



Republika e Kosovës  
Republika Kosova - Republic of Kosovo



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

---

***UNIVERSITY OF PRISHTINA  
BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN POWER SYSTEMS***

***ACCREDITATION***

**REPORT OF THE EXPERT TEAM**

*24<sup>th</sup> of March, Turku / Pristina / Zagreb*



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### 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 and program under evaluation..... | 5  |
| 2. PROGRAM EVALUATION .....  | 6  |
| 2.1. Mission, objectives and administration.....                           | 6  |
| 2.2. Quality management .....  | 9  |
| 2.3. Academic staff .....  | 12 |
| 2.4. Educational process content.....                                      | 16 |
| 2.5. Students.....   | 21 |
| 2.6. Research.....   | 21 |
| 2.7. Infrastructure and resources .....                                    | 25 |
| 3. OVERALL EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE ET.....                    | 31 |
| 4. APPENDICES ( <i>if available</i> ) .....                                | 31 |



## 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1. Context

**Date of site visit: 4<sup>th</sup> of March 2022**

**Expert Team (ET) members:**

- *Dr. Francisco Javier Farfan Orozco*
- *Laura Palac (Student Expert)*

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

- *Ilijane Ademaj*
- *Flamur Abazaj*

**Sources of information for the Report:**

- *Self-evaluation report “Bachelor of Science in Power Systems”*
- *KAA Accreditation Manual (February 2021)*
- *KAA Accreditation report template*
- *KAA Manual for External Reviewers*
- *Syllabi*
- *Staff CVs*
- *Annexes: Laboratory introductory videos, PS-BSc-Budget Planning and Expenses, Plan for Implementation of Recommendations-BScPS, Faculty entrance and amenities videos.*
- *Requested documents: Corrected program for discrepancies in ECTS credits, Comprehensive list for courses and the laboratories they use, Comprehensive list of courses and the software they use (with number of simultaneous active user licensed), Code of Ethics, Regulation for the transfer or ECTS credits, Example of questionnaires for students and academic staff.*

**Criteria used for program evaluation:**

- *Standards & performance indicators for external evaluation according to the Accreditation Manual of KAA, February 2021, Self Evaluation Report “Final\_01-SER-UP-FECE-PS-BS-accreditation[EN]”, courses syllabi, site visit, staff CVs, syllabus metadata and others.*



## 1.2. Site visit schedule

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Programme Accreditation Procedure at University of Prishtina, Faculty of Electrical and Computer Sciences |   |
| Programme:  | <b>Power Systems BSc</b>  |
| Online site visit on:   | <b>March 4, 2022</b>  |
| Expert Team:  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Dr. Francisco Javier Farfan Orozco</li><li>• Laura Palac</li></ul>            |
| Coordinators of the KAA:  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Flamur Abazaj, KAA Officer</li><li>2. Ilirjane Ademaj, KAA Officer</li></ol> |

### Site Visit Programme

| Time                 | Meeting   | Participants   |
|----------------------|---|--|
| <b>09:00 – 09:45</b> | Meeting with the management of the faculty where the programme is integrated<br><br><a href="https://meet.google.com/fgd-nftu-qgy">https://meet.google.com/fgd-nftu-qgy</a> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Isak Shabani – Dean</li><li>2. Qamil Kabashi –Vice Dean for Teaching and Student Affairs</li><li>3. Milaim Zabeli – Vice Dean for Finance And Infrastructure</li><li>4. Kadri Sylejmani – Vice Dean for Research and International Cooperations</li></ol> |
| <b>09:50 – 10:35</b> | Meeting with quality assurance representatives and administrative staff<br><br><a href="https://meet.google.com/buq-iukb-kha">https://meet.google.com/buq-iukb-kha</a>      | <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Hena Maloku – Coordinator for Academic Development</li><li>2. Besnik Loxha –University Academic Development Office</li></ol>  |
| <b>10:40 – 11:40</b> | Meeting with the heads of the study programme:<br><br><a href="https://meet.google.com/crw-mnga-wyu">https://meet.google.com/crw-mnga-wyu</a>                               | <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Bahri Prebreza</li><li>2. Arben Gjukaj</li><li>3. Shqipe Lohaj</li></ol>  |
| <b>11:40 – 12.25</b> | Lunch break (provided at the evaluation site)   |  |
| <b>12:25 – 13:10</b> | Meeting with teaching staff<br><br><a href="https://meet.google.com/bss-bsnv-noc">https://meet.google.com/bss-bsnv-noc</a>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Enver Hamiti</li><li>2. Blerim Rexha</li><li>3. Lavdim Kurtaj</li><li>4. Vezir Rexhepi</li><li>5. Bujar Krasniqi</li><li>6. Nuri Berisha</li></ol>  |



