

ACCREDITATION RULES AND REGULATIONS

of the University of West Bohemia

dated 18 March 2021

PART ONE GENERAL PROVISIONS

Article 1 General Provisions

- (1) This regulation issued by the University of West Bohemia (hereinafter referred to as "UWB") regulates, in accordance with Act No. 111/1998 Sb., on Higher Education Institutions and on Amendments and Supplements to Other Acts, as amended (hereinafter referred to as the "Act"), and in accordance with the legislation and methodological guidelines of the National Accreditation Bureau for Higher Education (hereinafter referred to as the "Accreditation Bureau"), the preparation, discussion and approval of:
 - a) applications for the accreditation of a study programme, the expansion or extension of its accreditation outside an institutional accreditation,
 - b) applications for the institutional accreditation of a specified area of education, applications for the extension of the institutional accreditation with another area of education or study programmes,
 - c) proposals for the authorization of a study programme within the framework of an institutional accreditation, and the expansion or extension of such authorization, and
 - d) the application for the accreditation of associate professorship/professorship appointment procedures.
- (2) The preparation of the abstract and a study programme proposal is carried out through electronic means. The procedure is the same for all types of study programmes offered at UWB, i.e., for Bachelor's, Master's and Doctoral study programmes.
- (3) The guarantor Faculty is the Faculty stated in a Rector's Decision which sets rules for the determination of the guarantor for a given area of education, including the list of guarantor Faculties.
- (4) If a proposal concerns a study programme in an area of education in which no study programme has existed so far, the guarantor Faculty is represented by the Rector and the Education Area Board (hereinafter referred to as the "ROV") is represented by the Deans of all Faculties and the Heads of Institutes which would actively participate in the implementation of the study programmes or parts thereof (hereinafter referred to as "Deans").

Article 2
External Evaluators

- (1) An external evaluator must be a qualified person who meets the requirements set by the Accreditation Bureau.
- (2) An external evaluator cannot be a person who has any conflict of interest, mainly due to a labour-law relation, the performance of paid activities or membership in any UWB body.
- (3) An external evaluator is appointed by the Rector based on his/her proposal, or on the proposal of the relevant ROV or the Dean of the guarantor Faculty.
- (4) For each area of education in which at least one study programme is implemented, at least three external evaluators must be appointed.
- (5) During the appointment procedure, the Rector takes into consideration the level of expertise of the external evaluator in the relevant area of education. If the Rector refuses to appoint an external evaluator, he/she is obliged to give reasons for his/her decision.
- (6) After the appointment of an external evaluator, he/she is registered in the list of external evaluators. The list of external evaluators is kept and updated by the Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs.
- (7) The current list of external evaluators is accessible to members of the relevant ROV, Deans and members of the Internal Evaluation Board (hereinafter referred to as "RVH")
- (8) Administrative matters related to the appointment procedure and activities of external evaluators are managed by the Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs.

Article 3
Cooperation with Legal Entities in the Implementation of a Study Programme

- (1) UWB may implement a study programme in cooperation with another legal entity only under the conditions stated in Sections 81 and 81 d) of the Act.
- (2) In the case of cooperation with a legal entity referred to in Section 81 (2) d) of the Act, this fact must be stated in the application proposal for institutional accreditation according to Article 16.
- (3) The framework agreement on cooperation in the implementation of study programmes is concluded by the Rector.

