



Internal Monitoring Report on Student Progression and Quality Assurance Follow-up (2022-2025)

Prepared by	Office of Transformation and Strategic Development
Contributing units	Office of Students Admission and Registration Office for Academic and Faculty Affairs Office of Academic Quality Assurance and Policy Alumni Engagement and Professional Development Unit Human Resources Office Faculty of International Relations Faculty of International Economics and Management Faculty of International Law
Reporting period (Academic years)	2022-2023 2023-2024 2024-2025 2025-2026
Date of issue	April 20 th , 2026

1. Executive Summary

This report presents the results of internal monitoring of student progression and selected quality assurance follow-up measures at the University of World Economy and Diplomacy (UWED) for the academic years **2022–2025**.

The report shows that student academic outcomes remained generally stable and positive throughout the reporting period. Student progression rates were consistently high, ranging from **94.4% to 97.6%**, while graduation rates remained above **96%** in all reporting years. At the same time, drop-out rates remained comparatively low, fluctuating between **2.4% and 5.6%**. Academic probation cases remained limited in absolute terms, although some fluctuation was observed, indicating the continued importance of academic monitoring and targeted student support.

The report also includes initial evidence from the **2025 pilot phase of course evaluations**. The pilot recorded a student participation rate of **88%** and an average overall course satisfaction score of **141.8 out of 150**. Based on these results, follow-up improvement plans were initiated for **15 courses** with lower-than-average ratings. These findings indicate an emerging institutional approach to linking student feedback with corrective and improvement measures.

In addition to student-related indicators, the report considers selected academic staff trends relevant to teaching quality and institutional capacity. The total number of academic staff increased from **134 in 2022 to 174 in 2025**, while the share of academic staff holding **PhD and DSc degrees** rose from **39.6% to 43.7%**. These trends suggest a strengthening of academic staff capacity and qualifications during the reporting period.

The report is based on official institutional data provided by the **Office of Students Admission and Registration** through the **HEMIS system**, course evaluation materials provided by the **Office of Academic Quality Assurance and Policy**, and academic staff data provided by the **Human Resources Office**. Additional input was provided by the **Office for Academic and Faculty Affairs** and the three faculties of UWED.

Overall, the report indicates that UWED has maintained stable student progression and graduation outcomes, has begun to strengthen student feedback-based quality assurance processes, and has continued to develop its academic staff capacity. The report therefore provides an evidence-based basis for further institutional monitoring, follow-up action, and quality enhancement.

Area	Key message for the summary
Student progression	Student progression remained consistently high throughout the reporting period, with stable graduation outcomes and comparatively low drop-out rates.
Assessment and academic regulations	Student monitoring and academic progression were supported by institutional academic regulations and internal procedures governing study, assessment, and student rights.
Programme review	Initial course evaluation results from the 2025 pilot phase show that student feedback is beginning to be linked to concrete follow-up improvement measures.

2. Scope, Data Sources and Methodological Note

This report presents the results of internal monitoring of student progression and selected quality assurance follow-up measures at the University of World Economy and Diplomacy (UWED) for the academic years **2022-2025**.

The scope of the report covers core indicators related to student academic performance and progression, including student progression rate, drop-out rate, graduation rate, academic probation cases, and selected results from course evaluation processes. In addition, the report incorporates selected information on academic staff capacity and qualification trends where relevant for the interpretation of teaching and quality assurance developments.

Primary data sources

The report is based on the following primary data sources:

- official institutional data provided through the HEMIS system by the Office of Students Admission and Registration;
- internal quality assurance and academic regulatory documents of UWED;
- course evaluation results and related analytical materials provided by the Office of Academic Quality Assurance and Policy;
- academic staff data provided by the Human Resources Office;
- additional narrative and follow-up information provided by the Office for Academic and Faculty Affairs and the three faculties of UWED.

Responsible units

The following units were responsible for providing data and input for this report:

- [Office of Students Admission and Registration](#)
- [Office for Academic and Faculty Affairs](#)
- [Office of Academic Quality Assurance and Policy](#)
- [Alumni Engagement and Professional Development Unit](#)
- [Human Resources Office](#)
- [School of International Relations](#)
- [School of International Economics and Management](#)
- [School of International Law](#)

Data verification

The quantitative indicators presented in this report are based on official institutional data provided by the Office of Students Admission and Registration through the HEMIS system for the respective academic years.