|                      |   |   |
|----------------------|---|---|
| <b>13:15 – 14:00</b> | Meeting with employers of graduates and external stakeholders<br><br><a href="https://meet.google.com/vjt-aywx-boa">https://meet.google.com/vjt-aywx-boa</a>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Luigj Imeri - KEK</li> <li>2. Gazmend Kabashi – KOSTT</li> <li>3. Valbona Kadrijaj – KEDS</li> <li>4. Petrit Pepaj – ZRRE</li> <li>5. Trim Ternava – JAHA SOLAR</li> <li>6. Lutfi Gashi -ELECTRA</li> </ol> |
| <b>14:00 – 14:15</b> | Internal meeting of KAA staff and experts<br><br><a href="https://meet.google.com/nve-dipv-rxy">https://meet.google.com/nve-dipv-rxy</a>                      |   |
| <b>14:15 – 14:30</b> | Closing meeting with the management of the faculty and program<br><br><a href="https://meet.google.com/nmt-urzq-ldf">https://meet.google.com/nmt-urzq-ldf</a> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Isak Shabani -Dean</li> <li>2. Hena Maloku – Coordinator for Academic Development</li> </ol>  |

### 1.3. A brief overview of the institution and program under evaluation

*The Faculty of Electrical and Computer Engineering (FECE) as part of the University of Prishtina (UP) was established in 1961, and the department of Power Systems was established in 1970. This spring 2022, FECE is postulating for accreditation of a renewed bachelor program on “Power Systems”. The UP is, at the moment, the only educational institution in Kosovo, public or private, to propose a bachelor program that covers both power generation and distribution. The program is presented as for first accreditation after updating. The update represented a change of over 60% of the content from its predecessor, and it is meant to reflect the fast evolution of the power sector and the power generation technologies.*

*FECE’s mission is declared as “educating the youth in the fields of Electric and Computer Engineering, at all levels of higher education, with the aim of preparing them for the demands of the labour market in the country and beyond, and for the continuous education in this highly dynamic field, and also to contribute directly to the sustainable technological, social and scientific development of Kosovo”.*

*For Kosovo, a country of almost 1.9 million people and almost 11 thousand square kilometres, currently the electricity production is mostly sourced from local coal reserves. As the world transitions towards carbon neutrality, availability of trained professionals to facilitate the transformation of Kosovo’s power system and its integration to Europe’s energy*



*economy. Therefore, FECE's objectives are vital to the development of the energy sector of Kosovo.*

*Nevertheless, having the right purpose and mission is not enough. Hence, we conduct this audit to guarantee that accreditation is given only if the quality of the BSc program meets the standards set by the Kosovo Accreditation Agency (KAA) and the demands and needs of the everchanging energy sector and society, while protecting the environment.*

## **2. PROGRAM EVALUATION**

### **2.1. Mission, objectives and administration**

*The missions of the BSc program in Power Systems the FECE and the UP appear to be well aligned, in relevance to Standard 1.1. It is only logical that the aim of all the aforementioned parties is to produce the highest quality professionals and study programs within the boundaries of the context.*

*In addition, from the conversations during the visit it was made clear that the industry has a significant amount of input to the continuous development of the program, in relevance to Standard 1.2. The "Framework of Qualifications for the European Higher Education Area" for a first cycle level such as a Bachelor's degree programme, the graduates completing the programme should meet the following qualifications:*

- have demonstrated knowledge and understanding in a field of study that builds upon their general secondary education, and is typically at a level that, whilst supported by advanced textbooks, includes some aspects that will be informed by knowledge of the forefront of their field of study;*
- can apply their knowledge and understanding in a manner that indicates a professional approach to their work or vocation, and have competences typically demonstrated through devising and sustaining arguments and solving problems within their field of study;*
- have the ability to gather and interpret relevant data (usually within their field of study) to inform judgments that include reflection on relevant social, scientific or ethical issues;*
- can communicate information, ideas, problems and solutions to both specialist and non-specialist audiences;*



• *have developed those learning skills that are necessary for them to continue to undertake further study with a high degree of autonomy.*

*Considering the current programme and the available details in the syllabi, it appears to me that these requirements are met.*

*In reference to Standard 1.3, the study program does have a well-defined didactic structure. Starting with strong foundations in math and physics as such programmes absolutely require, and moving forward to increasingly advanced topics, both in mandatory courses and elective choices.*

*In reference to Standard 1.4, as clarified in the conversations, there seems to be strong consideration to feedback and continuous improvement, particularly regarding the students' feedback. Moreover, in the Self Evaluation Report (SER) there are references to several laws, statues and regulations from the university and Kosovo. These laws, statues and regulations are publicly available online, and thus available to students and staff. However, in these regulations and laws I was not able to find any reference to "dealing with recurring procedural or academic issues". There is also no reference to this particular point in the SER. That being said, the material is plentiful, and it is possible that the information is contained within one or more of those documents and was just not found. In this case, the compliance to this point will remain as not compliant pending further clarification.*