PART TWO
ACCREDITATION/AUTHORISATION

CHAPTER I
ACCREDITATION OF A STUDY PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTED AT A FACULTY

Part 1

Application for Accreditation of a Study Programme Implemented at a Faculty

Article 4
Abstract of a Study Programme

- (1) The abstract of a proposal of the application for the accreditation of a study programme (hereinafter referred to as the "Abstract") is prepared by the Dean of the Faculty authorized to implement the given study programme (hereinafter referred to as the "Dean").¹
- (2) The abstract includes, in particular:
- a) name of the UWB Part,
 - b) name of the study programme,
 - c) the classification of the study programme within its educational area,
 - d) type of the study programme,
 - e) academic degree awarded,
 - f) profile of the study programme,
 - g) graduates' profile,
 - h) information regarding the necessary approval of the approving body and the name of the approving body,
 - i) form of study,
 - j) standard length of study,
 - k) language of study,
 - l) information regarding the intention to apply for the PhDr. procedure for graduates of master's study programmes who were awarded the master's degree,
 - m) proposal of the guarantor of the study programme,
 - n) objective of the study programme,
 - o) anticipated study plan,
 - p) justification of the necessity for the accreditation of the study programme ,
 - q) financial coverage,
 - r) estimated number of accepted candidates,
 - s) anticipated inter-faculty collaboration,
 - t) anticipated cooperation with other legal entities,
 - u) conformity with the UWB strategy.

¹ According to Art.29 of the Rules for the System of the Quality Assurance and the Internal Evaluation of Quality of UWB Educational, Creative and Related Activities

Article 5

Approval of the Abstract of a Study Programme

- (1) Once the Rector receives the Abstract from the Dean, he/she considers, through the Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs, whether the nominated guarantor of a study programme meets all requirements stipulated by the Act and Government Regulation No. 274/2016 Coll., on Accreditation Standards for Higher Education (hereinafter referred to as the "Accreditation Standards"), and submits the Abstract to the Deans together with his/her own opinion.
- (2) The Deans must comment on the submitted Abstract within 10 working days of its submission. If the Deans do not express any opinions, they are deemed to agree with the Abstract.
- (3) The approval of the Abstract of a study programme issued by the Rector is subject to the approval of the Deans of all Faculties which implement the given study programme or programmes in the areas of education within which the proposed programme should be implemented. If the Abstract is submitted by a Dean who is not the Dean of the guarantor Faculty, or if the proposed study programme significantly interferes with an area of education guaranteed by a Faculty other than the guarantor Faculty, the Rector's approval of the study programme Abstract is subject to the approval issued by the Dean of the guarantor Faculty. Any negative opinions raised by the Dean of the guarantor Faculty must be submitted in writing.
- (4) The Rector decides on the Abstract within five working days following the deadline for the opinion of persons pursuant to Section 2 in accordance with these persons' opinion.
- (5) If the Rector does not approve the Abstract, the procedure described in Article 4 and the following articles must be repeated.

Article 6

Preparation of the Study Programme Abstract

- (1) After the approval of the Abstract, the Dean appoints a guarantor of the study programme.
- (2) The guarantor of the study programme prepares the proposal of the application for the accreditation of the study programme (hereinafter referred to as the "proposal") in accordance with the approved Abstract, the UWB strategy, the requirements stipulated by law, the Accreditation Standards, these Accreditation Rules and Regulations and relevant UWB internal rules.
- (3) If the proposal includes a course which is not accredited, the guarantor of the study programme is obliged to ensure the accreditation of such a course by the Accreditation Committee before, at the latest, the proposal is discussed by the Faculty pursuant to Article 8.
- (4) Provisions of Article 3 do not apply to proposals for a doctoral study programme provided the credit system is not used to evaluate this study.

- (5) The guarantor submits the proposal in electronic form to the Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs. The Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs assesses the formal aspects of the proposal and returns it to the guarantor together with his/her opinion.
- (6) After the recommendations and comments on the proposal made by the Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs have been settled, the guarantor submits the proposal to the relevant ROV.

Article 7

Opinion of the Education Area Board Regarding the Proposal of a Study Programme

- (1) The ROV is entitled to comment on the proposal within 15 working days from its submission. The ROV opinion must be presented to the guarantor and the Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs.
- (2) In the case of a part-time study programme, all relevant ROVs are entitled to comment on the proposal.
- (3) If the ROV does not raise an objection through its chairperson or does not comment on the proposal within the stated deadline, the proposal is deemed to be recommended for approval.