The course evaluation-related information included in this report is based on materials provided by the Office of Academic Quality Assurance and Policy, including initial quantitative results from the 2025 pilot phase.

Academic staff data included in this report is based on official information provided by the Human Resources Office.

**Notes on interpretation. All indicators included in this report relate to academic years. The percentages presented are based on annual institutional calculations using the corresponding numerator and denominator values provided for each indicator. Where course evaluation indicators are included, these should be interpreted with due regard to the fact that the currently available confirmed results relate to the 2025 pilot phase.*

3. Definitions of Core Indicators

The table below presents the operational definitions of the core indicators used in this report, together with their source/owner and reporting frequency.

3.1 Student Progression and Academic Performance Indicators

Indicator	Operational definition	Source / owner	Frequency
Student progression rate	The percentage of students who progressed to the next year of study out of the total number of students included in the annual progression calculation for the respective academic year.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Office of Students Admission and Registration	Annual
Drop-out rate	The percentage of students who dropped out or were dismissed out of the total number of students included in the annual calculation for the respective academic year.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Office of Students Admission and Registration	Annual
Graduation rate	The percentage of graduates out of the total number of students in the graduating cohort used for the calculation in the respective academic year.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Office of Students Admission and Registration	Annual
Academic probation	The number of students assigned academic probation status during the respective academic year in accordance with the university's applicable academic regulations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Office of Students Admission and RegistrationOffice for Academic and Faculty Affairs	Annual

Course evaluation participation	The percentage of students who participated in course evaluations out of the total number of students invited or eligible to participate in the evaluation process in the respective reporting period.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Office of Academic Quality Assurance and Policy 	Annual
Average overall course satisfaction score	The average overall score awarded by students in course evaluations in the respective reporting period.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Office of Academic Quality Assurance and Policy 	Annual
Courses subject to follow-up improvement measures	The number of courses for which follow-up improvement plans were initiated on the basis of course evaluation results in the respective reporting period.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Office of Academic Quality Assurance and Policy Office for Academic and Faculty Affairs 	Annual

3.2 Academic Staff Capacity and Qualification Indicators

Indicator	Operational definition	Source / owner	Frequency
Number of academic staff	The total number of academic staff employed by the university in the respective academic year. Where relevant, the indicator may be disaggregated by school and by gender.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Human Resources Office 	Annual
Number of female academic staff	The total number of female academic staff employed by the university in the respective academic year.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Human Resources Office 	Annual
Number of academic staff with PhD and DSc degrees	The total number of academic staff holding PhD and DSc degrees in the respective academic year.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Human Resources Office 	Annual
Share of academic staff with PhD and DSc degrees	The percentage of academic staff holding PhD and DSc degrees out of the total number of academic staff in the respective academic year.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Human Resources Office 	Annual

4. Quantitative Overview (2022–2025)

4.1 Student Progression and Academic Performance Trends

Indicator	2022	2023	2024	2025	Evidence reference
Student progression rate	94.4%	97.6%	96.4%	97.0%	Office of Students Admission and Registration / HEMIS
Drop-out rate	5.6%	2.4%	3.6%	3.0%	
Graduation rate	97.0%	98.6%	96.2%	97.1%	
Academic probation cases	12	6	23	18	
Course evaluation participation	—	—	—	88%	Office of Academic Quality Assurance and Policy / 2025 pilot phase
Average overall course satisfaction score	—	—	—	141.8/150	Office of Academic Quality Assurance and Policy / 2025 pilot phase
Courses subject to follow-up improvement measures	—	—	—	15	Office of Academic Quality Assurance and Policy / 2025 pilot phase

Brief Interpretation of Quantitative Trends

The quantitative data for **2022–2025** indicate generally stable and positive student academic outcomes at UWED. Student progression rates remained consistently high throughout the reporting period, ranging from **94.4%** to **97.6%**. Drop-out rates remained comparatively low, fluctuating between **2.4%** and **5.6%**, while graduation rates were consistently strong and remained above **96%** in all reporting years.

Academic probation cases remained limited in absolute terms, although some fluctuation was observed, with a noticeable increase in **2024** followed by a reduction in **2025**. This pattern suggests the importance of continued monitoring of academically at-risk students and the maintenance of appropriate support mechanisms.