*Regarding Standard 1.5, the regulations provided in the SER do make clear and specific reference to the rights, responsibilities and roles of all entities and stakeholders within the context, as well as the protocols for dealing with possible disciplinary actions should it be required.*

*Finally, regarding Standard 1.6, it is specified in the SER that this specific standard is regulated by the Statutory Provisions of the UP, articles 100-102. These articles clearly and concisely define the establishment and composition of the study commission and its role to continuous review and update of programs as part of the university senate. However, there is no reference to the frequency of these evaluations in the aforementioned articles nor in the SER. Although it makes sense for these evaluations to be probably happening more often than once every 2 years, this standard will be marked as non-compliant until further clarification in future rounds of accreditation. An example of clarification could be the schedule for such*



*meetings for the next two years for the program under accreditation, or the schedule of the next or last two years for the meetings of another program currently running under FECE.*

| Standard   | Compliance |    |
|--|------------|----|
|  | Yes        | No |
| Standard 1.1. The study program mission is in compliance with the overall mission statement of the institution.  | X          |    |
| Standard 1.2. Relevant academic and professional advice is considered when defining the intended learning outcomes which are consistent with the National Qualifications Framework and the Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area. | X          |    |
| Standard 1.3. The study program has a well-defined overarching didactic and research concept.  | X          |    |
| Standard 1.4. There are formal policies, guidelines and regulations dealing with recurring procedural or academic issues. These are made publicly available to all staff and students.   |            | X  |
| Standard 1.5. All staff and students comply with the internal regulations relating to ethical conduct in research, teaching, assessment in all academic and administrative activities.   | X          |    |
| Standard 1.6. All policies, regulations, terms of reference and statements of responsibility relating to the management and delivery of the program are reviewed at least once every two years and amended as required in the light of changing circumstances. |            | X  |

**Compliance level:** Partially compliant (4/6)

**ET recommendations:**

- 1. I highly recommend including in the program a mandatory course on energy economics. Decision making on new energy projects is almost always decided exclusively on the economics of power generation (and storage, depending on the technology). This issue has already been addressed.*
- 2. The course 5-2 “Transmission and Distribution of Electricity” with Prof. Gazmend Pula requires further elaboration on the lecture topics, as that part has been left empty for a quite important mandatory course. This issue has already been addressed.*





## 2.2. Quality management

*Contained in the SER are described the strategies and tools for quality management as designed by the study commission and approved by the UP senate. The tools mentioned in the SER are the following:*

- *Questionnaires for academic staff*
- *Questionnaires for administrative staff*
- *Questionnaires for students*
- *Subject/course-based semestral anonymous feedback questionnaires*
- *Academic staff performance reviews of publications and participation in conferences*
- *Student performance evaluations (percentage of students passing/failing, actual time required to complete the programme and courses, etc.)*

*As declared in the SER, these tools are developed and applied in accordance to the following regulations:*

- *Quality Assurance Guidelines of the University of Prishtina "Hasan Prishtina",*
- *Regulation on Quality Assurance and Evaluation at the University of Prishtina,*
- *Regulation on re-accreditation preparation procedures at UP,*
- *Quality Assessment Regulation at UP,*
- *Regulation on basic studies - Bachelor studies at the Faculty of Electrical and Computer Engineering,*
- *Regulation for Master Scientific Studies at the Faculty of Electrical and Computer Engineering,*
- *Regulation for Doctoral Studies at the Faculty of Electrical and Computer Engineering,*
- *Regulation on internal organization and systematization of jobs at the University of Prishtina - Faculty of Electrical and Computer Engineering,*
- *Regulation on the establishment and principles of operation of the Institutes at the University of Prishtina - Faculty of Electrical and Computer Engineering,*
- *Rules of procedure of the electronic system for student management (SEMS) at the University of Prishtina "Hasan Prishtina"*

*Logically, and as mentioned also in the SER, an important tool for monitoring the quality of learning by the students is the use of regular testing and grading of assignments, lab reports and essays.*



Republika e Kosovës  
Republika Kosova - Republic of Kosovo



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

---

*Referring to specific standards, for Standard 2.1 it is declared that at the end of every semester and academic year self-evaluation is conducted on the staff. Moreover, after the data is obtained and analysed, it is also declared that development discussions are held with each staff member. Both of the previous statements cover for Standard 2.2 also.*

