APPROVED
at the RISEBA Senate meeting on
14.12.2022. Minutes No. 22/1.1-7/9

REGULATION ON THE PROCEDURE FOR DEVELOPMENT, APPROVAL AND SUPERVISION OF A STUDY PROGRAMME

1. General regulations

1.1. This Regulation governs the "Biznesa, mākslas un tehnoloģiju augstskolas "RISEBA"" (hereinafter — 'RISEBA') procedure for preparing the annual self-assessment report of an academic direction as well as lays down a procedure for the development and approval of a study programme, introduction of amendments to a study programme, and closure of a study programme.

1.2. The self-assessment report of an academic direction consists of the academic direction description and descriptions of study programmes included in the particular academic direction.

1.3. Decisions regarding the development of a new study programme or closing a programme are made by the Management Group, which are ratified by the Senate.

1.4. A study programme can be developed or submitted for approval to the Management Group by a RISEBA lecturer, programme director, department or faculty head, and/or other academic, research or administration structural unit employee (hereinafter referred to in the text as the 'programme initiator'). Independent experts are involved in the assessment of the developed study programme.

1.5. RISEBA develops academic study programmes.

1.6. Every academic year, a description of each RISEBA study programme is prepared. All such descriptions are incorporated in the self-assessment process of an academic direction.

1.7. Annual self-assessment reports of academic directions aim to ensure the continuous improvement of study programmes.

1.8. By means of these reports, RISEBA informs students, the Ministry of Education and Science (MES), the Quality Agency for Higher Education (AIKA), and all parties involved in the learning process about any changes or improvements in the implementation of the respective programme.

1.9. The development of the study programme is regulated by the Republic of Latvia's Law on Higher Education Institutions, RoL Cabinet Regulations "Study Programme Licencing Regulations", the "Regulations regarding Opening and Accreditation of Academic Directions" and the "Guidelines for the Development of a Description of a Study Programme" devised by the Academic Information Centre. The contents of the programme are stipulated by the "Regulations regarding the State Academic Educational Standard" and "Regulations regarding the Second Level Professional Higher Education State Standard", as well as the requirements for professional study programmes — Professional Standard and/or Professional Qualification requirements.

1.10. The procedure for the preparation of self-assessment reports is determined based on the requirements of Article 55 of the Law on Higher Education Institutions, in accordance with RoL Cabinet Regulation No. 794 "Regulations Regarding Accreditation of Higher Education Institutions and Colleges" and AIKA's "Guidelines on Development of an Academic Direction Self-assessment Report", as well as based on EFMD (*European Foundation for Management Development*) and

AACSB (*The Association to Advanced Collegiate Schools of Business*) programme accreditation standards and criteria, as well as CEEMAN (*The International Association for Management Development in Dynamic Societies*).

2. Development and Approval of a New Study Programme

2.1. Applying for the Development of a Study Programme

2.1.1. The programme initiator prepares a rationale justifying the need for the new study programme. In his/her rationale, the programme initiator lays down the goal and learning outcomes to be achieved, includes information about the target audience of the programme, carries out the analysis of competitors, prepares an economic substantiation, inter alia, how it is planned to achieve the minimum required number of students and ensure the development of the programme, as well as other information (see the Flow Chart of Development of a New Study Programme in Annex No. 1).

2.1.2. The prepared rationale for the programme is discussed within the profiling department. The profiling department provides comments and recommendations to the programme initiator.

2.1.3. When a recommendation from the profiling department is received, the initiator prepares and submits a document substantiating the development of the new programme to Management Group.

2.1.4. The Management Group reviews this document and decides whether RISEBA will introduce the new study programme. If the Management Group decides that the study programme cannot be implemented, it is refused.

2.1.5. If RISEBA is able and needs to implement the new study programme, and if the new programme is in line with its mission, vision, and the strategy for development of new study programmes, the Rector issues an order to start the development of a new study programme and appoints the responsible official: a Programme Developer, decides about the composition of the programme development working group, determines the financial and technical means required for the development, and enters into an agreement with the Programme Developer about the new programme.

