



Republika e Kosovës
Republika Kosova - Republic of Kosovo



Agjencia e Kosovës për Akreditim
Agencija Kosova za Akreditaciju
Kosovo Accreditation Agency

EXPERT REPORT
POST-ACCREDITATION EVALUATION
UNIVERSITY OF PRISHTINA “HASAN PRISHTINA”

Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences

Study Program: Ecology and Environmental Protection, BSc

May 06, 2025, Prishtina



Republika e Kosovës
Republika Kosova - Republic of Kosovo



Agjencia e Kosovës për Akreditim
Agencija Kosova za Akreditaciju
Kosovo Accreditation Agency

Date of Accreditation Decision: April 19, 2024

Date of Post-Accreditation Review: May 06, 2025

Expert Name: Professor *Mladen Krajacic*, PhD

Coordinator/s from Kosovo Accreditation Agency (KAA): *Milot Hasangjekaj*, Head of Post-Accreditation Division; *Fjollë Ajeti*, Senior Officer for Post-Accreditation Procedures

Sources of information for the Report:

- *Self-Improvement Report (SIR)*
- *Report of Expert Team for the previous accreditation/re-accreditation process*
- *Relevant institutional documentation and annexes, requested as additional documents:*
 1. *Regulation for the Internal Evaluation Process in the Accreditation and Reaccreditation Procedure for Institutional and Study Programs at the University of Pristina*
 2. *Draft Faculty's strategy 2025 -2028*
 3. *Draft Quality Monitoring Plan 2025-2028 & Plani i Monitorimit te cilesise 2025-2028, FSHMN - Prishtinë*
 4. *Invitation for Training from the Center for Excellence in Teaching & Module Descriptions & Training Schedule - May-June 2025*
 5. *Module Descriptions*
 6. *Student Declaration of Original Work_Argjenda Berisha_P.dipl=BchEko_Deklarata e studentit*
 7. *Questionnaire for Academic Staff & questionnaires for staff*
 8. *Questionnaire for Students & questionnaires on overall Bachelor program that students submit*
 9. *Questionnaire for The Administrative and Support Staff & questionnaires for staff*
 10. *The Questionnaire Labor Organization*
- *Site visit/online interviews*

Note: the process is based on the KAA METHODOLOGY on Monitoring and Post-accreditation Procedures



Republika e Kosovës
Republika Kosova - Republic of Kosovo



Agjencia e Kosovës për Akreditim
Agencija Kosova za Akreditaciju
Kosovo Accreditation Agency

Post-Accreditation Procedure has been carried out:

- a) in distance
- b) **on-site visit**

Date of on-site visit (if applicable): May 06, 2025

Agenda and representatives met as part of the post-accreditation process:

Time	Meeting	Participants
09:15 – 10:00	Meeting at the KAA office	KAA staff and expert
10:00 – 11:15	Meeting with the management where the programme is integrated	Assoc. Prof. Kajtaz Bllaca - Dean Prof. Arben Haziri - Vice-dean Ferim Gashi - Vice-dean Ass. Prof. Lulzim Millaku - Vice-dean MSc. Jeton Hyseni – Secretary
11:20 – 12:20	Lunch break	
12:30 – 12:50	Visiting Facilities	Prof. Dr. Halil Ibrahim Prof. Dr. Elez Krasniqi Prof. Dr. Agim Gashi
13:00 – 14:00	Meeting with responsible people to discuss and identify improvement	Prof. Dr. Halil Ibrahim Prof. Dr. Elez Krasniqi Prof. Dr. Agim Gashi Prof. Assoc Dr. Kimete Llugaz Rizani Prof. Dr. Linda Grapci Kotori Prof. Assoc. Dr. Hazbije Sahiti Prof. Dr. Avdulla Alija Prof. Dr. Avni Hajdari Prof. Assoc Dr. Bekim Gashi Ass. Dr. Naim Berisha



Republika e Kosovës
Republika Kosova - Republic of Kosovo



Agjencia e Kosovës për Akreditim
Agencija Kosova za Akreditaciju
Kosovo Accreditation Agency

		Ass. MSc. Bledar Pulaj Ass. Dr. Fisnik Asllani, Ass. Dr. Donard Geci Ass. Dr. Qëndrim Ramshaj
14:00 – 14:10	Internal meeting of KAA staff and experts	
14:10 – 14:20	Closing meeting with the management of the faculty and program	Assoc. Prof. Kajtaž Bllaca - Dean Prof. Arben Haziri - Vice-dean Ferim Gashi - Vice-dean Ass. Prof. Lulzim Millaku - Vice-dean MSc. Jeton Hyseni – Secretary

Section 1: General Information

1. Accreditation Period:

- Start Date: September 2024
- End Date: September 2027

2. Recommendations Overview:

- Total Recommendations: **32** (four out of 36 are considered not applicable)
- Recommendations Fulfilled: **9**
- Recommendations Pending: **23** (not fulfilled or action taken)



Section 2: Summary of Findings

Overall Fulfillment of Recommendations:

(Provide a general summary on the extent in implementation of recommendations from the accreditation process).