Article 8

Discussion of the Proposal at the Faculty

- (1) After the expiry of the deadline, the Dean presents the proposal to the Faculty Academic Senate together with the comments made by the ROV.
- (2) Once the proposal has been discussed by the Faculty Academic Senate, the Dean presents it to the Faculty Scientific Board. The Dean submits the proposal together with the opinion made by the Faculty Academic Senate and the ROV opinion.
- (3) In the case of a study programme the completion of which meets the professional prerequisites for the performance of a regulated profession, the Dean must request the opinion of the relevant recognition authority before submitting the proposal to the Faculty Scientific Board.
- (4) If the Scientific Board does not approve the proposal, the Dean must notify the Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs without further delay. The guarantor must revise the proposal according to the recommendations and comments made by the Scientific Board and the procedure described in Article 7 must be repeated.

Article 9

Discussion of the Proposal by the Internal Evaluation Board

- (1) The Dean presents the proposal approved by the Faculty Scientific Board through the Rector to the Internal Evaluation Board no later than 14 days before its meeting. The Dean also presents records proving the assessment of the proposal by the Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs, or a possible ROV opinion, the Faculty Academic Senate opinion and the approval issued by the Faculty Scientific Board. In the case of a study programme the completion of which meets the professional prerequisites for the

performance of a regulated profession, the Dean must submit, to the RVH, the opinion issued by the relevant recognition authority as a supporting document.

- (2) The RVH Secretary must present the proposal to the Deans of all Faculties without any delay. The Deans are entitled to comment on the proposal. They must send their comments in electronic form to the RVH Secretary at the latest three working days before the first meeting of the Board. These comments are part of the supporting documents.
- (3) The Internal Evaluation Board is obliged, when deciding on the approval of a study programme, to assess all supporting documents and properly settle them within the justification of its decision.
- (4) The Internal Evaluation Board is entitled, in justified cases, to discontinue the discussion on the proposal and ask the Dean for its completion or the modification of the proposal within a stipulated deadline. The deadline can be extended.
- (5) If the Internal Evaluation Board requires a modification of the proposal that would be considered a significant change according to the methodological materials issued by the Accreditation Bureau, the modified proposal must be discussed in the Academic Senate of the Faculty submitting the proposal and approved by its Scientific Board.
- (6) The Internal Evaluation Board must notify the Dean, through the Secretary of the Internal Evaluation Board, in writing.
- (7) If the proposal concerns a study programme which will be implemented in an area or areas of education for which UWB does not have the institutional accreditation, the Internal Evaluation Board adopts a resolution and decides if, with regard to the content of the file (especially with regard to the settlement of recommendations and comments), it is possible to vote on the approval of the proposal. If such a resolution is adopted, Sections 8-11 do not apply.
- (8) At the meeting, the chairperson appoints, taking into account the area of education, one Board member who will act as a reporter and who will assess the proposal. The reporter cannot be a person who has a conflict of interests.
- (9) The reporter prepares documents for the proposal of a resolution. For this purpose, the reporter asks two external evaluators to assess the proposal. In the case of a part-time study programme, each area of education must be assessed by two external evaluators.
- (10) The reporter selects the external evaluators from a list of external evaluators. The Secretary of the Internal Evaluation Board ensures administrative tasks related to the preparation of assessments completed by external evaluators.
- (11) Based on the assessments and supporting documents, the reporter suggests a statement regarding the decision on the approval of the study programme.
- (12) In the case of study programmes implemented within an area or areas of education for which UWB does not have the institutional accreditation, after the proposal is approved by the Internal Evaluation Board, this proposal becomes an application for the accreditation of the given study programme (hereinafter referred to as the "application for accreditation"). In the case of study programmes implemented within an area or

areas of education for which UWB has institutional accreditation, the proposal becomes the resolution for granting the authorization to implement the given study programme.