Additional evidence became available in **2025** through the pilot phase of course evaluations. Initial results show a student participation rate of **88%** and an average overall course satisfaction score of **141.8** out of **150**. Based on these results, follow-up improvement plans were initiated for 15 courses with lower-than-average ratings. These initial findings provide an

important foundation for the further development of student feedback mechanisms and quality assurance follow-up.

4.2 Academic Staff Capacity and Qualification Trends

Indicator	2022	2023	2024	2025	Evidence reference
Number of academic staff	134	147	151	174	Human Resources Office
Share of female academic staff	69.4%	68.7%	70.9%	64.4%	
Number of academic staff with PhD and DSc degrees	53	60	66	74	
Share of academic staff with PhD and DSc degrees	39.6%	40.8%	43.7%	42.5%	

Brief Interpretation of Quantitative Trends

The available data indicates a positive trend in academic staff capacity and qualification at UWED during the reporting period. The total number of academic staff increased from **134** in **2022** to **174** in **2025**. The share of female academic staff remained consistently high, ranging from **64.4%** to **70.9%** across the reporting period. The number of academic staff holding PhD and DSc degrees increased from **53** in **2022** to **74** in **2025**, while their share rose from **39.6%** to **43.7%**. Overall, these trends indicate strengthening academic staff capacity and qualification at UWED.

5. Main Findings and Follow-up Actions

The table below summarises the main monitoring findings identified during the reporting period, the evidence base used for their review, and the main follow-up actions undertaken at institutional or school level.

Monitoring finding	Evidence base	Reviewed by	Follow-up action taken	Status
Student progression rates remained consistently high throughout the reporting period, indicating overall stable academic continuation across cohorts.	Annual progression data for 2022–2025 provided through HEMIS by the Office of Students Admission and Registration	Office of Students Admission and Registration; Office for Academic and Faculty Affairs; relevant faculties; Academic Council	Continued institutional monitoring of progression trends and maintenance of existing academic support and progression oversight mechanisms.	Ongoing
Drop-out rates remained comparatively low, but annual variation indicated the need for continued monitoring of cohort-level and programme-level patterns.	Annual drop-out data for 2022–2025 provided through HEMIS by the Office of Students Admission and Registration	Office of Students Admission and Registration; Office for Academic and Faculty Affairs; relevant faculties; Academic Council	Continued review of student retention patterns and follow-up at school and programme level where needed.	Ongoing

Graduation rates remained consistently high, demonstrating stable completion outcomes across the reporting period.	Annual graduation data for 2022–2025 provided through HEMIS by the Office of Students Admission and Registration	Office of Students Admission and Registration; Office for Academic and Faculty Affairs; Academic Council	Continued monitoring of graduation outcomes and use of completion data in internal academic review.	Ongoing
Academic probation cases showed fluctuation during the reporting period, with a noticeable increase in 2024, indicating the importance of continued support for academically at-risk students.	Annual academic probation data for 2022–2025 provided through HEMIS by the Office of Students Admission and Registration	Office for Academic and Faculty Affairs; relevant faculties; Academic Council	Continued monitoring of academically at-risk students and follow-up through school-level academic support measures.	Ongoing
The 2025 pilot phase of course evaluations recorded a student participation rate of 88% and an average overall course satisfaction score of 141.8 out of 150.	2025 pilot course evaluation results provided by the Office of Academic Quality Assurance and Policy	Office of Academic Quality Assurance and Policy; Office for Academic and Faculty Affairs; relevant faculties; Academic Council	Institutional review of pilot results and use of course evaluation findings for quality assurance follow-up.	Ongoing
The 2025 pilot course evaluation results identified 15 courses with lower-than-average ratings requiring targeted follow-up.	2025 pilot course evaluation results provided by the Office of Academic Quality Assurance and Policy	Office of Academic Quality Assurance and Policy; relevant faculties; Academic Council	Follow-up improvement plans were initiated for 15 courses with lower-than-average ratings.	Ongoing
Academic staff capacity increased during the reporting period, with growth in the total number of academic staff and in the number and share of staff holding PhD and DSc degrees.	Academic staff statistics for 2022–2025 provided by the Human Resources Office	Human Resources Office; Office for Academic and Faculty Affairs; Academic Council	Continued strengthening of academic staff capacity and qualification profile through institutional staffing and academic development processes.	Ongoing

The monitoring results for the period **2022–2025** indicate generally stable student progression and graduation outcomes at UWED, together with comparatively low drop-out rates. At the same time, fluctuations in academic probation cases confirm the importance of continuing attention to academically at-risk students and school-level follow-up where required. The monitoring results were reviewed by the relevant responsible units and faculties and were also discussed at the level of the Academic Council, thereby ensuring university-level oversight of academic performance trends and related follow-up measures.

