orientation. New staff, programme guarantors, administrative employees and students need to understand how the system works. A coherent set of documents helps them locate procedures and responsibilities. It also supports external readers who need evidence that the University has an organised internal quality assurance system.

Functional Interpretation of the Regulatory Instruments

The educational process regulations should be understood as the operational core of programme and course quality. The regulation on the organisation of the educational process establishes a common framework for planning and conducting studies, while the internal quality assurance regulation defines the mechanisms by which the University monitors and improves this activity. Together, these instruments create the baseline for consistency across programmes and departments. They ensure that education is not organised differently according to informal local habits, but according to institutionally approved principles.

The regulations on programme guarantors, support groups, stakeholders and programme development form a programme-quality cluster. Their combined function is to ensure that each programme has academic leadership, disciplinary expertise, external input and an approved mechanism for renewal. This cluster supports the full programme cycle: defining learning outcomes, designing curriculum structure, selecting appropriate courses, involving stakeholders, monitoring implementation, preparing accreditation evidence and revising the programme when evidence shows that change is needed.

The regulations on educational and methodological support, timetables, distance learning, optional language study, physical education and curators of academic groups form a teaching-and-learning support cluster. These regulations shape the everyday conditions in which students learn. They make teaching materials available, organise time and space, support flexible and digital formats, promote language competence and wellbeing, and ensure that academic groups have personal guidance. Their quality function is practical: they reduce uncertainty and help students and teachers work within a predictable educational environment.

The regulations on assessment, examination commissions, course papers, qualification theses, professional qualifications, appeals and diplomas with honours form an assessment and certification cluster. These instruments protect the credibility of grades, final decisions and qualifications. They define how student work is evaluated, how final certification is organised, how independent academic work is supervised and defended, how professional qualifications are awarded, how exceptional achievement is recognised, and how students may challenge procedures or results. This cluster is central to public trust because assessment is the point at which learning claims are verified.

The regulations on re-crediting, academic differences, individual study plans, elective disciplines, mobility and recognition of non-formal and informal learning form a flexibility and progression cluster. Their common purpose is to allow individual educational trajectories while ensuring that programme standards are met. Students may enter with prior learning, choose elective components, participate in mobility, or have learning outcomes recognised from other contexts. The quality system must support

such flexibility without weakening the integrity of qualifications. These regulations provide the procedures for doing so.

The regulations on student conduct, scholarships, practical training, bullying and mobbing prevention, student questionnaires and student support mechanisms form a student environment cluster. This cluster protects the educational conditions in which students learn, participate and develop. It combines rights and responsibilities: students receive support, protection and opportunities, but they are also expected to act ethically, respect the academic community and participate responsibly in feedback processes. The quality function of this cluster is to maintain fairness, motivation, safety and engagement.

The Code of Scientific Ethics, staff satisfaction questionnaires, recognition of foreign credentials, staff selection, professional development, awards, rating evaluation, attestation and academic title procedures form a staff and academic credibility cluster. These instruments ensure that teaching and research are carried out by qualified, developing and ethically responsible staff. They also create mechanisms for recognising achievement and addressing professional performance. Because staff competence is one of the strongest determinants of programme quality, this cluster has direct educational significance.

The system benefits from viewing these clusters as interdependent. Programme development depends on staff competence and stakeholder feedback. Teaching quality depends on methodological support, timetabling and digital infrastructure. Assessment reliability depends on clear syllabi, examination procedures and appeals. Student flexibility depends on accurate records and programme coherence. Staff evaluation depends on evidence of teaching, research and professional development. External accreditation depends on the functioning of all clusters together. Quality management therefore requires cross-referencing among regulations rather than isolated application.

Guidelines for Institutional Leadership

Institutional leadership should use the quality management system as a decision-support framework. Quality-related information should inform strategic planning, resource allocation, staff development priorities, digital infrastructure investment, programme renewal and external partnership development. Leadership should ask not only whether a procedure exists, but whether it functions effectively, produces evidence and leads to improvement. This approach helps avoid formalism and keeps quality assurance connected to institutional strategy.