2.2. Preparing a Description of a Study Programme

2.2.1. After receiving the Rector's order, the Programme Developer, based on external regulations (see Clause 1.9), prepares a description of a study programme according to AIKA's Guidelines (*https://www.aika.lv/normativie-akti/ieksejie-normativie-akti/*).

2.2.2. In preparing the description of a new study programme, the following shall be taken into account:

2.2.2.1. the number of credit points during one academic year — 40 CP, one semester — 20 CP;

2.2.2.2. the scope of one study course consists of at least 2 CP or more;

2.2.2.3. the internship envisaged in the study programme is planned within one academic year;

2.2.2.4. course papers envisaged in the study programmes are divided by academic years;

2.2.2.5. mandatory study courses are included, which can be planned together with other study programmes: civil protection, environment protection, project management, ethics, personal growth, development of business skills (other than management/business study programmes).

2.2.3. During the preparation of a programme description, the Programme Developer should discuss the content of the programme with sectoral experts that represent the respective industries. After recommendations of experts, corrections are made, if needed.

2.2.4. The Programme Developer submits the prepared description of the study programme to the Head of Academic Direction for harmonisation, if improvements are required.

2.2.5. The prepared description of the study programme is submitted to the Head of Quality Assurance. The Head of Quality Assurance will review the prepared programme description pursuant to the requirements of the Cabinet of Ministers and provide comments to the Programme Developer about any corrections, if needed. If the Head of Quality Assurance recognises the description of the study programme as compliant, it is transferred for presentation to the Management Group.

2.2.6. The Programme Developer presents the prepared description of the study programme to the Management Group. The Management Group assesses the contents of the programme, economic rationale, the compliance of the programme to RISEBA's mission and vision and makes proposals for final corrections. If the draft programme is found compliant, the Programme Developer submits the description of the study programmes for approval by the Senate.

2.2.7. The Senate examines the prepared description of the study programme. If the description of the study programme is not approved, the implementation of the study programme is rejected or it is indicated to necessary corrections in the description of the study programme and the repeated examination of the programme by the Senate. If the description of the study programme is approved, the Programme Developer prepares an application for the licensing of the study programme.

2.2.8. The Programme Developer submits the prepared description of the study programme and the application for the licensing of the study programme to the Academic Information Centre for receiving a licence.

2.2.9. Re-assessment has to be carried out for the new study programme once in two years at AIKA, if it already falls within the accredited academic direction.

3. Procedure for Preparing the Annual Self-assessment Report

3.1. The annual self-assessment report of an academic direction is considered to be one of the most important elements of the internal quality assurance system of RISEBA.

3.2. The director of the respective programme is responsible for drafting an annual description of the study programme and its quality. The Head of Academic Direction is responsible for drafting the annual self-assessment report of an academic direction and its quality.

3.3. The annual self-assessment reports are approved by the Senate (see the Flow Chart of the Development Process of the Annual Self-assessment Report in Annex No. 3).

3.4. The annual self-assessment report of the study programme demonstrates the achievements of the academic year, identifies the strengths and weaknesses of the programme, reflects on opinions of students and alumni about the academic processes and delivery of lecturers, facilitates implementation of the programme and lays down changes necessary for further development.

3.5. By involving all stakeholders (students, faculty, employers, etc.), the Programme Director prepares a summary of all information accumulated during the academic year.

3.6. The Programme Committee plays an important role during preparation of a self-assessment report, as it encompasses all stakeholders. During this process, meetings of Programme Committees, as well as separate meetings and discussions on various issues are organised on as needed bases.

3.7. The self-assessment report of the academic direction and programmes is prepared by using the current structure of the self-assessment report recommended by AIKA.

3.8. The Head of Quality Assurance revises the recommended structure of the academic direction self-assessment report published by AIKA every year and informs Heads of Academic Directions thereof.