An important development during the reporting period was the introduction of the **2025** pilot phase of course evaluations. The pilot generated initial institutional evidence on student feedback, including a participation rate of **88%** and an average overall course satisfaction score of **141.8** out of **150**. The identification of **15** courses with lower-than-average ratings and the initiation of follow-up improvement plans demonstrate that student feedback is beginning to be systematically linked to review and improvement measures. These results were likewise

considered within the university's quality assurance framework, including discussion at the level of the Academic Council.

In parallel, academic staff indicators show positive developments in institutional teaching capacity. The increase in the number of academic staff and in the share of staff holding PhD and DSc degrees provides an important supportive context for the university's teaching quality and programme development efforts. These developments also formed part of the broader institutional review of academic quality and capacity reflected in the university's internal monitoring processes.

6. Student Progression and Academic Support

Student progression at UWED is supported through a structured system of [academic support](#) that combines institutional monitoring with school-level coordination and student guidance.

A central element of this system is the work of Coordinators. In accordance with the university's internal regulation, course coordinators perform an important linking function between students, academic departments, and the university administration. Their responsibilities include supporting students' adaptation to the university learning environment, explaining academic rules and procedures, providing academic guidance, monitoring attendance and academic performance, assisting students who encounter learning difficulties, reviewing student appeals at the initial stage, and facilitating communication with school and relevant university units.

The course coordinator system is implemented across all three faculties of the university. Based on the current internal coordinator list, UWED has **17** course coordinators in total, including **6** in the School of International Relations, **5** in the School of International Law, and **6** in the School of International Economics and Management. The same list indicates assigned student coverage across faculties and years of study, demonstrating that academic support is organised on a structured and cohort-based basis.

In total, the current coordinator allocation covers 4,720 assigned students, including 1,571 students in the School of International Relations, 1,320 students in the School of International Law, and 1,829 students in the School of International Economics and Management. This confirms that academic support is not provided on an ad hoc basis, but through a formally assigned system with identified responsible staff.

The academic support function of course coordinators is further operationalised through the university's annual work planning. In practice, coordinators monitor attendance and academic progress, review oral, written, and electronic student appeals, support students during assessment and timetable-related processes, maintain relevant student information in HEMIS, assist students in eliminating academic debts, and provide support to students requiring special

attention, including students with disabilities, low-income students, and other socially vulnerable groups.

Overall, student progression at UWED is supported through a combination of institutional data monitoring, school-level oversight, and a formalised course coordinator system that provides academic guidance, early support, communication channels, and targeted follow-up throughout students' studies.

7. Assessment Procedures and Protection of Student Rights

Assessment procedures at UWED are governed by the **Study and Examination Regulations** and are embedded within the university's broader internal quality assurance framework as set out in the **Quality Assurance Handbook**. Together, these documents establish a structured system intended to ensure fairness, transparency, consistency, and academic integrity in student assessment and academic decision-making.

Under the **Study and Examination Regulations**, student assessment is based on clearly defined learning outcomes, approved curricula, and transparent evaluation criteria. The Regulations provide for mid-term and final assessment, define grading thresholds, regulate progression and academic debt, and require that the forms, timing, and criteria of assessment be communicated to students in advance through syllabi and the university's learning management system. The same Regulations also establish a 100-point evaluation system, minimum progression thresholds, and documented procedures for retakes, re-study, suspension, reinstatement, and certification.

A significant safeguard for fairness in assessment is the formal separation between teaching and final assessment functions. According to the **Study and Examination Regulations**, final assessment must be conducted by professors who did not teach the subject to the assessed student group. Examination procedures are further supported by an Exam Committee structure, procedural oversight, anonymisation of examination responses prior to marking, and clearly regulated timelines for recording and publishing results. These measures are intended to strengthen objectivity and confidence in academic decisions.

The protection of student rights is also reinforced through a formal appeals framework. The **Study and Examination Regulations** provide students with the right to appeal assessment results, including final examination results, through an established institutional procedure. Students may submit appeals electronically through the official student application within the specified period, and appeals are reviewed by an Appeals Commission composed of persons who did not participate in the original assessment. Students also have the right to be present during the consideration of their appeal, and decisions must be reasoned, documented, and communicated through official university channels.

