

**UNIVERSITY OF PRIZREN**  
***'UKSHIN HOTI'***

**INSTITUTIONAL AND PROGRAM EVALUATION**

**REPORT OF THE EXPERT TEAM**

*Site visit: Prizren, 15<sup>th</sup> May 2019*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	2
1. INTRODUCTION.....	3
1.1. Context.....	3
1.2. Site visit schedule .....	4
1.3. A brief overview of the institution under evaluation .....	5
2. INSTITUTIONAL EVALUATION.....	5
2.1. Public mission and institutional objectives.....	6
2.2. Strategic planning, governance and administration.....	6
2.3. Financial planning and management .....	9
2.4. Academic integrity, responsibility and public accountability.....	9
2.5. Quality management .....	10
2.6. Learning and teaching.....	11
2.7. Research.....	11
2.8. Staff, employment processes and professional development .....	12
2.9. Student administration and support services.....	13
2.10. Learning resources and facilities .....	14
2.11. Institutional cooperation .....	15
3. PROGRAM EVALUATIONS .....	16
3.1. <i>Program 1</i> .....	16
3.1.1. Mission, objectives and administration.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
3.1.2. Quality management .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
3.1.3. Academic staff .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
3.1.4. Educational process content.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
3.1.5. Students.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
3.1.6. Research.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
3.1.7. Infrastructure and resources .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
3.2. <i>Program 2</i> .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
4. OVERALL EVALUATION AND JUDGEMENTS OF THE ET..	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
5. APPENDICES ( <i>if available</i> ) .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>

# 1. INTRODUCTION

## 1.1. Context

**Date of site visit: 15<sup>th</sup> May 2019**

**Expert Team (ET) members:**

- Prof. Stephen Adam
- Prof. Dr. Magdalena Platis
- Prof. Dr. Kristiina Tonnison
- Prof. Dr. Peeter Normak
- Prof. Dr. Johannes Falterbaum
- Mr. Mihai Adrian Vilcea (Student Expert)

**Coordinators from Kosovo Accreditation Agency (KAA):**

- Avni Gashi, Acting Director of KAA
- Shkelzen Gerxhaliu, Senior Officer for Evaluation and Monitoring
- Arianit Krasniqi, Senior Officer for Evaluation and Accreditation

**Sources of information for the Report:**

- New KAA guidelines for institutional and programme evaluation;
- Self-evaluation report (SER) submitted by the University of Prizren “Ukshin Hoti”;
- Previous External Evaluation Report (FR) dated 22<sup>nd</sup> April 2015;
- Information obtained during the site visit;
- Supplementary documents requested by Institutional re-accreditation team:
  1. Organisation diagram of management structure.
  2. Terms of reference, duties and responsibilities for key management bodies and positions not covered/detailed in the University statutes/articles (e.g. posts such as Rector, Vice Rector, General Secretary, Deans, Vice-Deans, Student series officer, QA manager/director, etc.).
  3. Institutional development plan/strategic plan and any separate Faculty development plans.
    - a. Minutes of the meetings when strategic plan was voted and discussed (no need for translation)
  4. Master, Bachelor and Doctoral (if exist) programme regulations. Plus any extra modular/ECTS regulation. Any documents that cover Institutional/Faculty progression, pass/fail, assessment rules, grading regulations, etc.
  5. Institutional Internationalisation policy document.
  6. Research Strategy and terms of reference of ‘research group’.
  7. Any data on current institutional student numbers + Faculty and programme numbers + monitoring data on admissions, retention and dropout rates.
  8. Staff development and enhancement policy (Institutional and Faculty).
  9. Graduate destination data (if exists).
  10. Staff Student Ratios (SSR’s) by Faculty and programme.
  11. Terms of reference of the new committee for evaluation/feedback monitoring
  12. Institutional Quality Assurance policy and process document.
  13. University budget for the period 2016 – 2019.
  14. Election criteria and processes of decision (if is existing)
  15. Minutes of the voting process for annual budget (last 3 years)
  16. Reports of monitoring of expenditure (last 3 years) – no need for translation
  17. Code of ethics
  18. List of members for Ethics Committee
  19. Minutes of Ethics Committee meetings for last 3 years