3.9. The self-assessment report includes also the following information:

3.9.1. Analysis of audit results of Moodle sites of study courses (for every study course);

Quality assessment of the Moodle site of the study course in the previous academic year, according to the Requirements for Developing Study Courses in MOODLE Environment for Full Time, Part Time and Distance Learning Studies (MN0009-02)	
Activities that were planned to be carried out for improving the study course in the previous academic year	
Quality assessment of the Moodle site of the study course in the current academic year, according to the Requirements for Developing Study Courses in MOODLE Environment for Full Time, Part Time and Distance Learning Studies (MN0009-02)	
Assessment of performed activities and their impact on the quality of the study course site	

Sample data summary table for audit results of Moodle sites of study courses — Annex No. 5.

3.9.2. Results of the objectivity monitoring analysis of study course assessments (for every study course);

Average assessment and standard deviation of the study course (specifying the number of students);	
Situation assessment after negotiations with the course academic staff member, if the number of students in the course was at least 5 and the average value of final assessments in the study course was equal to or exceeded 9 or was equal to or below 5.	
Situation assessment after negotiations with the course academic staff member, if the number of students in the course was at least 15 and the standard deviations from the final assessments in the study course was equal to or below 1.	

Sample summary on the results of the objectivity monitoring analysis of study course assessments — Annex No. 8.

3.9.3. Analysis of student drop-outs and their reasons;

Number of student drop-outs (ex-matriculated students and students on an academic leave) in the previous academic year	
Analysis of reasons for student drop-outs, separately specifying the cases (reasons) directly or indirectly related to RISEBA	
Activities carried out during the previous academic year to reduce student drop-outs, especially in cases directly or indirectly related to RISEBA	

Example of data summary on student drop-outs and their reasons — Annex No. 6.

3.9.4. Analysis of results of the student survey on study courses (for every study course);

Report table on the average assessment by students for every question asked in the survey (specifying also the total number of students and the number of students who participated in the survey)	
Free-form summary of comments given by students	
Activities planned to be carried out during the upcoming academic year to improve the study course.	

Comparative analysis of changes in the assessment of study courses by students since the previous self-assessment	

Sample summary of results of the student survey on study courses — Annex No. 7.

3.9.5. Analysis of results of the annual student survey

Analysis of results of the annual student survey, separately specifying the students' assessment, comments and recommendations regarding both the study programme in general and, if possible, individual study courses	
Activities planned to be carried out during the upcoming academic year to improve the study programme.	
Report on activities that were planned to be implemented since the previous self-assessment.	

Sample summary of results of the annual student survey on study courses — Annex No. 4.

3.10. The Programme Director prepares the self-assessment report, agrees it with the Programme Committee and submits it to the Head of Academic Direction.

3.11. The Head of Academic Direction revises the submitted self-assessment report of the study programme and submits it along with the self-assessment report of the academic direction to the Head of Department for approval.

3.12. The Head of Department revises the submitted self-assessment report of the academic direction and convokes a departmental meeting, which decides on the approval of the self-assessment report.

3.13. After the approval of the self-assessment report by the departmental meeting, Faculty Deans submit self-assessment reports of academic directions and excerpts from minutes of respective departmental meetings to the Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs by 1 December of each year.

3.14. Heads of Academic Directions and Programme Directors are to present critical analysis data of self-assessment reports to the Management Group from 1 December to 15 December.

3.15. By 15 December of each year, the Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs submits the annual self-assessment reports for approval by the Senate.

3.16. The Study Programme Director creates a concise version of the report for publication on the RISEBA's website in Latvian and English.

3.17. After the approval of annual self-assessment reports by the Senate, the Head of Marketing and Communications publishes the concise version of the report prepared by every Study Programme Director in Latvian and English by 15 January of every year.