Leadership should maintain a clear link between quality objectives and institutional mission. The University serves students, professional fields and the regional community. Programme development, adult education, career tracking, stakeholder cooperation and multilingual educational opportunities should therefore be considered not as separate activities, but as expressions of mission-driven quality. Strategic decisions should evaluate how each major action strengthens educational relevance, academic credibility, student support or public accountability.

Leadership should also protect the independence and credibility of quality-related processes. Student feedback should be collected and interpreted without pressure. Appeals should be handled impartially. Staff evaluation should be transparent and evidence-based. Programme review should consider real evidence rather than predetermined conclusions. Accreditation preparation should present existing practice honestly. Such credibility is essential for trust among students, staff and external partners.

A further leadership responsibility is to ensure that improvement actions are resourced. Quality assurance can identify weaknesses, but improvement requires time, staff capacity, training, digital tools, communication and sometimes financial investment. When survey results or accreditation recommendations point to a problem, leadership should assign responsibility, define a realistic response and monitor progress. Otherwise quality assurance risks producing reports without change.

Guidelines for Departments and Programme Guarantors

Departments and programme guarantors should treat programme quality as a continuous cycle. Programme review should not be limited to the moment of accreditation or formal curriculum revision. Departments should regularly examine whether courses remain aligned with learning outcomes, whether assessment methods verify expected competences, whether staff expertise corresponds to programme needs, whether practical training is effective, and whether student and stakeholder feedback indicates areas for improvement.

Programme guarantors should maintain a clear evidence file for each programme. This may include programme documentation, curriculum changes, minutes of stakeholder consultations, student feedback summaries, employer or graduate comments, practical training reports, accreditation recommendations, staff qualification information and records of improvement actions. Such evidence supports internal monitoring and reduces the burden of external accreditation because programme teams can demonstrate a continuous quality cycle.

Departments should discuss student feedback constructively. Feedback should not be used mechanically or punitively, but it should also not be ignored. When students report unclear assessment criteria, uneven workload, timetable problems or insufficient communication, departments should examine the issue and decide whether action is needed. Where student perceptions differ from academic expectations, departments can improve communication by explaining learning objectives and assessment standards more clearly.

Programme guarantors should ensure that stakeholder input is meaningful. Employers or alumni should not be consulted only to produce evidence for external review. Their comments should be analysed in relation to programme outcomes and curriculum structure. If stakeholder suggestions are adopted, the programme should record how they influenced changes. If suggestions are not adopted, the academic reasons should also be clear. This protects academic standards while maintaining responsiveness.

Departments should connect staff development with programme needs. Professional development should not be a purely individual activity unrelated to educational strategy. If a programme introduces new methods, digital tools, research themes, practical components or language requirements, staff development should support those priorities. Rating evaluation and attestation can help identify both strengths and needs.

Guidelines for Academic Staff

Teachers play a decisive role in the quality system because students experience the University primarily through courses, supervision and assessment. Academic staff should therefore view course documentation as a teaching tool, not simply as paperwork. A clear syllabus helps students organise learning, understand expectations and prepare for assessment. It also helps colleagues and programme guarantors see how the course contributes to programme outcomes.

Assessment criteria should be communicated in advance and applied consistently. Students need to understand what is expected in written work, oral presentations, examinations, practical tasks and qualification theses. Feedback should help students improve, not only record a grade. Where possible, assessment should be aligned with the competences defined in the educational programme and should test understanding, application, analysis and professional judgement rather than only reproduction of information.

Academic staff should participate responsibly in feedback processes. Student questionnaires, staff surveys, departmental discussions and programme reviews are opportunities for improvement. Teachers may explain the academic rationale of courses, identify resource needs, propose methodological changes and respond to student experience. A strong quality culture depends on staff seeing themselves as co-owners of quality rather than passive subjects of monitoring.

Supervision of course papers and qualification theses requires special attention to academic integrity. Supervisors should guide students in topic selection, methodology, citation, evidence use and ethical conduct. The University benefits when student research work demonstrates independent thinking and respect for scholarly standards. This connects teaching quality, research culture and the Code of Scientific Ethics.