20. Minutes of the meetings when quality assurance policy was discussed/adopted
21. Reports for the last 3 years – semestrial reports (standard 5.5)
22. Structure of quality committee and minutes when was appointed/voted
23. Link from website where syllabuses are accessible for students (or people who want to become students) – links from Albanian version (no translation needed)
24. List of research publication for all academic staff (list with the article in the last 3 years – table with each academic staff her/her article)
25. Policy for intellectual property
26. Criteria and processes for performance of staff
27. Description of the process for orientation program and proof of exitance
28. Information and proof of existence for scholarship/financial support for students (last 3 years)
29. Student handbook
30. Reports of student services monitorization
31. List of international projects
32. List of events (and links from de announcement) for international events (last 3 years)
33. List with advisory committees and minutes from their last 3 years

*N.B. No new document should be supplied just existing documents. Many of the documents received were in local language and thus not accessible to externals. Multiple documents were sought in order to satisfy the new KAA standards.*

### **Criteria used for institutional and program evaluations**

- The new KAA Accreditation Manual and guideline materials, information obtained during the site visit plus additional documents requested following the visit.

### **Site visit schedule:**

#### 14 May

- 19.45 Meeting at the Reception of the Hotel  
20.00 Working dinner

#### 15 May

- 07.30 Meeting at the reception of the hotel  
09.00 – 10.30 Meeting with the management of the institution  
10.40 – 11.50 Meeting with quality assurance representatives and admin services  
12.00 – 13.00 Meeting with the heads of study programs  
13.00 – 13.50 Lunch break  
13.50 – 14.50 Visiting tour of the facilities and infrastructure  
14.50 – 15.40 Meeting with teaching staff  
15.50 – 16.40 Meeting with students  
16.50 – 17.40 Meeting with graduates  
17.50 – 18.40 Meeting with employers of graduates and external stakeholders  
18.45 – 19.00 Internal meeting – Expert Team and KAA  
19.00 – 19.15 Closing meeting with the management of the institution

Nr.	Study programs	Experts	Responsible persons of study programs		
1	Institutional Re-accreditation	Stephen Adam & Adrian Mihai Vilcea			
2	Business Administration/BSc	Magdalena Platis	1. Behxhet Brajshori	2. Hamdi Hoti	3. Nerimane Bajraktari
3	International Management/BSc	Kristiina Tonnison	1. Artan Nimani	2. Drita Krasniqi	3. Florije Govori-Fejzullahu

4	Law/LLB	Johannes Falterbaum	1. Arif Riza	2. Armend Podvorica	3. Halim Bajraktari 4. Muharem Faiku
5	Constitutional and Administrative Law/LLM	Johannes Falterbaum	1. Kadri Kryeziu		
6	Software Design/BSc	Peeter Normak	1. Ercan Canhas	2. Samedin Krrabaj	3. Dhuratë Hyseni
7	Information Technology and Telecommunication/BSc	Peeter Normak	1. Arsim Susuri	2. Naim Baftiu	3. Malush Mjaku

## 1.2. A brief overview of the institution under evaluation

University of Prizren (UPZ) “Ukshin Hoti”, was established on 09.10.2009 with the decision number 01/87 of the government of the Republic of Kosovo and after an intensive preparation work with international consultants started officially in 2010. The tradition of higher education in Prizren starts earlier with its Higher Pedagogical school in 1962 which University of Prizren inherited. HPS got independent from the University of Prishtina which is the oldest HE institution. HPS in Prizren has been transformed to Faculty of Education in Prizren under the umbrella of the University of Prishtina. Since 2010/2011 Faculty of Education which until that time was under UP got transferred to UPZ. The university now has six faculties: Economics; Law; Computer Science; Education; Philology; Life and Environmental Sciences.

On 14<sup>th</sup> May 2019 Prof Asoc. Dr Ismet Temaj was elected Rector of the University by unanimous vote votes of the University Steering Council.

## 2. INSTITUTIONAL EVALUATION

This re-accreditation proved particularly challenging for three reasons: (i) the process was slowed by the need to translate from local language to English and vice versa<sup>1</sup>; (ii) the demands of the new and unfamiliar KAA approach to Institutional and Programme review using standards and performance indicators; and (iii) the need to get access to 33 further documents (listed above in section 1.1 of this report) necessary for accurate evaluation under the new KAA approach to quality. A number of important documents that were listed as attached to the SER were not. The institutional evaluation now consists of 11 prescribed sub-headings through which the administration, organisation and management of the institution, as well as teaching and research are assessed. The report below follows these KAA sub-headings.