This protection is complemented by the **Complaints and Appeals Policy**, which establishes the university's general framework for receiving, reviewing, and resolving complaints and appeals

in a fair, transparent, and timely manner. The Policy defines the scope of complaints and academic appeals, identifies the [Office of Students Admission and Registration](#) as the single entry point for complaints and appeals, and sets out principles of legality, promptness, protection of applicants' lawful interests, transparency, confidentiality, and protection against retaliation. In particular, the Policy expressly states that where a student submits an academic appeal complaint, this must not adversely affect the student's academic status, assessment results, or access to university services.

The **Complaints and Appeals Policy** also strengthens due process by specifying applicants' rights during the consideration of appeals. These include the right to receive information about the progress of review, present arguments and explanations, examine relevant materials, submit additional documents, request clarification or correction of responses, withdraw an appeal, and challenge unlawful refusal or improper consideration through a higher authority or court. The Policy also requires that appeals be reviewed impartially and within defined timeframes and that university officials monitor the implementation of decisions taken because of complaints and appeals.

From the perspective of institutional quality assurance, the [Quality Assurance Handbook](#) confirms that student assessment processes are subject to quality assurance through clearly defined regulations, criteria, moderation procedures, transparency requirements, and mechanisms for academic integrity and appeals. It also states that the university systematically uses monitoring data, feedback, and review mechanisms as part of a continuous improvement cycle. Student feedback on courses and teaching is collected regularly, analysed by the Office of Academic Quality Assurance and Policy, and reported to university-level bodies for follow-up and improvement.

In addition, [the Regulation for the Evaluation and Validation of Programmes](#) supports this framework at programme level by linking evaluation, monitoring, stakeholder feedback, and Academic Council oversight to continuous academic enhancement. While this regulation is broader than assessment alone, it provides an important institutional context for how review findings, programme quality considerations, and follow-up actions are incorporated into university decision-making.

Overall, assessment procedures and the protection of student rights at UWED are based on a documented regulatory framework that combines formal academic rules, appeals procedures, quality assurance mechanisms, and institutional oversight. Through the Study and Examination Regulations, the Complaints and Appeals Policy, the Quality Assurance Handbook, and the Regulation for the Evaluation and Validation of Programmes, the university provides a

structured basis for fair assessment, transparent review, and the protection of students' academic rights.

8. Teaching Quality, Staff Development and Workload Management

Teaching quality, staff development, and workload management at UWED are supported through a combination of institutional regulation, quality assurance procedures, and formal workload planning mechanisms. This area is governed by the **Teaching Load Regulation**, the **Quality Assurance Handbook**, and the **Human Resources Policy Framework**.

The [Quality Assurance Handbook](#) confirms that teaching quality forms part of UWED's institution-wide internal quality assurance system. It states that student assessment processes are subject to clearly defined regulations, criteria, moderation procedures, transparency requirements, and academic integrity measures. The Handbook also indicates that student feedback on courses and teaching is collected systematically, analysed by the [Office of Academic Quality Assurance and Policy](#), and used as evidence for improvement planning and quality monitoring.

The [Teaching Load Regulation](#) provides the formal basis for workload planning and allocation for academic staff. It establishes that the annual individual work plan serves as the foundational document regulating the professional activities of school members and that these plans include instructional duties, methodological work and curriculum development, research and scholarly activities, and mentorship within the "mentor–apprentice" system. The Regulation further states that workload distribution must be equitable, transparent, proportional to academic rank and qualification, and aligned with educational quality requirements and national standards.

The same **Teaching Load Regulation** also introduces a structured framework for normative workload calculation and monitoring. Effective from the 2025–2026 academic year, the standard annual teaching workload is set at **700** hours, with differentiated classroom contact ranges depending on academic rank and discipline. The Regulation also specifies time standards and verification rules for different forms of academic work, including classroom teaching, mid-term and final assessment, supervision of internships, supervision of graduation qualification work, supervision of master's dissertations, open lectures, and mentorship-related activities. These arrangements support a more transparent and consistent allocation of academic duties and help reduce the risk of disproportionate workload distribution.