Despite the number of recommendations (32), their overall implementation is considered feasible. In addition to those already fulfilled (9), the recommendations currently in progress (11) are expected to be completed by the end of the current academic year. Remaining recommendations (12) are projected to be fully implemented by autumn 2026—well in time for the next accreditation process.

Based on the institutional progress and improvements in study programmes observed over the past decade, the expert is confident that the *University of Prishtina* and the *Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences* possess the capacity and determination to meet these expectations.

Introduction

(Provide 1-2 paragraphs about the process of post-accreditation).

The post-accreditation process was conducted through an on-site visit at the premises of the Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences. The process primarily took place during one morning and one afternoon session, involving discussions with the management team and academic staff, respectively. The discussions were structured to align specific subjects and standards with their relevant counterparts, although some standards were addressed in both sessions.

As first-time participant, the management understandably lacked a clear understanding of how the review would be carried out. Moreover, the management seemed insufficiently familiar with all the recommendations issued during the previous accreditation cycle. Compounding this challenge was the unusually high number of recommendations made by the expert team, which further complicated the institution's ability to respond effectively.

Although the Self-Improvement Report template is clearly structured—requiring a description of actions undertaken for each recommendation, along with supporting evidence—the latter was not provided. Instead, the Faculty mistakenly repeated the action descriptions in the final column intended for evidence.



During the closing meeting with management, the institution was asked to provide documentation for fulfilled recommendations, and for actions being undertaken, to submit minutes from meetings where relevant issues were discussed and decisions were made (please, find a list in *Section 4: Annexes*)

Based on the experience gained through this process, the institution will be able to approach future post-accreditation processes more seriously and efficiently.

Description of Actions and Evidence

(Provide a general summary on the extent in implementation of recommendations from the accreditation process).

The aim of this post-accreditation report is to evaluate institutional efforts to implement the recommendations made in the previous accreditation report. The role of the post-accreditation expert is not to challenge the previous evaluation team or the process they followed, but rather to assess the institution's response to their findings and recommendations.

However, I find it necessary to highlight the following comments regarding the previous report and the institution's capacity and need to respond:

- The total number of recommendations (36) is exceptionally high and, in this context, counterproductive. Recommendations should be proportionate and realistically implementable to effectively support continuous improvement of the study programme.
- While 36 recommendations were presented throughout the sections, the expert-team closed the accreditation report with a final conclusion and a list of seven recommendations to be considered in the context of future accreditation (certainly confusing – raising the question of whether the remaining recommendations have to be addressed)
- Recommendation No. 9 (*Quality Management* section) appears to be non-applicable. Its lack of clarity—particularly regarding the role and definition of "external experts"—hinders its feasibility and necessitates further elaboration for effective implementation.
- The Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences is an integral organizational unit of the University of Prishtina, which has already undergone institutional accreditation. Consequently, most of the recommendations concerning academic staff are considered fulfilled. Relevant documentation, while possibly not submitted to the evaluation team, was undoubtedly reviewed during the university's (re-)accreditation process.



- While academic staff evaluations are conducted, concerns remain about the follow-up processes. This issue falls under the remit of *Quality Management* section. The institution is strongly encouraged to act based on evaluation results. However, the recommendation to publicly share evaluation outcomes is presently deemed non-applicable for several reasons:
 - Although transparency is a growing trend in European higher education, only about 50% of students who evaluate their teachers receive feedback or observe tangible follow-up actions, despite 85% having the opportunity to participate in evaluations. National context must be respected in addressing this matter.
 - Any decision to make results public must be made at the university level and is not currently applicable at the faculty or study programme level.Thus, recommendation No. 5 (*Students section*) is considered non-applicable.