In order to fully complete the evaluation, it was necessary to manipulate the meeting agenda so that considerably more time with the senior management was available. The senior management team graciously agreed to this. Considerable time pressures existed associated with this visit as the new approach for institutional and programme accreditation has a wider scope and more dimensions to examine.

It will obviously take a little time for experts and institutions to adjust to the demands, implications and approach of the new system.

<sup>1</sup> Translations were ably provided by Jasmini Jusufil PhD candidate and UPZ Quality Assurance Coordinator.

## 2.1. Public mission and institutional objectives

The initial meeting with five senior management personnel began by exploring the University of Prizren (UPZ) responses to the previous institutional accreditation report of April 2015. The Prizren responses are briefly detailed in a chart (SER pages 47-50). The institution had decided not to revise their mission statement. The mission statement remains that denoted under article 6 of the UPZ founding Statutes. The 2015 external report recommended ‘*Like 2012 the experts recommend a specification of the mission statement and the strategy of the university.*’ The UPZ response was ‘*We believe our mission and vision suits us very well to our capacity and needs*’ (2019 SER. p 47). It was indicated that this decision was the result of various bodies consulted including Senate, Management, Steering Board, etc. It was indicated that the original mission was drafted by the Steering Board. The UPZ response is disappointing. The mission (SER p 8-9) remains excessively broad and provides no focus on the specific needs of the locality and region. It is so vague and very generalised and allows any and all newly proposed programmes to fit with it. This negates and breaches the KAA standards (see KAA standards 1.1-1.5 and performance indicators 1.1-1.4).

The previous criticisms of the organisational chart were repeated as it remains impossible to read due to the small print of the electronic version and it not being available in English. It is currently not available in the local language nor in English on the university website (section cannot be accessed).

The initial meeting with senior management staff was severely hampered by the need to continually translate English to the local language and vice versa.

Standard:	S 1.1	S 1.2	S1.3	S 1.4	S 1.5						
Compliance:	No	No	yes	No	No						

*N.B. Any blanks and/or? above indicate not evaluated and/or impossible to evaluate.*

**Compliance level:** Non-compliant Because most of the standards are not compliant + performance indicators cannot be assessed for this section.

### ET recommendations:

- A. *The mission statement needs to be revised to properly reflect the needs of the immediate locality and region of Kosovo. Such a revision must involve the participation of key stakeholders within and outside the university.*
- B. *The UPZ organisational chart should be readable and available in English and local language on the university website.*
- C. *Following appropriate internal reflections and review, UPZ should seek to amend its founding Statutes in order to permit and focus on a revised mission statement, and to streamline and improve its structures.*
- D. *Medium and long-term institutional objectives have to accord with a revised mission statement and to involve all the stakeholders in the development process.*

## 2.2. Strategic planning, governance and administration

It was indicated that a new UPZ ‘Strategic Plan’ was drafted two months previously. The document received indicates that it covers the period 2018-2022. It indicates that it is the

product of intensive consultations. The working group consulted numerous bodies before the strategy was agreed by the university Steering Council. It repeats the previously mentioned Mission and Vision statement (omitting the elements stated in its statutes) as:

‘Ukshin Hoti University Prizren (UUHP) serves the region of Prizren and around the country recruiting, developing and educating students to be graduates, successful in the labor market in Kosovo, in the region and beyond.’

‘University "Ukshin Hoti" Prizren and its management are committed to enhancing the quality of teaching and teaching as well as activities related to the University to strengthen its position and comparability with other institutions in the region and beyond.’

(Strategic Plan, page 5)

To this it adds a list of 9 strategic aims each with several sub-aims (page 7 of the document). The plan includes a useful ‘action plan’ chart (pages 13-16) which details the aims, activities, measures, timetable, bearer of activities (persons responsible) and cost of financial resources. This approach is commended but detailed analysis of the plan reveals that: most of the timetable elements are marked as ‘ongoing’; resource implications are marked ‘BKK’ but is not clear what this means; under the ‘measures’ column – often unclear statements and aims are briefly indicated, Unfortunately, the strategy document largely omits precise costings<sup>1</sup>, criteria and precise dates for (short-medium-long term) monitoring progress. In addition, the ‘action plan’ chart does not appear to tie into or reflect all the previously mentioned listed strategic aims and sub-aims.