The **Teaching Load Regulation** further links workload planning to institutional review and accountability. Annual work plans are prepared collaboratively between academic staff and department leadership, reviewed by relevant vice-rectors and academic units, and formally approved within the university's academic governance structure. Their implementation is monitored continuously by department chairs and reviewed at the end of each semester by

deans, vice-deans, and relevant academic units. This provides a documented institutional basis for oversight of teaching-related duties and workload management.

About staff development, the [Human Resources Policy Framework](#) demonstrates that UWED applies a structured and rule-based approach to staff recruitment, onboarding, probation, and early-stage adaptation. The document states that recruitment is based on fairness, transparency, equal opportunity, and merit-based selection and confirms that newly hired staff are introduced to internal regulations, the code of ethics, job descriptions, and health and safety requirements before commencing work. In addition, a mentor may be assigned during the initial adaptation period.

Taken together, these documents show that UWED has a formal institutional basis for maintaining teaching quality, regulating academic workload, and supporting staff through structured employment and workload processes. The **Quality Assurance Handbook** provides the broader quality assurance context, the **Teaching Load Regulation** establishes the main framework for workload allocation and monitoring, and the **Human Resources Policy Framework** supports fairness, onboarding, probation, and mentoring arrangements for staff. Overall, these arrangements contribute to a more transparent and quality-oriented management of teaching responsibilities and academic staff support at the university.

9. Programme Monitoring, Stakeholder Input and Labour-Market Alignment

Programme monitoring, stakeholder input, and labour-market alignment at UWED are supported through a structured institutional framework that combines graduate employability monitoring, internship coordination, employer and alumni engagement, and programme-level follow-up within the university's internal quality assurance cycle. A central role in this area is performed by the **Regulation on the Alumni Engagement and Professional Development Unit**, supported by the **Quality Assurance Handbook** and related programme evaluation mechanisms.

The [Alumni Engagement and Professional Development Unit](#) serves as UWED's main institutional mechanism for career guidance, internship placement and monitoring, employer cooperation, alumni engagement, and graduate tracking. According to the [Regulation on the Alumni Engagement and Professional Development Unit](#), the Unit also collects and analyses data related to internships, career events, and graduate employment outcomes, and uses these data for analytical, reporting, and quality assurance purposes.

[Graduate employability is monitored systematically.](#) Under the Regulation on the Alumni Engagement and Professional Development Unit, employment outcomes are tracked monthly during the first twelve months following graduation, using surveys, telephone follow-ups, and internal university data sources. These data are used to assess employability trends, sectoral

distribution, programme relevance, and labour-market alignment, and they are reviewed by faculties, deans, and the [Academic Council](#) as part of curriculum review and internship planning.

Internships and qualifying internships form an important part of this monitoring system. The same Regulation confirms that practical training is organised, coordinated, and monitored in cooperation with faculties and academic departments, and that [Internship Diaries](#), final internship reports, and host-organisation evaluations are collected and reviewed. This provides direct evidence on the relevance of practical training and its connection to programme learning outcomes and labour-market expectations.

Employer and alumni feedback also support programme improvement. The [Quality Assurance Handbook](#) states that UWED systematically collects and uses feedback from employers and alumni to improve programme relevance and effectiveness. In parallel, the Regulation on the Alumni Engagement and Professional Development Unit provides for annual review of internships, career events, employer engagement, and graduate employability, with improvement actions recorded in an internal Improvement Plan and submitted to the [Office for Academic and Faculty Affairs](#) and the [Academic Council](#).

Overall, UWED has a documented system that links programme monitoring with stakeholder input, practical training, employability evidence, and institutional follow-up. Through the Regulation on the Alumni Engagement and Professional Development Unit, the Quality Assurance Handbook, and related review processes, labour-market relevance is monitored systematically and used to inform programme development and quality enhancement.

10. Student Feedback, Closing the Loop and Communication of Improvements

Student feedback at UWED is collected, analysed, reviewed, and used as part of the university's internal quality assurance and student progression monitoring framework. This process is supported by the [Quality Assurance Handbook](#), the [Data Collection and Student Progression Policy](#), and the university's course evaluation arrangements. The institutional approach is based on the principle that feedback should inform academic review, improvement planning, and follow-up action rather than remain a purely formal exercise.