- (13) The Dean is entitled to take back the proposal for granting the authorization to implement the study programme, in full or in part. This right cannot be exercised after the issuance of the Internal Evaluation Board resolution pursuant to Articles 22 or 23 until the beginning of the appeal proceedings.

Article 10

Submitting an Application for Accreditation

- (1) The Rector submits applications for accreditation to the Accreditation Bureau.
- (2) In administrative proceedings leading to accreditation, the Rector always asks the Dean of the Faculty submitting the proposal for his or her opinion regarding individual procedural steps. The Rector always proceeds in accordance with the Dean's opinion.
- (3) If the Accreditation Bureau identifies deficiencies during the course of the administrative procedure, the removal of which would result in a significant change of the study programme according to the methodological documents of the Accreditation Bureau, the modified proposal must be discussed in the Academic Senate of the Faculty submitting the proposal and approved by the Scientific Board of the Faculty and the Internal Evaluation Board.

Part 2

Proposal for the Expansion or Extension of the Study Programme Accreditation

Article 11

Proposal for the Expansion or Extension of the Study Programme Accreditation

Articles 6-10 apply to the expansion or extension of the study programme accreditation implemented by the Faculty.

CHAPTER II

SUBSTANTIAL CHANGES TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF A STUDY PROGRAMME

Article 12

Substantial changes to the Implementation of a Study Programme

- (1) Substantial changes carried out during the implementation of the study programme are defined in the methodological documents issued by the Accreditation Bureau.
- (2) Proposals for a substantial change must be processed by the guarantor of the study programme in accordance with methodological documents issued by the Accreditation Bureau. The Dean submits the proposal to the Academic Senate of the Faculty for discussion, to the Faculty Scientific Board for approval, and to the Internal Evaluation Board for approval.

- (3) The Rector ensures that the notification be sent to the Accreditation Bureau.

CHAPTER III STUDY PROGRAMMES WHICH ARE NOT IMPLEMENTED AT ANY FACULTY

Article 13

Proposals for Applications for the Accreditation of a Study Programme; Proposals for Expansion of the Accreditation of a Study Programme, and Proposal for the Extension of the Accreditation of a Study Programme which is not Implemented at Faculties

Articles 4 to 10 shall apply *mutatis mutandis* to proposals for applications for the accreditation of a study programme, proposals for expansion of the accreditation of a study programme and proposals for the extension of the accreditation of a study programme which are is not to be implemented at Faculties.

Article 14

Substantial Changes in the Implementation of a Study Programme which is not Implemented at any of the Faculties.

The provisions of Article 12 apply *mutatis mutandis* to substantial changes in the implementation of a study programme which is not implemented at any of the Faculties.

Article 15

- (1) In the case of the procedure pursuant to Articles 13 and 14, the Director of a higher education institution performs the role of the Dean pursuant to this Regulation.
- (2) The UWB Academic Senate expresses its opinion regarding proposals pursuant to Articles 13 and 14; then, through the Rector, the proposals are submitted for approval to the RVH.

CHAPTER IV INSTITUTIONAL ACCREDITATION

Part 1

Proposal of an Application for Institutional Accreditation

Article 16

Preparation of a Proposal of an Application for Institutional Accreditation for an Educational Area/Educational Areas

- (1) The Rector prepares the proposal of an application for institutional accreditation for the area or areas of education (hereinafter referred to as the "proposal for an application for institutional accreditation") after prior discussion with all Deans.
- (2) The Rector prepares the proposal of an application for institutional accreditation so that the proposal of an application for institutional accreditation is prepared in accordance with the UWB strategy and in accordance with the requirements for institutional accreditation set by law, accreditation standards, these Accreditation Rules and Regulations and relevant UWB internal rules.

- (3) The Rector is responsible for processing the institutional part of the proposal of an application for institutional accreditation.
- (4) The Dean of the guaranteeing Faculty is responsible for the elaboration of the proposal of an application for institutional accreditation in the relevant area of education. Each dean of a faculty that implements a study programme in this area of education is obliged to provide necessary cooperation to the Dean of the guaranteeing Faculty.