- Given that this is a Bachelor's level programme, it is not appropriate to require evidence of students' co-authorship in academic publications. At this level, participation in small-scale projects within courses or an elective course in research methodology is sufficient. Since the programme culminates in a diploma thesis based on independent research, Recommendation No. 3 (*Research section*) is considered fully implemented.
- Implementation of anti-plagiarism measures is currently incomplete. It is the responsibility of university management to ensure this recommendation is addressed effectively.
- The achievement of some recommendations cannot yet be reliably measured. For instance, the recommendation that *teaching staff develop and apply a shared understanding of academic challenge in both teaching and assessment* is best evaluated through student interviews during the next accreditation cycle. In such cases, my judgement relies on interviews with management and staff.

In general, the most challenging recommendations to implement are within the areas of *Quality Management* and *Educational Process Content*, particularly those regarding learning outcomes.

Based on my previous involvement in accreditation processes at the *Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences*, the results of this accreditation were largely anticipated. It has been consistently observed by various expert teams that while the *quality assurance system* (QAS) exists formally at both university and faculty levels, its practical effectiveness remains limited. As a result, some recommendations from previous reports remain unimplemented. It appears that both the University and the Faculty often expect the other to take the lead on implementing changes. As rightly stated in the accreditation report, a quality assurance system is not simply a



mechanism for conducting evaluations—it must analyse results and drive continuous improvement. It is the responsibility of the QAS to ensure that all relevant documentation is referenced and submitted, and that previous recommendations are addressed. The QAS, alongside institutional leadership, must take a proactive role in ensuring implementation by academic staff.

Among the key responsibilities where the QAS should intensify its efforts are:

- Clear and outcome-oriented formulation of learning outcomes,
- Monitoring achievement and feasibility of these outcomes,
- Initiating revisions when necessary.

External consultation is not required at this stage; this is precisely the function for which QAS staff are employed. What is urgently needed is greater dedication and commitment. Additionally, immediate attention must be paid to the formulation and implementation of student assessment, ensuring it aligns with the course syllabus. While individual instructors are responsible for their syllabi, it is the duty of the QAS and management to guide and ensure continuous improvement in this area.

It would also be beneficial for the Faculty to develop a research concept and strategic plan for the next accreditation cycle. This foundational academic document could begin with individual and research group action plans—an initiative that is reportedly already underway—and be compiled into an overarching institutional strategy. This document should highlight significant past achievements, current research strengths, and future objectives. Ideally, it should also be published on the institution’s website as a hallmark of a research-oriented institution.

The development of a protocol for research involving animals, including obtaining approval from the University of Prishtina’s Ethical Committee for such research, is an important issue that should be prioritised, but is easily manageable.

1. Mission, Objectives and Administration

Status received: Partially compliant
Number of recommendations: 4

2. Quality Management

Status received: Substantially compliant
Number of recommendations: 10

3. Academic Staff

Status received: Substantially compliant
Number of recommendations: 5



4. Educational Process Content

Status received: Partially compliant
Number of recommendations: 8

5. Students

Status received: Substantially compliant
Number of recommendations: 7

6. Research

Status received: Partially compliant
Number of recommendations: 5

7. Infrastructure and Resources

Status received: Substantially compliant
Number of recommendations: 2

• **Strengths Identified:**

List key strengths that emerged from the post-accreditation evaluation.

- ✓ Clearly defined mission for the study programme
- ✓ Ambitious academic staff motivated to lead both education and science in the region
- ✓ Faculty members with strong track records and international recognition
- ✓ Interdisciplinary faculty environment (including chemists, physicists and mathematicians) that supports both educational programmes and research initiatives
- ✓ Presence of highly accomplished individuals with notable scientific achievements

• **Areas for Further Improvement:**

Highlight areas that still need attention or improvement.

- ✓ A multi-level quality assurance system that is formally established but remains ineffective in practice
- ✓ Limited engagement and follow-through in addressing quality improvement initiatives
- ✓ Inadequate responsiveness to student feedback, concerns and proposals
- ✓ A website that lacks sufficient clarity, informativeness, and promotional value



Section 3: Final Evaluation

- **Final Fulfillment of Recommendations**

(Provide final evaluation statement for State Quality Council)

(The supposed recommendation has been fulfilled/partially fulfilled/not fulfilled)

Taking into consideration the content of the SIR and its annexes and documentation made available, along with the information gained through the undertaken interviews, the Expert Team finds the Study Programme evaluated to have met the KAA post-accreditation requirements with the following level of compliance:

Standard	Recommendation Status
1. Mission, objectives and administration	4 recommendations with action taken out of the 4 recommendations
2. Quality management	1 recommendation with action taken out of the 9 recommendations
3. Academic staff	4 recommendations with action taken out of the 5 recommendations
4. Educational process content	8 recommendations with action taken out of the 8 recommendations
5. Students	3 recommendations with action taken out of the 4 recommendations
6. Research	2 recommendations with action taken out of the 5 recommendations
7. Infrastructure and resources	2 recommendations with action taken out of the 2 recommendations

In conclusion, the Expert Team considers that the Bachelor's Study Programme in Ecology and Environmental Protection offered by the University of Prishtina, the Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences **has taken actions (being either fulfilled or partially fulfilled)** to implement for **20** recommendations meaning for **62.5 %** of the total recommendations of **32**.



Section 4: Annexes

Annex 1. Synthetic approach of the recommendation implementation process

Number	Recommendation	Evaluation (Fulfilled / Partially Fulfilled / Not Fulfilled)	Recommended deadline to fulfill
1. Mission, Objectives and Administration			
1.	<i>The program may wish to consider seeking external academic advice when the program learning outcomes are next reviewed.</i>	Partially Fulfilled	<i>Before next application for accreditation (2026)</i>
2.	<i>Develop and apply an overarching didactic and research concept.</i>	Partially Fulfilled	<i>Before next application for accreditation (2026)</i>
3.	<i>Develop means for students to be part of the decision-making program management processes.</i>	Fulfilled	
4.	<i>Ensure that all policies, regulations, and terms of reference relating to the management and delivery of the program are reviewed at least once every two years.</i>	Partially Fulfilled	<i>End of the academic year 2024/25</i>
2. Quality Management			
1.	<i>QAS needs to be embedded into practice and mechanisms designed to enable feedback and action within appropriate timescales.</i>	Not Fulfilled	<i>Before next application for accreditation (2026)</i>
2.	<i>As set of key performance indicators need to establish (agreed), monitored and reviewed at key times throughout the academic year.</i>	Not Fulfilled	<i>Before next application for accreditation (2026)</i>
3.	<i>Open discussion of the course evaluation results with the students.</i>	Not Fulfilled	<i>Before next application for accreditation</i>



			(2026)
4.	<i>Open discussion of the course evaluation results with the teachers.</i>		
5.	<i>The Faculty should make efforts to develop and implement a quality management system which ensures proactive involvement of all stakeholders following a PDCA- cycle approach.</i>	Not Fulfilled	<i>Before next application for accreditation (2026)</i>
6.	<i>The culture must change to one of continuous improvement with appropriate feedback and timely/efficient loops e.g., annual cycles</i>	Not Fulfilled	<i>Before next application for accreditation (2026)</i>
7.	<i>The Faculty should make efforts to set functional and operational quality system with all stakeholders.</i>	Not Fulfilled	<i>Before next application for accreditation (2026)</i>
8.	<i>Establishment of alumni tracking and the corresponding integration into institutionalised surveys.</i>	Not Fulfilled	<i>Before next application for accreditation (2026)</i>
9.	<i>Introduce additional subjects with a focus on current and future knowledge and skills, both for current students and for external experts who need more advanced knowledge</i>	N.A. (the recommendation is not clear)	
10.	<i>Accept all recommendations from last report.</i>	Partially Fulfilled	<i>Before next application for accreditation (2026)</i>
3. Academic Staff			
1.	<i>All candidates for employment should be provided with full position descriptions and conditions of employment while they remain candidates.</i>	Fulfilled	
2.	<i>Ensure that all staff who teach and assess are provided with adequate training in teaching and assessing before they commence their duties.</i>	Fulfilled	