According to the **Quality Assurance Handbook**, student feedback on courses and teaching is collected through course evaluation surveys conducted twice a year, at the end of Semesters 1 and 2. The results are analysed by the [Office of Academic Quality Assurance and Policy](#), reported to the University Council, and communicated to faculties, academic programmes, and individual lecturers. The Handbook further states that these results are used to develop corrective and improvement measures aimed at enhancing teaching quality.

The **Data Collection and Student Progression Policy** reinforces this approach by defining student feedback as a component of progression monitoring and institutional learning. It states that feedback collected through institutional digital platforms and survey instruments is used together with progression and performance data to support teaching improvement, curriculum

review, and enhancement of student support mechanisms. The Policy also emphasises that analytical findings should lead to documented academic action and follow-up rather than remain descriptive only.

Initial evidence from the **2025** pilot phase of course evaluations shows that this “closing the loop” approach has already begun to operate in practice. The pilot recorded a student participation rate of **88%** and an average overall course satisfaction score of **141.8** out of **150**. Based on these results, follow-up improvement plans were initiated for 15 courses with lower-than-average ratings. This demonstrates that feedback collection is linked to review and action at course and programme level.

A more detailed analysis of student satisfaction with teaching staff was also conducted for the first semester of the **2024–2025** academic year. In total, **3,386** student responses were collected across all undergraduate years: **1,356** responses from **1st-year** students, **1,162** from **2nd-year** students, **562** from **3rd-year** students, and **306** from **4th-year** students. In percentage terms, 1st-year students accounted for **40.0%** of responses, 2nd-year students for **34.3%**, 3rd-year students for **16.6%**, and 4th-year students for **9.0%**. The participation of senior students should be interpreted in relation to the actual size of their cohorts; for example, around 360 students were enrolled in the 4th year at the time, which means that 306 responses represent a strong level of participation.

The numerical results confirm a high level of satisfaction with teaching quality. Across all four years, students submitted **50,790** numerical ratings across 15 teaching-quality indicators. Of these, **44,089** ratings, or **86.8%**, were in the high satisfaction range of **8–10** points. In addition, **41,437** ratings, or **81.6%**, were **9** or **10** points, while the maximum score of **10** points accounted for **36,506** ratings, or **71.9%** of all numerical evaluations. The overall average score was **8.98** out of 10, indicating that students generally assessed teaching staff very positively.

The qualitative comments support the quantitative findings. Students frequently described teachers as **professional, knowledgeable, responsible, supportive, fair, respectful, and highly competent in their subjects**. Many students expressed gratitude to individual professors and instructors, noting that they explain complex topics clearly, answer questions, motivate students to learn, and create a positive classroom atmosphere. A significant number of students also requested that specific teachers continue teaching them in the following semester, which indicates a high level of trust and satisfaction with the teaching staff.

At the same time, the survey also identified constructive areas for further improvement. The main issues mentioned by students included the need for clearer assessment criteria, more timely feedback on assignments, stronger alignment between syllabus topics and examination questions, wider use of interactive teaching methods, better language accessibility in multilingual groups, and more practice-oriented learning, especially for senior students. These

comments were used to identify areas where targeted follow-up could be introduced, including the 15 courses with lower-than-average ratings.

Communication back to students and staff is supported through institutional reporting and review channels. The **Quality Assurance Handbook** indicates that survey findings are communicated to faculties, programmes, and individual lecturers, while the **Data Collection and Student Progression Policy** provides for review, oversight, and follow-up through the relevant academic and quality assurance units. In this way, student feedback contributes not only to internal analysis but also to visible improvement processes within the university.

Overall, UWED has established a structured feedback cycle in which student input is collected through course evaluations and digital feedback channels, analysed by the responsible quality assurance units, reviewed within academic structures, translated into improvement measures, and communicated through institutional follow-up processes. This provides a credible basis for demonstrating student feedback, closing the loop, and communication of improvements within the university’s quality assurance framework.

11. Evidence Checklist

Evidence	Available	Location / reference
Signed or approved data table with yearly figures	Yes	Office of Students Admission and Registration
Explanation of indicator definitions	Yes	Office of Students Admission and Registration
Supporting reference to relevant regulation / policy	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study and Examination Regulations • Complaints and Appeals Policy • Quality Assurance Handbook • Regulation for the Evaluation and Validation of Programmes • Teaching Load Regulation • Human Resources Policy Framework • Regulation on the Alumni Engagement and Professional Development Unit
Website	Yes	https://www.uwed.uz/en