Article 17

Assessment of the Proposal of an Application for Institutional Accreditation by the Guaranteeing Faculty and the Education Area Board

- (1) The relevant bodies of the guaranteeing Faculty (the Academic Senate, the Scientific Board) and the relevant ROV gradually assess the proposal of an application for institutional accreditation in the relevant area. Articles 7 and 8 apply *mutatis mutandis*.
- (2) In assessing the proposal, the bodies or persons referred to in Section 1 focus, in particular, on the accuracy of the information provided and on the fulfilment of the standards for the given area of education.
- (3) The Dean of the guaranteeing Faculty settles the comments and recommendations of the bodies or persons referred to in Section 1.
- (4) The Dean submits the proposal to the Rector approved by the Scientific Board of the guaranteeing Faculty.

Article 18

Approval of the Proposal of an Application for Institutional Accreditation by the UWB Scientific Board

- (1) The Rector submits the overall proposal of an application for institutional accreditation (institutional part as well as all parts concerning the areas of education approved at the guaranteeing faculties) for approval to the UWB Scientific Board. The UWB Scientific Board approves the proposal of the application for institutional accreditation, otherwise the assessment of the proposal of the application for institutional accreditation must be repeated.
- (2) By approving the proposal of the application for institutional accreditation by the Scientific Council of the UWB, the proposal of the application for institutional accreditation becomes an application for institutional accreditation.

Article 19

Submitting the Application for Institutional Accreditation

- (1) The Rector submits the application for institutional accreditation to the Accreditation Bureau.
- (2) As soon as the Rector receives a proposal for members of the evaluation committee from the Accreditation Bureau, the guaranteeing Faculty asks the relevant ROV for its opinion on this proposal through the Dean.

- (3) The Rector notifies the Accreditation Bureau of any dissenting opinions with a member or members of the evaluation committee.
- (4) The Rector communicates the decision on the accreditation to the Dean as soon as he/she receives it.
- (5) The Rector decides on the filing of an appeal against the decision of the Accreditation Bureau not to grant the institutional accreditation of a programme upon consultation with the Dean of the guaranteeing Faculty.

Part 2

Proposal for the Expansion/Renunciation of Institutional Accreditation

Article 20

Proposal for the Expansion of Institutional Accreditation

- (1) Articles 16-19 apply *mutatis mutandis* to the proposal to expand the institutional accreditation.

Article 21

Renunciation of Institutional Accreditation for an Educational Area

- (2) Articles 16-19 apply to a proposal to waive the institutional accreditation *mutatis mutandis*.

Part 3

Authorization to Implement a Study Programme within Institutional Accreditation

Article 22

Proposal for Granting, Expanding and Extending the Authorization to Implement a Study Programme or Substantial Changes to a Study Programme

The provisions of Articles 4-9 and 11-15 apply *mutatis mutandis* to proposals for an application for the authorization to implement a study programme, proposals to expand or extend the authorization to implement a study programme and proposals for substantial changes to a study programme implemented on the basis of implementation authorization.

Article 23

Granting the Authorization to Implement a Study Programme

- (1) The RVH grants the authorization to implement a study programme for a maximum period of ten years. For a period of fewer than ten years, the authorization to implement a study programme may be granted if
 - a) the authorization to implement a study programme is granted with regard to the fulfilment of the need to ensure that students have an opportunity to complete their studies,