Teachers should also support student-centred learning by providing accessible information, maintaining respectful communication and referring students to appropriate support mechanisms when needed. Student-centredness does not remove the teacher's authority; it frames that authority as transparent, fair and developmental.

Guidelines for Students

Students are active participants in the quality management system. They contribute to quality by engaging seriously with learning, following academic integrity principles, using elective and mobility opportunities responsibly, respecting rules of conduct, participating in practical training and providing honest feedback. Their participation is most valuable when it is specific, constructive and connected to the educational process.

Students should be encouraged to understand their rights and responsibilities. They need to know how elective choice works, how individual study plans are formed, how appeals can be submitted, how scholarships are awarded, how mobility results are recognised, how non-formal learning may be considered and how bullying or mobbing can be reported. Clear communication of these procedures supports fairness and reduces unnecessary conflict.

Student feedback should be used as a dialogue mechanism. Questionnaires allow students to express views, but quality culture is strengthened when students also receive information about how feedback has been considered. Even when not all requests can be fulfilled, explaining decisions helps build trust. Student self-government can play an important role in this communication.

Students should also be involved in programme development where appropriate. Their experience of workload, teaching, assessment, practical training and support services is essential evidence. Involving students in consultations helps programme guarantors understand how programme design works in practice. It also strengthens students' sense of responsibility for the academic community.

Guidelines for Administrative and Support Units

Administrative units should understand their work as part of quality assurance. Accurate records, timely communication, reliable schedules, clear forms, accessible information and consistent procedures protect student rights and support academic staff. Administrative errors can affect grades, scholarships, mobility, recognition, progression and graduation. Administrative reliability is therefore a quality outcome.

Support units should coordinate closely with academic departments. Student records must reflect individual study plans, elective choices, credit recognition, mobility outcomes and assessment decisions. IT services must support distance learning, surveys and information management. Communication units must publish accurate information. Career tracking must provide usable data for programme review. When support units and academic units cooperate, the educational process becomes more coherent.

Digital and information systems should be developed with user needs in mind. Systems should be secure, reliable and accessible, but they should also fit the actual processes they support. Teachers, students and administrative staff need guidance and support. Data collection should avoid unnecessary duplication and should produce information that can be used for analysis and decision-making.

Career tracking and communication units should help close the feedback loop. Graduate data and public information can demonstrate accountability, but they can also support internal improvement. If graduate outcomes or employer comments point to competence gaps, programme teams should be able to consider the evidence. If programme changes are introduced, public communication can explain how the University is responding to needs.

Guidelines for Evidence Use and Improvement Cycles

The University should distinguish between collecting evidence and using evidence. Surveys, monitoring reports and accreditation materials are valuable only when they influence decisions. Each significant feedback process should therefore include analysis, discussion, decision, implementation and follow-up. This creates a visible improvement cycle and prevents quality assurance from becoming a reporting exercise.

Evidence should be triangulated. A single survey result may be useful, but stronger conclusions arise when student feedback is compared with assessment outcomes, staff comments, stakeholder input, career tracking data and programme monitoring. Triangulation reduces the risk of overreacting to isolated opinions or overlooking systemic problems. It also helps departments identify whether an issue concerns a single course, a programme structure, a resource problem or a wider institutional process.

Improvement actions should be proportionate and documented. Some issues require immediate correction, such as unclear communication or administrative error. Others require longer-term planning, such as curriculum revision, staff development or digital infrastructure improvement. Documenting the rationale, responsible actor and expected result helps the University monitor progress and demonstrate accountability.

Quality assurance should also recognise strengths. Evidence may identify good teaching practices, successful practical training models, effective stakeholder cooperation or strong student support. These strengths should be shared across departments where relevant. Continuous improvement is not only the correction of deficiencies; it is also the dissemination of effective practice.