The plan and the faculty sub-plans clearly are the product of serious work and constitute a useful basis for future development. However, it does require strengthening. It is also apparent that UPZ suffers from huge funding constraints and many of the goals and development have enormous resource implications.

The unreadability of the organogram mentioned in section 2.1 above is a significant issue as it prevents judgements and recommendations about UPZ’s internal structures and reporting mechanisms. A legible organogram was supplied as one of the additional documents requested. This was only available in Albanian and existed over several pages. It is still not possible to make judgements about the university structures and their coherence. Furthermore, as many of the documents requested were in Albanian this means that the external evaluators were unable to make judgements concerning aspects of ‘*strategic planning, governance and administration*’.

The UPZ statutes were provided with the additional documents requested. All key documents must be available in English if external evaluators are to discharge their functions. This is particularly important if institutions are hamstrung by outmoded or inappropriate regulations as the senior management team indicated.

The Statutes do not appear to provide student representation (with full voting rights) on the Steering Council/Board. This Board has 7 voting members 3 of which are Ministry (MEST) nominees. None of these is specified as a local/regional position. No student representation is mandatory. The Board is clearly the power centre of the university. It is not clear from the organogram (no translation) how key academic bodies plug into it effectively. Article 24 of the Statutes indicates that the Board shall arrange for the publication of an annual report on the performance of the university. It was not possible to access this. It is not clear if this report is

---

<sup>1</sup> It is not clear what the funding resource ‘BKK’ means.

accessible in the local language on the UPZ website as the Statute article 24, point 4 stipulates. The UPZ Statutes include quite detailed regulations that would normally be found in university internal regulation for Bachelor and Master programmes e.g. progression, mobility (ECTS), student status, Master thesis, retake rules, etc. Statute 110 details student rights for appeal but nothing on permissible grounds.

Other issues and peculiarities associated with the UPZ Statutes include:

- Article 6 - mission breadth issue (previously raised in this report);
- Article 43, 1.5 - exclude certain student categories from the Senate;
- Article 47 - establishes cross responsibilities and potential conflicts between bodies;
- Article 78 - item (1) appears to allow students to 'decide' rights and obligations;
- Article 81 - item 3.1 the Steering Board 'complies' library development strategies;
- Article 104 - constitutes a prescriptive and restrictive list of assessment methods at odd with Bologna reforms.

Standard:	S 2.1	S 2.2	S 2.3	S 2.4	S 2.5	S 2.6	S 2.7	S 2.8	S 2.9	S2.10	S2.11
Compliance:	yes	no	no	no	no	yes	yes	no	no	?	?

*N.B. Any blanks and/or? above indicate not evaluated and/or impossible to evaluate*

**Compliance level:** Non-compliant

### **ET recommendations:**

- A. *Revise the strategic plan to encompass all 9 strategic aims and sub-aims. Ensure that the new plan includes detailed costings, measurable criteria, staged time scales, etc.*
- B. *The strategic plan needs to consider in more detail the development of non-state funding sources.*
- C. *The Ministry of Education Science and Technology (MEST) resource allocations and the Kosovo Accreditation Agency (KAA) standards and performance indicators have significant implications for the funding of its public universities. Universities thus can find themselves unable to meet the conflicting requirements of state, quality assurance and external evaluators.*
- D. *Approach the requisite bodies to seek the revision of any outdated university statutes and state education laws that might prevent the modernisation and effective functioning of the university.*
- E. *The existence of a readable organogram is a pre-requisite for external evaluation and must be available for externals, staff and students.*
- F. *Key institutional documents including policies and committee terms of reference need to be available in English if external evaluators are to fulfil their functions and duties.*
- G. *The annual report of the UPZ Board should be available in English and accessible via the UPZ website (and available on the website in the local language as per Statute 24, section 4).*
- H. *Senior management should review and seek to get changed any outmoded, inappropriate or illogical founding statutes that prevent the effective running of UPZ - with particular reference to specific articles indicated above.*
- I. *Involvement of students at all levels (consultative, executive, decisional) have to be put in place. In addition, the number (percentage) have to be increased. At the grass root level (commissions/teams who revise the educational programs) up to highest decision body.*



### 2.3. Financial planning and management

In the UPZ internal report financial aspects are treated briefly more than that the provisional budget for the following years is identical with the current year (identical total budget, extra budgetary resources, staff etc.). This aspect offered us a clear picture that realistic and concrete action are not planned yet.