- b) the study programme does not provide sufficient guarantees of proper implementation and development, especially in terms of staffing and meeting the standards for accreditation for a period of ten years,
 - c) it is a study programme that has not been implemented so far, or
 - d) the Faculty requests it.
- (2) The RVH resolution on granting the authorization to implement a study programme contains:
- a) name and type of the study programme,
 - b) standard length of study,
 - c) form of study,
 - d) in the case of a study programme with specializations, the names of the specializations,
 - e) in the case of a bachelor's or master's study programme, the profile of the study programme,
 - f) the area/areas of education to which the programme belongs; in the case of a part-time study programme, also the share of educational areas in teaching,
 - g) the period for which the study programme may be implemented,
 - h) the name of the Faculty that is authorized to implement the study programme,
 - i) language of instruction,
 - j) possible granting of authorization to hold a state rigorous (PhDr.) examination with the relevant title.
- (3) In the case of granting an authorization pursuant to Section 1 b), the RVH resolution contains the imposition of possible corrective measures or the requirement of an inspection report.
- (4) The RVH resolution in the form of a decision on granting the authorization to implement a study programme must be subsequently signed by the Rector.
- (5) The RVH delivers the original of the resolution on granting the authorization to implement the study programme to the Rector. The Rector sends it to the Dean and the Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs.
- (6) The Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs ensures the assignment of the numerical code of the study programme by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports, and provides the documents for the transmission of the required information to the Accreditation Bureau.
- (7) The Rector forwards the information to the Accreditation Bureau.
- (8) The Rector ensures the publication of the resolution on granting the authorization to implement the study programme, together with information on the accessibility of the study for persons with disabilities in the public part of the UWB website without undue delay.

Article 24

Rejecting the Application for Granting the Authorization to Implement a Study Programme

- (1) The RVH decides in the form of a resolution on the rejection of the application for the authorization to implement a study programme, if the proposal
 - a) is not in accordance with legal regulations and UWB internal regulations,
 - b) does not meet the standards for accreditation,
 - c) is not in accordance with the UWB Strategic Plan,
 - d) does not contain all the particulars relevant for its approval.
- (2) In the case of a resolution pursuant to Section 1, the RVH notifies the Dean, through the Rector, about the reasons for its decision.

Article 25

Resolution on Termination

The RVH stops, in the form of its resolution, the proposal procedure if the Dean has withdrawn the proposal, in part or in full, pursuant to Article 9 13).

Article 26

Appeal against a Resolution of the RVH

- (1) An appeal may be filed against a resolution of the RVH pursuant to Articles 23 and 24 within 15 days of its notification.
- (2) The appellate body is the Rector.
- (3) The decision of the Rector is final.

Part 4

Restriction or Withdrawal of the Authorization to Implement a Study Programme within Institutional Accreditation

Article 27

Restriction or Withdrawal of the Authorization to Implement a Study Programme within Institutional Accreditation

- (1) If the RVH finds serious deficiencies in the implementation of a study programme, it asks the Dean to rectify them within a reasonable period of time.
- (2) In the event of the persistence of serious deficiencies in the implementation of the study programme, the RVH decides, depending on the nature of the matter, to:
 - a) restrict the authorization to implement the study programme, consisting in the prohibition of admitting other applicants to the study programme,
 - b) withdraw the authorization to implement the study programme.
- (3) In the resolution, the RVH states specific reasons for its decision.

CHAPTER V
ACCREDITATION OF THE ASSOCIATE PROFESSORSHIP/PROFESSORSHIP
APPOINTMENT PROCEDURE

Article 28

Proposal of the Application for the Accreditation of the Associate Professorship/Professorship Appointment Procedure