Guidelines for External Communication and Accreditation Preparation

For external readers, the University should present quality assurance as a living system. Accreditation experts and partners need to see how principles, responsibilities, procedures and evidence interact. They are likely to ask whether students know their rights, whether programme updates are evidence-based, whether stakeholders are involved, whether staff development is systematic, whether assessment is transparent and whether improvement actions are documented. The University's quality system should be able to answer these questions with concrete evidence.

Programme teams should prepare for accreditation continuously. Evidence should be generated through normal academic work, not produced retrospectively. Syllabi, stakeholder minutes, survey analyses, practical training reports, staff development records, student feedback responses and programme updates should be maintained throughout the programme cycle. This reduces pressure before external review and improves the credibility of self-evaluation.

External communication should be clear and understandable for international partners. The University's quality management system can be explained through familiar higher-education quality concepts: public quality policy, programme design and review, student-centred learning, transparent assessment, staff competence, learning resources, information management, stakeholder feedback and external evaluation. Using such concepts helps partners understand the system while preserving the University's institutional identity.

Public accountability should include both compliance and improvement. It is important to show that the University meets national requirements, but it is equally important to show how the institution learns from evidence. External stakeholders are more likely to trust a system that acknowledges review, feedback and enhancement than one that presents quality as a purely formal status.

Preventive and Corrective Logic of the System

The University's quality management system has both preventive and corrective functions. Preventive quality assurance is visible wherever the institution defines clear rules before problems occur. Programme approval, staffing requirements, syllabus preparation, assessment criteria, timetabling rules, practical training arrangements, mobility agreements and individual study plans all reduce the likelihood of misunderstanding or inconsistency. Preventive mechanisms are especially important in higher education because many quality problems become difficult to correct after students have already completed courses or graduated.

Corrective quality assurance operates when the system identifies a weakness and responds to it. Appeals, conflict-resolution procedures, survey analysis, programme monitoring, staff evaluation, accreditation recommendations and stakeholder feedback can all reveal issues that require action. Corrective action may involve clarification of rules, revision of course documentation, retraining of staff, adjustment of assessment methods, improvement of communication, updating of curricula or changes in administrative processes. The important point is that correction should be documented and followed up.

Preventive and corrective mechanisms should not be separated. For example, appeals may reveal that assessment criteria were unclear; the corrective response resolves the case, while the preventive response improves criteria and communication for future cohorts. Career tracking may reveal that graduates need stronger practical competences; the corrective response may revise practical training, while

the preventive response builds stakeholder review into future programme monitoring. This combined logic turns individual findings into systemic improvement.

Risk awareness also supports quality assurance. Risks may concern outdated curricula, insufficient stakeholder input, inconsistent assessment, staff workload, weak digital infrastructure, unclear student information, incomplete records, low response rates to surveys, or delayed follow-up after accreditation. The University does not need to treat quality management as a separate risk-management bureaucracy, but responsible actors should be able to identify where educational quality is vulnerable and decide what evidence or action is needed.

At programme level, the main risks often concern relevance, coherence and delivery capacity. A programme may be formally approved but may require revision because of changes in standards, labour-market needs or disciplinary development. Course content may overlap or leave gaps. Staff qualifications may need renewal. Practical training may not fully correspond to learning outcomes. Programme guarantors and support groups are positioned to identify and address these risks through regular review.

At course level, the main risks often concern clarity, workload and assessment. Students may not understand expectations, independent work may be poorly structured, assessment may not match learning outcomes, or feedback may arrive too late to support learning. Teachers and departments can reduce these risks through well-prepared course documentation, transparent criteria, departmental discussion of assessment practice and constructive use of student feedback.

At institutional level, the main risks concern coordination and evidence use. Quality processes may function separately without being connected to decisions. Surveys may be conducted without follow-up. Stakeholder feedback may be collected but not analysed. Accreditation recommendations may be addressed only formally. The Higher Education Quality Assurance Council, the Higher Education Quality Assurance Department and senior leadership have a special role in preventing these risks by maintaining a coherent institutional cycle.

The system should therefore evaluate not only whether regulations exist, but whether they work as intended. A regulation works when users know it, responsible actors apply it, evidence is produced, decisions are documented and improvement follows where necessary. This functional understanding is the difference between documentary compliance and effective quality management.