3.	<i>Ensure and monitor the professional updating of all teachers in relation to developments in teaching and assessing practice.</i>	Fulfilled	
4.	<i>Academic staff evaluation should be conducted regularly at least through self-evaluation, students, peer and superiors' evaluations, occur on a formal basis at least once each year, and the results made publicly available.</i>	Fulfilled	
5.	<i>Develop strategies for quality enhancement to include improving the teaching strategies and quality of learning materials.</i>	Not Fulfilled	<i>Before next application for accreditation (2026)</i>
4. Educational Process Content			
1.	<i>Ensure that in both teaching and assessing, teaching staff have and apply a common understanding of the degree of challenge to be applied.</i>	Partially Fulfilled	<i>End of the academic year 2024/25</i>
2.	<i>Revise course learning outcomes so that they are all assessable and match the expectations of the external frameworks.</i>	Partially Fulfilled	<i>Before next application for accreditation (2026)</i>
3.	<i>Ensure that all learning outcomes are assessed.</i>	Partially Fulfilled	<i>End of the academic year 2024/25</i>
4.	<i>Ensure that marks and credits are awarded only for learning, and not for any other factor, such as attendance.</i>	Fulfilled	
5.	<i>Learning outcomes should be explained and discussed with students from the perspective of their relevance to the students' development.</i>	Fulfilled	
6.	<i>Implement a mechanism to ensure that all assessments as specified in the course documents are performed.</i>	Fulfilled	
7.	<i>Develop appropriate, valid and reliable mechanisms for verifying standards of student achievement.</i>	Partially Fulfilled	<i>Before next application for accreditation (2026)</i>



8.	<i>Collect and analyse data to ensure that the standard of work required for different grades is consistent over time, comparable in courses offered within the program, and in comparison, with other study programs at highly regarded institutions.</i>	Partially Fulfilled	<i>End of the academic year 2024/25</i>
5. Students			
1.	<i>Design an action plan for the graduation rate improvement, monitor its implementation, and report, annually. Adjustment necessary upon the reporting.</i>	Partially Fulfilled	<i>Before next application for accreditation (2026)</i>
2.	<i>Post-evaluation action plan design and implementation is compulsory, at least once per year, for the academic staff to improve the teaching process and the knowledge transfer for the teaching staff towards the students.</i>	Partially Fulfilled	<i>Before next application for accreditation (2026)</i>
3.	<i>The SER should contain sufficient and specific data for assessment of the study programme according to the standards. The SER lacks Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) such as number of student enrolment to each year, number of graduates per academic year, number of dropouts, average duration of the studying, mobility participation and similar. For the next re-accreditation KPIs should be presented with clearly set threshold indicators and their achievement.</i>	Partially Fulfilled	<i>Before next application for accreditation (2026)</i>
4.	<i>The recommendation regarding high drop-out of the study programmes' students is for the Faculty to develop the support system that will reduce the unwillingness of the enrolled students to finish their study.</i>	N.A. (It overlaps with the first recommendation in this section)	
5.	<i>Students don't have feedback on their comments in the student survey. The faculty should take the responsibility for disseminating the questionnaire results with the suggestions for the improvement.</i>	N.A. (It is uniformly regulated at the university level)	
6.	<i>Improve the anti-plagiarism check of the students' works.</i>	N.A.	



		(To be addressed at the university level)	
7.	<i>Include students' performance in quality indicators.</i>	Not Fulfilled	<i>Before next application for accreditation (2026)</i>
6. Research			
1.	<i>The Department of Biology should develop own research plan with clear objectives, indicators and performance.</i>	Not Fulfilled	<i>Before next application for accreditation (2026)</i>
2.	<i>Each Academic staff member should have developed their individual plan of research and teaching activities, implement it and monitor its implementation. The Plan should include no. of paper planned to publish, no. of workshops attendance with presentations and participation per year and the planned trainings for professional advancement. Cumulative plan for the academic staff should be available for the next reaccreditation.</i>	Partially Fulfilled	<i>End of the academic year 2024/25</i>
3.	<i>Teaching staff should involve students in the research activities. Publications should be listed.</i>	Fulfilled	
4.	<i>The Department must get the UP's Ethical Committee Approval for each research including animals before the research starts. Written approval should be available as the supporting evidence.</i>	Not Fulfilled	<i>Before next application for accreditation (2026)</i>
5.	<i>The Department must develop and implement a protocol for performing research on animals. All academic staff conducting research on animals should be obliged to apply it.</i>	Not Fulfilled	<i>Before next application for accreditation (2026)</i>
7. Infrastructure and Resources			
1.	<i>Ensure appropriate provision for learning resources for students and staff with disabilities or difficulties.</i>	Partially Fulfilled	<i>Beginning of the academic year 2025/26</i>



Republika e Kosovës
Republika Kosova - Republic of Kosovo



Agjencia e Kosovës për Akreditim
Agencija Kosova za Akreditaciju
Kosovo Accreditation Agency

2.	<i>Investments in IT-resources is recommended to improve students' needs for studying experience.</i>	Partially Fulfilled	<i>Beginning of the academic year 2025/26</i>
3.			

Expert

Mladen Krajacic

May 06, 2025

Expert Name

(Signature)

(Date)