Standard:	S 3.1	S 3.2	S 3.3	S 3.4	S 3.5
Compliance:	no	no	yes	no	?

*N.B. Any blanks and/or? above indicate not evaluated and/or impossible to evaluate*

**Compliance level:** Partially compliant

#### ET recommendations:

- A. *The UPZ management should focus more on the financial sustainability of the university by offering more time and resources to the planning of budget.*
- B. *The Strategy for development of the institution should be reflected also in the budget for the following years.*

### 2.4. Academic integrity, responsibility and public accountability

UPZ had developed a Code of Ethics which is comprehensive, there are some regulation that constrain freedom of speech especially for students.

The Ethic committee is proposed by the Rector and set up by Steering Committee, this procedure is not offering the independence of the committee, more over many regulation of the Code of Ethics are empowering the Steering Committee, actions of the academic staff or students are not able happened if there are not approve by Steering Committee.

Standard:	S 4.1	S 4.2	S 4.3	S 4.4	S 4.5	S 4.6	S 4.7				
Compliance:	yes	yes	partially	partially	no	no	no				

*N.B. Any blanks and/or? above indicate not evaluated and/or impossible to evaluate*

**Compliance level:** Non-compliant.

#### ET recommendations:

- A. *Revision of Code of Ethics with the guarantee of freedom of speech and right to protest especially for students.*
- B. *Establishment of a more democratic process for setting up Ethic Committee, Senate should vote for the people who are appointed.*

## 2.5. Quality management

The university has its quality assurance policies, processes and systems detailed (SER section 2.5). It states that all academic and administrative units within the institution, including the governing body, are the focus for evaluation and monitoring and participate in the process of quality assurance and contribute to its continual improvement. There is a quality assurance office established in 2012. There is no quality assurance committee but the Senate covers this function (SER section 5.9, page 23). A vice-rector also has responsibility for quality assurance. However, it was indicated that a new committee for evaluation had been created which would be responsible for evaluation of feedback. Its terms of reference (TOR) were sought in the list of additional documents requested (item 11). A number of the documents subsequently received were in Albanian and impossible for external evaluators to access, evaluate or even to ascertain which of the documents requested were actually received. The TOR for the new committee for evaluation fell into this category.

The UPZ Quality Assurance department appears to consist of one person - Jasmini Jusufil (PhD candidate) who played a prominent and effective role in the site visit as main translator and person most able to answer technical questions. No manual for quality assurance exists. Different people and bodies have some function concerning quality assurance include the Vice-Rector, General Secretary, Senate, etc.

The process whereby quality management functioned was explored. The new Rector indicated that he was keen to change the current system. It was indicated that the management system itself was not evaluated but it was intended that it would be. The new Rector indicated that he wanted the quality assurance office to have more power.

The administration was evaluated by students and they completed questionnaires focused on their teaching and learning experience. UPZ places great emphasis on the role of student questionnaires. Proposed new programmes of study were also evaluated and the Steering Group had rejected a programme (MA Management Studies). No guidelines for 'study commissions' exist.

It was stated that UPZ suffered from the existence of a number of legal and administrative straitjackets including education laws/statutes, state regulations and imposed university statutes.

Standard:	S5.1	S5.2	S5.3	S5.4	S5.5	S5.6	S5.7	S5.8	S5.9	S5.10	S5.11	S5.12	S5.13	S5.14
Compliance:	no	no	?	no	no	partial	no	no	no	no	yes	no	partial	no

*N.B. Any blanks and/or? above indicate not evaluated and/or impossible to evaluate*

**Compliance level:** Non-compliant

### ET recommendations:

- A. *Evaluate and review all UPZ institutional quality assurance policies, processes and systems.*
- B. *Establish a quality assurance committee that plugs into, and makes appropriate reports to, various structures and bodies in the university system.*

- C. *Enhance the role of the quality assurance office and its leader. Such an office needs to mature and move from a purely advisory role to have more executive powers and authority within the UPZ system.*
- D. *Create a UPZ Quality Assurance manual outlining duties, powers, policies, approaches, responsibilities and relationships within UPZ.*
- E. *Collect and evaluate graduate employment data and analyse its implications.*
- F. *Monitor student dropout rates by faculty and programmes and, where possible, UPZ/Faculties to implement suitable policies to reduce them.*

## 2.6. Learning and teaching

UPZ had developed some policies and procedures for academic programs, unfortunately during the evaluation and from self-evaluation report we couldn't identify how UPZ is monitoring the policies and procedures.