Indicators of Effective Functioning

The effectiveness of the quality management system can be observed through several indicators. At the programme level, educational programmes should have current documentation, clearly formulated outcomes, evidence of stakeholder involvement, appropriate staffing, updated syllabi, practical training arrangements and records of review or improvement. Programme teams should be able to explain why changes were made and what evidence supported them.

At the teaching and learning level, students should receive clear information about courses, workload, assessment and expectations. Teachers should use approved methodological materials and provide feedback that supports learning. Departments should monitor the completeness and relevance of course documentation. Assessment should be transparent, and appeal procedures should be known and accessible.

At the student support level, students should be able to exercise rights without unnecessary obstacles. They should know how to choose electives, prepare individual study plans, apply for mobility,

request recognition of prior learning, obtain information about scholarships and use protection or appeal mechanisms. Student feedback should be collected regularly and used constructively. Student self-government should have meaningful channels for communication with leadership and departments.

At the staff level, recruitment, professional development, evaluation and recognition should operate transparently. Staff should have opportunities to improve teaching, research and digital competences. Rating evaluation and attestation should support both accountability and professional growth. The ethical framework should be known and applied consistently.

At the evidence level, quality-related data should be reliable, analysed and connected to decisions. The University should be able to show how survey findings, stakeholder comments, career tracking, appeals, accreditation recommendations or staff feedback have influenced improvement. Evidence should not be stored only as documentation; it should be part of institutional management.

At the external accountability level, accreditation materials should reflect everyday practice. Public information should be accurate and accessible. Partners and stakeholders should be able to understand the University's quality commitments and the mechanisms used to fulfil them. These indicators show whether the system is not only documented but operational.

The system also requires regular review of its own effectiveness. A quality management system may become outdated if procedures no longer correspond to legal requirements, accreditation expectations, digital practice, student needs or institutional strategy. Periodic review should therefore examine whether responsibilities remain clear, whether documents are current, whether feedback mechanisms have sufficient participation, whether evidence is analysed in time, and whether improvement actions are completed. This meta-review helps the University assure the quality of the quality assurance system itself.

Sustainability depends on accessibility and institutional learning. Regulations and guidelines should be available to those who need them, but availability alone is not enough. Staff and students should receive orientation on the procedures that affect them. New programme guarantors and department heads should understand how programme evidence is maintained. Administrative units should know how their records support accreditation and student rights. Student representatives should understand how to use quality mechanisms constructively. In this way, the system becomes part of institutional competence.

The system should also support proportionality. Not every issue requires a large institutional reform, and not every improvement action requires a new regulation. Some problems can be solved through clearer communication, better scheduling, improved templates, additional consultation or targeted staff development. Other issues, such as outdated programme outcomes or repeated assessment appeals, may require formal revision and approval. A mature quality system chooses responses that are appropriate to the scale and seriousness of the evidence.

Finally, the system should remain developmental rather than defensive. Quality assurance sometimes becomes defensive when institutions focus only on proving compliance. The more productive approach is to use evidence to understand how education works and how it can be improved. This does not weaken accountability; it strengthens it. An institution that can identify its own areas for development, act on them and document progress demonstrates a stronger quality culture than one that presents quality as a finished state.

The practical success of the system will be seen in the ordinary experience of students and staff. Students should encounter programmes that are understandable, courses that are well organised, assessment that is fair, support that is accessible and information that is reliable. Staff should encounter expectations that are clear, professional development that is meaningful, evaluation that is transparent and

governance that uses evidence responsibly. External stakeholders should encounter a University that can explain its decisions, listen to feedback and show documented improvement. These everyday results are the real test of quality management.

Because the University operates in a complex academic, regional and regulatory environment, quality management should remain adaptable. Adaptability does not mean instability; it means that approved procedures are reviewed when circumstances change and that the institution is able to respond without losing coherence. This capacity for disciplined adaptation is essential for sustainable institutional development.