- (1) The authorization to carry out the associate professorship/professorship appointment procedure is subject to accreditation granted by the Accreditation Bureau.
- (2) The draft application for accreditation of the associate professorship/professorship appointment procedure at the Faculty is processed by a person (hereinafter referred to as the "processor") appointed and dismissed by the Dean of the relevant Faculty from among persons fulfilling the conditions specified in the accreditation requirements of the Accreditation Bureau.
- (3) The draft application for accreditation of the associate professorship/professorship appointment procedure is prepared in the structure specified in Section 82 2) of the Act, in accordance with the standards for accreditation and in accordance with these Accreditation Rules and Regulations.
- (4) In the case of accreditation of the associate professorship appointment procedure which has not yet been carried out at the Faculty yet, the Dean asks the other Deans for their opinion regarding this proposal. The Deans will comment on the submitted abstract no later than ten working days following its submission. If the Deans do not comment, they are deemed to agree with the abstract. Any negative opinion must be substantiated in writing.
- (5) The processor submits a draft application for accreditation of the associate professorship/professorship appointment procedure to the Dean, who decides on the submission of the draft application for accreditation of the associate professorship/professorship appointment procedure to the Faculty Scientific Board. The opinions of the Deans pursuant to Section 4 are an obligatory part of the documents for the discussion on the application.
- (6) If the Faculty Scientific Board does not agree with the draft application for accreditation of the associate professorship/professorship appointment procedure, the procedure specified in Sections 2-5 is repeated, otherwise the Faculty Scientific Board submits the draft application for accreditation of the associate professorship/professorship appointment procedure to the Rector.

Article 29

Approving the Proposal of the Application for the Accreditation of the Associate Professorship/Professorship Appointment Procedure

- (1) On the proposal of the UWB Scientific Board, the Rector submits a draft application to the UWB Scientific Board for accreditation of the associate professorship/professorship appointment procedure, including all supporting documents.

- (2) If the UWB Scientific Board does not approve the draft application for accreditation of the associate professorship/professorship appointment procedure, the Rector returns the draft application for accreditation of the professorship/professorship appointment procedure to the Faculty for revision. The Faculty revises the draft application for accreditation of the associate professorship/professorship appointment procedure according to the comments of the UWB Scientific Board. If larger or fundamental changes are required, a re-approval by the Faculty Scientific Board is required.
- (3) If the UWB Scientific Board approves the draft application for the accreditation of the professorship/professorship appointment procedure, the draft application for the accreditation of the associate professorship/professorship appointment procedure becomes the application for accreditation of the associate professorship/professorship appointment procedure.

Article 30

Submitting the Application for the Accreditation of the Associate Professorship/Professorship Appointment Procedure

- (1) The Rector submits the application for the accreditation of the associate professorship/professorship appointment procedure to the Accreditation Bureau.
- (2) As soon as the Rector receives, from the Accreditation Bureau, a proposal of members of the evaluation committee, he/she asks the relevant Dean for an opinion regarding this proposal.
- (3) The Rector communicates a dissenting opinion with a member or members of the evaluation committee to the Accreditation Bureau.
- (4) The Rector notifies the Dean of the decision on the accreditation as soon as he/she receives it.
- (5) The Rector decides on the filing of an appeal against the decision of the Accreditation Bureau not to grant the accreditation of the associate professorship/professorship appointment procedure upon consultation with the Dean of the relevant Faculty.

PART THREE

FINAL AND TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS

Article 31

- (1) During the period of validity of this institutional accreditation, study programmes approved by the Accreditation Bureau through its granting of institutional accreditation and in which UWB currently has institutional accreditation for the area of education to which the study programme belongs are treated as if they had been granted institutional accreditation.

- (2) If the institutional accreditation in the given area of education expires, the study programmes implemented on its basis as of the day of the termination of the accreditation are considered to be study programmes accredited for a period of three years.
- (3) These Accreditation Rules and Regulations also apply, from their effective date, to proceedings initiated pursuant to the original legal regulation. The legal effects of acts which occurred in the proceedings before the entry into force of these Rules and Regulations must be maintained.

Article 32

- (1) This UWB internal regulation was approved, pursuant to Section 9 1) (b) 3 of the Act, by the UWB Academic Senate on 24 February 2021.
- (2) This UWB internal regulation enters into force pursuant to Section 36 4) of the Act on the day of its registration by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports.
- (3) This internal regulation takes effect on the day of its registration by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports.

RNDr. Petr Tomiczek, CSc.,
by own hand,
Chair of the UWB Academic Senate

Doc. Dr. RNDr. Miroslav Holeček,
by own hand,
UWB Rector