4. Procedure for Preparing the Self-assessment Report
(in the event of accreditation or re-accreditation)

4.1. On the basis of a Rector's order, no later than a year before submitting an application to the AIKA, a Self-Assessment Report Support Work Group (hereinafter — the 'Work Group') is established to provide support to Programme Directors while they prepare for an external quality review of the programme.

4.2. A year before submitting an application, the Head of Academic Direction reserves the time at the AIKA (by sending an application to the AIKA by e-mail) to submit an application for the assessment of an academic direction.

4.3. By involving all stakeholders (students, faculty, employers, etc.), the Programme Director prepares a summary of all information accumulated during the academic year. The Head of Academic Direction ensures that self-assessment reports of academic directions are prepared.

4.4. The Work Group meets at least once in three months to study the draft self-assessment report, monitor the progress and agree about further action.

4.5. The final self-assessment report is approved during a meeting of the respective department, while self-assessment reports of programmes — discussed in the respective Programme Committees.

4.6. The final version of the self-assessment report and its English translation shall be fully prepared at least one month prior to their submission to the Senate.

4.7. After the approval of the self-assessment report by the Senate, the Head of Academic Direction submits the report to the AIKA no later than one year before the expiry of the license or accreditation.

4.8. As soon as the AIKA accepts the report, an agreement is reached concerning the dates and times of expert visits, as well as their agenda.

5. Making Amendments to the Accredited Study Programme

5.1. Every year, the Faculty Dean has discussions with Programme Directors about the development of study programmes, and the need for any substantial changes or their closure. Amendments to the study programme are organised and applications for amendments are prepared by the Study Programme Director.

5.2. If the amendments are significant and include amendments referred to in existing Republic of Latvia Cabinet of Ministers study area accreditation regulations, which shall be decided upon by the Study Quality Commission, the Programme Director submits the prepared amendment application to the Faculty Dean, clearing it beforehand with the Programme Committee, which includes industry experts and students. The Faculty Dean harmonises amendments with Programme Directors, with whom study courses are merged, and present them to the Management Group. The Management Group assesses the contents of major changes to the programme and the resources required for their implementation. If the Management Group supports crucial amendments to the study programme, the Faculty Dean submits and presents amendments planned to the study programme at the meetings of the Senate (if necessary, inviting the Programme Director). If the meeting of the Senate approves amendments planned to the study programme, the Programme Director prepares an application for amendments and submits it along with the decision made by the meeting of the Senate to the Study Quality Commission.

5.3. If amendments, in conformity with Republic of Latvia Cabinet Regulations, are not significant, and it is not necessary to decide on the exclusion and inclusion of study courses, opening of new professional specialisations, the Programme Director obtains clearance for the amendments from the Head of Academic Direction. Amendments are approved by the Faculty Dean and the Vice Rector for Academic Affairs. The Faculty Dean harmonises amendments with Programme Directors, with whom study courses are merged, and make a decision on making amendments.

5.4. The division structure of study courses of the study programme is approved every year by 15 January for the upcoming academic year.

6. Closing a Study Programme

6.1. Closure of a study programme is proposed by a Programme Director, Faculty Dean or Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs. The Faculty Dean presents the rationale for the closure of the study programme to the Management Group. The Management Group assesses the proposal and decide on the closure of the programme.

6.2. If the Management Group decides to close the programme, the Faculty Dean prepares a rationale for the Senate. The application for closure of a joint university programme or double degree programme is harmonised beforehand with all the partner universities involved. If the Senate supports the closure of the programme, the Programme Director submits an application for the closure of the programme to the Study Quality Commission.

Annexes:

1. Development of a New Study Programme at RISEBA (block scheme);
2. Procedure for Development, Approval and Supervision of RISEBA Study Programmes;
3. Procedure for Preparation of the Annual Self-assessment Report of an Academic Direction (incl. Study Programme) (block scheme);
4. Analysis of results of the annual student survey;
5. Analysis of audit results of Moodle sites of study courses;
6. Analysis of student drop-outs and their reasons;
7. Sample summary of results of the student survey on study courses;
8. Results of objectivity monitoring analysis of study course assessments.