During the meetings with top management was mention that the only system for ensuring the programs are meeting the standards are the evaluations done by KAA, there are no other internal processes developed. Also, UPZ didn't developed yet their own quality indicators. We couldn't fully assess standard 6.4 because documents were provided only for the programs which were under the evaluation process during the visit.

Students mentioned that is room for improvements regarding the methods and environments because not all of them are student-centred.

Evaluation of the academic staff, done by students seems to function. Unfortunately, during the visit - only the evaluation from last year were accessible – for the previous years there were lost.

Standard:	S 6.1	S 6.2	S 6.3	S 6.4	S 6.5	S 6.6	S 6.7	S 6.8	S 6.9
Compliance:	partially	no	no	partially	?	?	?	substantially	yes

*N.B. Any blanks and/or? above indicate not evaluated and/or impossible to evaluate*

**Compliance level:** Partially compliant

### ET recommendations:

- A. *Development of coherent and comprehensive policies and procedures for academic programs that are regularly monitored.*
- B. *Internal processes for assuring quality have to be establish and monitored regularly.*
- C. *Evaluation of academic staff have to be stored and analysed every semester/year. Without continuous data, coherent measures are not able to be put in place.*

## 2.7. Research

Information on research was provided in section 2.7 of the SER. This indicated that it does not have an explicit plan but that the research development plan was incorporated into two major documents 'General Development Strategy 2018-2022' and 'Quality Assurance Strategy'. An examination of the General Development Strategy reveals that scientific research, establishing research institutes and publishing in journals are the key focus. The integration of research into

teaching is another priority and is also mentioned in some individual Faculty action plans. There are no specific costings for these priorities. The ‘Quality Assurance Strategy’ dated 2013 contains little on research, just a statement on staff international mobility. It is very difficult to disentangle a coherent, developed plan from the documents provided. Article 24 of the UPZ statutes indicates the university Steering Board publishes an annual performance report that includes a research dimension (Article 24, point 1.2.7). It was not possible to access this.

The current scattered research policy is consistent with the current UPZ mission statement because they are both so generalised but neither focus on the needs of the region.

A sophisticated research plan might encompass: Continuing Professional Development (CPD); a dedicated budget resource allocation; staged review and monitoring of short-medium and long term goals; staffing/appointments; infrastructure support mechanism (buildings, research officer, facilities, etc.); research partnerships development (industrial, business, economic, etc.); identification of future staff specialisms linked to a focused mission statement (capacity building), etc. Research should be a major driver of university development.

Staff indicated that they would welcome more research support and improved research/laboratory facilities. It is not clear what the current and projected research budget is.

Standard:	S 7.1	S 7.2	S 7.3	S 7.4	S 7.5	S 7.6	S 7.7	S 7.8	S 7.9	S7.10	S7.11
Compliance:	no	no	no	part	yes	yes	?	yes	yes	yes	yes

*N.B. Any blanks and/or? above indicate not evaluated and/or impossible to evaluate*

**Compliance level:** Partially compliant

**ET recommendations:**

- A. *UPZ should develop a detailed overall free-standing research plan; it should guide and be reflected in any university overall development plan, budget statements, Faculty plans, etc.*
- B. *Ensure that a future refined UPZ research plan fully reflects local and regional needs and be a product of full local/regional stakeholder consultation.*
- C. *Clarify the implication of Professors who fail to publish, as regulations require, an average of one scientific/applied research publication every three years, and the process by which this monitored.*
- D. *Clarify the current and projected future research budget expenditure with a breakdown of individual components.*

**2.8. Staff, employment processes and professional development**

The team of externals explored the staff-student ratio (SSRs) within UPZ and its faculties. Information provided was unclear and a discussion followed concerning overall student numbers, the nature of ‘active students’ and dropout and progression data. The SER (page 52) indicates a total student number registered in 2018 of around 17,000 but the number of ‘active students’ was indicated as 6,000. This raises a number of questions as to the length of registration of students, ministry admission policy for public universities, and the distinction between part-time and full-time students.