The quality system should also be understandable across languages and professional audiences. Internal users may know local terminology and institutional routines, while international partners and accreditation experts may rely on broader higher-education quality concepts. The University therefore benefits from explaining its system in terms that connect institutional practice with recognised quality assurance language: learning outcomes, programme review, student-centred learning, transparent assessment, staff competence, stakeholder engagement, information management and external evaluation. This improves communication without changing the institutional substance of the system.

The system should remain attentive to the relationship between formal authority and practical implementation. Regulations approved by competent bodies provide authority, but implementation occurs through teachers, students, departments and administrative units. The quality cycle is complete only when approved rules are known, applied, monitored and revised when necessary. This practical orientation helps the University maintain consistency while allowing responsible actors to solve real educational problems.

15. Concluding Overview

The quality management system of Ferenc Rakoczi II Transcarpathian Hungarian University is a comprehensive institutional system that connects mission, governance, educational processes, student-centred support, staff quality, evidence use, administrative reliability and external accountability. It treats quality as a shared responsibility of the whole academic community rather than as the task of a single unit or the production of formal documents.

The system is strongest where it links programme-level, course-level and institutional-level quality. Programme guarantors, support groups, departments and stakeholders maintain the relevance and coherence of educational programmes. Teachers and departments translate programme objectives into courses, methodological support and assessment. Students participate through choices, feedback, appeals, mobility, practical training and representative bodies. Staff development and scientific ethics protect the academic credibility of teaching and research. Administrative and digital services create the conditions for reliable implementation.

The system also demonstrates a balanced understanding of quality assurance and quality enhancement. Regulations and procedures provide predictability, compliance and fairness. Feedback, surveys, career tracking, stakeholder engagement, staff development and accreditation feedback provide opportunities for improvement. This balance is essential because a university must both meet established standards and renew itself in response to evidence and changing conditions.

Student-centredness gives the system practical meaning. The University protects student rights through appeals, conduct rules, anti-bullying and anti-mobbing procedures, scholarships, elective choice, individual study plans, recognition procedures, mobility and feedback mechanisms. These instruments

make the student experience more transparent and flexible while preserving academic standards and responsibility.

Staff quality is treated as a central determinant of educational quality. Recruitment, professional development, satisfaction measurement, rating evaluation, attestation, awards, recognition of credentials, academic titles and scientific ethics create a framework for competence, motivation and accountability. This framework supports the credibility of programmes and the public value of qualifications.

Evidence and feedback provide the basis for continuous improvement. The system generates information from students, staff, graduates, employers, stakeholders, appeals, programme monitoring, administrative data and external evaluation. Its effectiveness depends on whether this evidence is discussed by responsible bodies, translated into decisions and followed up through documented actions. Quality assurance becomes meaningful when evidence changes practice.

Administrative, digital and communication processes are not peripheral. Student records, timetables, information systems, library resources, media communication, adult education and career tracking all support the conditions under which education becomes reliable and transparent. The University recognises that quality depends on the interaction between academic work and the services that sustain it.

External quality assurance and accreditation confirm and strengthen the internal system. They provide independent evaluation, public accountability and developmental feedback. When internal processes function continuously, accreditation becomes a demonstration of existing quality culture rather than a temporary exercise. Alignment with Ukrainian requirements and recognised European principles supports the University's credibility among students, partners and public authorities.

The Handbook and its appendices give documentary form to this system. Appendix 1 models the educational quality assurance system, and Appendix 2 registers the regulations that implement it. Their institutional significance lies in supporting clarity, consistency, evidence, rights protection, responsibility and improvement. They are the operational memory of the quality system and the basis for transparent communication with internal and external stakeholders.

Overall, Ferenc Rakoczi II Transcarpathian Hungarian University operates a quality management system that connects strategic mission with daily educational practice. Its continued effectiveness depends on leadership commitment, active departmental responsibility, meaningful student and stakeholder participation, professional staff engagement, reliable information management, current documentation and the regular use of evidence for improvement. When these conditions are maintained, the system provides a strong foundation for assuring and enhancing the quality of education, strengthening institutional trust and supporting the University's academic and regional mission.