Prepared by:
A.Berežaņina

RISEBA Procedure for Development, Approval and Supervision of RISEBA Study Programmes

Process to be controlled	Process description	Time, regularity	Responsible person
Proposal of study programmes and their transfer for development	The programme initiator prepares a rationale justifying the need for the new study programme. The Management Group reviews this document and decides whether RISEBA will introduce the new study programme. The Rector appoints the responsible person and determines the members of the programme development work group.	Upon necessity	Programme initiator, Head of Department, Management Group, Programme Developer
Development of draft study programmes	The Programme Developer develops the draft study programme and submits it for assessment by the Management Group	Upon necessity	Programme Developer
Development of draft study programmes	The Programme Developer submits the draft study programme discussed by the Management Group to the Head of Quality Assurance	Upon necessity	Programme Developer
Development of draft study programmes	The draft study programme recognised by the Head of Quality Assurance is submitted for approval by the Senate.	Upon necessity	Programme Developer
Approval of study programmes and their transfer for licensing	The Senate approves the draft study programme and decides on its transfer for licensing	Upon necessity	Senate, Programme Developer
Study course descriptions and their updating	Study course descriptions are approved by the Head of Department along with the study programme description upon licensing or accreditation. The study programme description for licensing or accreditation and the self-assessment report after the decision made by the departmental meeting are transferred for examination and approval by the Senate. In planning the implementation of study courses, the lecturer develops the study course description in electronic format (according to the study course description form determined by RISEBA) in Latvian and English and submits it to the respective Study Programme Director. The Study Programme Director	Upon necessity Once a year	Study Programme Director, Lecturer, Head of Department

	harmonises and submits it to the Head of Department for approval. The audit of study programme course descriptions — updating and improvement is carried out every year before the start of the academic year.	Once a year	
Quality assessment of study programme implementation / Assessment and updating of study programme contents	Examination of the self-assessment report of the study programme by the Study Programme Committee	Every year	Programme Director/ Programme Committee
	The Senate approves the annual self-assessment of the academic direction / study programme	Every year — in December	Head of Academic Direction / Study Programme Directors
	Survey for internship organisations	On the last day of internship	Study Quality Centre
	Assessment questionnaire for a study course	Three days after the exam date of the study course	Study Quality Centre
	Assessment questionnaire for a study programme	Every year — in May	Study Quality Centre
	RISEBA annual survey of students	Every year — in May	Study Quality Centre
	Alumni survey	Once in three years — in May	Career and Alumni Centre
	Employer survey	Once in three years — in May	Career and Alumni Centre
	Sectoral specialists included in the State Examination Commission submit their opinions, recommendations on the quality of bachelor and master theses	Once a year	Head of Academic Direction Study Programme Director
	Assessment questionnaire for the thesis writing process	Along with the submission of the final thesis	Study Quality Centre
	International cooperation assessment	Once a year	External Relations Department

	Recommendations by the International Board of Advisors	Once a year	Dean
	External assessment — accreditation	Once in 6 years or once in 2 years	Head of Academic Direction, Study Programme Director

Annex 6
Analysis of Student Drop-outs and Their Reasons

Types of study break (example)

Date	Application form	Activity	Reason
08.10.2021	VI 013	To ex-matriculate from 08.10.2021	For family reasons
23.02.2022	VI 018	To grant a study break from 01.03.2022 to 31.01.2023	No possibility of finishing the development of the bachelor thesis
23.02.2022	VI 018	To grant a study break from 01.03.2022 to 31.01.2023	No possibility of finishing the development of the bachelor thesis
25.02.2022	VI 013	To ex-matriculate from 01.02.2022	For family reasons
02.03.2022	VI 018	To grant a study break from 01.03.2022 to 31.01.2023	Time required for covering academic debts
04.03.2022	VI 018	To grant a study break from 01.03.2022 to 31.01.2023	Unable to combine studies and work at the moment; academic debts have to be covered