The number of ‘active students’ by Faculty was sought. It was not clear how dropout rates were treated or if they were just accepted as a consequence once a student had registered and paid. DA dropout rate of 33% appeared to exist. This could be a consequence of a faulty admission criteria.

There appeared to be no staff employment handbook but there was information on such matters in the statutes. New staff were provided with support and initial Continuing Professional Development (CPD) support.

A number of the standards in this area established by the KAA are very difficult to evaluate if they are full, partially or not met.

Standard:	S 8.1	S 8.2	S 8.3	S 8.4	S 8.5	S 8.6	S 8.7	S 8.8	S 8.9	S8.10	S8.11
Compliance:	part	?	?	yes	part	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	part

*N.B. Any blanks and/or above indicate not evaluated and/or impossible to evaluate.*

**Compliance level:** /Substantially compliant

**ET recommendations:**

- A. *Clarify the distinction between total student registration and the notion of ‘active student’.*
- B. *If not in existence create a unified staff employment handbook as required by Standard 8.1.*

**2.9. Student administration and support services**

Information about admission couldn’t be verified – on the website this information is not available in English.

During the evaluation one challenge couldn’t be solved – the evaluation team received different data regarding the total number of students registered. Also top management, during the evaluation couldn’t offer a unique explication about inactive students. In the first meeting it was mention that the university has approximately 6.000 students, in the self-evaluation report (page 52) is mention that UPZ has 17.000 students and in the data offered by the electronic system are more than 29.000 students.

It was noticed that students are registered also in December (even if the academic year is starting in October) – teachers (during the meeting with ET) were mentioning the challenges faced by the fact that new students are registering during the first semester.

Aldo is mention that information is available for students in order to cover “life cycle” a student handbook wasn’t identified as existing. During the meetings was noticed that there are faculties where the infrastructure is not suitable for the number of students registered.

Freedom of expression is not guaranteed by UPZ – students are forbidden to invite press in the premises of the university and also is forbidden the right to protest whiteout prior approve by top management.

Students were mentioning that the only support received for extracurricular activities or for student organization from UPZ is that they allow them to exist.

Standard:	S9.1	S9.2	S9.3	S9.4	S9.5	S9.6	S9.7	S9.8	S9.9	S9.10	S9.11	S9.12
Compliance:	?	?	no	?	no	no	?	Yes	No	Yes	No	no

*N.B. Any blanks and/or? above indicate not evaluated and/or impossible to evaluate*

**Compliance level:** Partially compliant

**ET recommendations:**

- A. *Improve management of students – better understanding the dynamic of students.*
- B. *Organize clear admission process – no registration should be admitted after the university year is starting*
- C. *Guarantee freedom of speech and freedom of protest for students*
- D. *UPZ could create materials for first year students – students handbook – that can improve the understanding of academic life.*

**2.10. Learning resources and facilities**

The learning resources and facilities in terms of teaching rooms and lecture theatre provision appear to be reasonable. However, the conditions of the library are, as in other Universities in Kosovo, insufficient. There are not enough books or journal articles and the library budget is small. The electronic library system appeared to malfunction on the day of the visit.

A particular problem highlighted by students was the need for overall improvement of the university environment. They would like more physical space as there was some overcrowding. They also confirmed the need for the library to provide more texts in English as key cutting-edge books were published in this language. Journal access is also poor.

Students would also welcome recreational facilities as none were currently provided (see also comments and recommendations in section 2.11 of this report below).

Standard:	S10.1	S10.2	S10.3	S10.4	S10.5	S10.6	S10.7	S10.8	S10.9	S10.10	S10.11	S10.12
Compliance:	no	few	??	partially	??	??	Substantially	No	No	??	Partially	yes

*N.B. Any blanks and/or? above indicate not evaluated and/or impossible to evaluate*

**Compliance level:** Partially compliant

**ET recommendations:**

- A. *UPZ needs to improve its library provision as a priority. The current level of provision inhibits the approval of new programme of study and thus the future development of the institution.*
- B. *A new, fully costed library development plan is required as a matter of priority.*

## 2.11. Institutional cooperation

The meeting with employers of graduates and external stakeholders involved Almir Saiti and Dka Prizrch explored how employers plugged into and provided feedback to the university. They confirmed that no local/regional stakeholder ‘consultative board’ or similar arrangement existed.

There were links between the Prizren local department of education and the Kosovo MEST. It was indicated that the Prizren local education department has links with private institutions. In addition, MEST had the right to nominate members to the UPZ Steering Council but the local Prizren administration could not. There are enormous potential benefits for all concerned if a closer relationship, via a formal arrangement, existed between the UPZ and local/regional stakeholders (including employers, civic bodies, graduates/alumni, etc.) The local municipality had a range of leisure facilities (for swimming, football, tennis, etc.) and it was suggested that these might easily be exploited by UPZ which had no such facilities itself. There were huge potential benefits and opportunities from closer formal collaborations including the provision of tailored local training courses for municipal employees.

The UPZ Strategic Plan 2018-2022 indicates that ‘internationalisation’ is a priority (see strategic aims on pages, 4 7, and 9). Opening offices, increasing projects and joining international organisations are mentioned in some of the Faculty strategic plans that are listed but few details are provided and costings appear to be absent. The adoption of a more detailed institutional cross-faculty policy and support mechanisms would be beneficial. It is not clear how any central coordination works. Currently UPZ has a relatively limited number of cooperative agreements with other universities.

Standard:	S11.1	S11.2	S11.3	S11.4	S11.5	S11.6	S11.7	S11.8	S11.9	S11.10	S11.11	S11.12
Compliance:	part	?	yes	yes	? tbc	yes	no	yes	no	no	no	no

*N.B. Any blanks and/or? above indicate not evaluated and/or impossible to evaluate*

**Compliance level:** Partially compliant

### ET recommendations:

- A. *UPZ should establish a strong consultative board of local employers, graduates, local government representatives, civic bodies, etc. These stakeholders would increase the cooperation between the university and its immediate locality and region and be of mutual benefit to all concerned.*
- B. *The Prizren local authority should enjoy representation on relevant UPZ internal committees – including the UPZ Steering Council.*
- C. *Opportunities for local/regional formal and informal collaboration between the municipality, local professional bodies, employers, alumni and UPZ should be explored.*
- D. *The UPZ internationalisation policy needs to be refined and its detail expanded. Particular attention should be paid to its funding and central coordination and monitoring.*
- E. *UPZ should develop a detailed, monitored and funded strategy to develop more links with appropriate foreign universities.*

## 2.12 Concluding Observations:

Many public universities in Kosovo are clearly under considerable pressure from social, economic and political realities. The new KAA approach to quality assurance also increases the burden upon them with its emphasis on documentary evidence and proof, standards and performance indicators.

Many of the University of Prizren additional documents requested were not available in English and this makes a number of judgements, about compliance and non-compliance, by external experts impossible. All key documents must be available in advance and in English.

The University of Prizren is caught between competing and sometimes contradictory forces including MEST, KAA, and Bologna requirements. The university needs to modernise study programmes but without resources to boost libraries, access to modern journals, staffing levels, etc., this is very difficult. Added to this situation, the university is bound by outdated founding statutes that appear problematic to amend. The cooperation of MEST is vital for this.

The university of Prizren is clearly in a difficult and funding-constrained situation. However, it must rapidly evolve its systems, processes and policies in order to modernise and adapt to become fully compliant with KAA and European standards.

The recommendation below conforms to the new KAA standards and compliance regime. The external Expert Team (ET) would have preferred to recommend a strict one-year period of approval in order to give the institution time to make appropriate changes to their policies, structures and processes. However, it is no longer in their power to do this.

### OVERALL EVALUATION:

#### **FINAL RECOMMENDATION (institutional re-accreditation):**

**The University of Prizren (Ushin Hoti) is non-compliant with the standards included in the KAA Accreditation manual and, therefore, the experts recommends not to re-accredit the institution.**

EXPERTS: Stephen Adam and Adrian Mihai Vilcea, June 2019

-----

## **2. PROGRAM EVALUATIONS – TO BE INSERTED**

### **2.1. Program 1**