*Regarding Standard 2.3, the SER diverges to something unrelated to the standard, addressing publications in journals and conferences, while the standard refers to the program planning and delivery of services and resources by other parts of the institution. However, during the virtual site visit, clarifications were made on the involvement of other parts of the institution such as human resources, language courses, libraries, studying places and physics/mathematics. In discase, the SER content will be ignored regarding this standard and compliance will be considered. However, the same issue on future iterations will result with a non-compliance decision on the standard if I am to evaluate the next application.*

*On Standard 2.4, the SER states clearly the quality components for measurement, as well as which components are considered inputs or outputs. As a first-time accreditation, more detailed considerations and descriptions of outputs are expected to develop further with time, but at the moment this standard is in compliance.*

*Standard 2.5 addresses the continuous improvement in performance. The SER cites the program evaluation report, during accreditation and reaccreditation, as the main input for continuous quality improvement. However, these evaluations happen once every 3-5 years, so a concise internal continuous quality improving strategy is definitely missing, to which the evaluation reports of KAA are just complementary.*

*Standard 2.6 refers to data collection from students, graduates and employers, later making results available. As a program being accredited for the first time, there is no data collected understandably. UP appears to have a plan for this as indicated in the SER, further verifications of this will be needed in reaccreditation applications, but for now will be marked as compliant. However, QA representatives mentioned that some students avoid participating in these questionnaires because they are afraid that they will be punished for their opinion. Also, it was mentioned that the results of these surveys are sent directly to teachers, and teachers have an opportunity to discuss results with students. However, teachers are not obliged to do this.*

10



*On Standard 2.7, the SER reports how the results of the quality assurance system have impacted the strategic program development. Also, it is mentioned how the effects on student workload, employment and academic success are measured constantly.*

*Standard 2.8 refers to the periodicity of overall program quality reports. The SER states indeed that the reports are made periodically according to the period of accreditation of the program, thus covering for the standard.*

*Finally, Standard 2.9 refers to the regularity in which all quality assurance methods are themselves updated and evaluated. On this regard, the SER refers to articles 210, 211, 222 and 225 of the statute of UP. Specifically, article 211 states that the periodicity of updates for the quality assurance methods shall be evaluated at least once every 5 years, whilst some reports are generated every calendar year. By following the aforementioned articles, the program meets the standard.*

| Standard   | Compliance |    |
|--|------------|----|
|  | Yes        | No |
| Standard 2.1. All staff participates in self-evaluations and cooperate with reporting and improvement processes in their sphere of activity.   | X          |    |
| Standard 2.2. Evaluation processes and planning for improvement are integrated into normal planning processes.   | X          |    |
| Standard 2.3. Quality assurance processes deal with all aspects of program planning and delivery, including services and resources provided by other parts of the institution.   | X          |    |
| Standard 2.4. Quality evaluation provide an overview of quality issues for the overall program as well as of different components within it; the evaluation consider inputs, processes and outputs, with particular attention given to learning outcomes for students. | X          |    |
| Standard 2.5. Quality assurance processes ensure both that required standards are met and that there is continuing improvement in performance.   |            | X  |
| Standard 2.6. Survey data is being collected from students, graduates and employers; the results of these evaluations are made publicly available.   | X          |    |
| Standard 2.7. Results of the internal quality assurance system are taken into account for further development of the study program. This includes evaluation results, investigation of the   | X          |    |



|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| student workload, academic success and employment of graduates.   |   |  |
| Standard 2.8. The institution ensures that reports on the overall quality of the program are prepared periodically (e.g. every three years) for consideration within the institution indicating its strengths and weaknesses. | X |  |
| Standard 2.9. The quality assurance arrangements for the program are themselves regularly evaluated and improved.   | X |  |

**Compliance level:** Substantially compliant (8/9)

**ET recommendations:**

- 1. Standard 2.3 of the SER seems to not address the actual standard demands, something to take into account for future accreditation and re-accreditation applications by the institution. The issue has been noted.*
- 2. In reference to Standard 2.5, a clear and concise strategy for improvement of the quality assurance processes that is independent but complementary with the external evaluations. This issue has been noted and will be more explicitly clarified in re-accreditation rounds.*
- 3. Develop and implement a mechanism/procedure that will increase the quantity of students participating in surveys and questionnaires in order to get a representative sample for analysis and evaluation of teachers performance, quality of courses and the study program. Strategies to secure the participation from students are already in the implementation phase.*
- 4. Inform students about results of surveys and questionnaires and measures taken based on those results. This recommendation has been noted and considered for implementation during the development of the next action plan.*

**2.3. Academic staff**

*As all formal academic institutions, the UP has a very specific regulation regarding the level of employment each employee may reach, according to his/her qualifications, contract status with other institutions (if any) and level of engagement. On this line, the third area of evaluation focuses on the academic staff and the indicators, requirements and performance metrics, as well as responsibilities and workloads. Therefore, the SER presents an almost full list of staff, with their position, to take part in the program. It is considered almost complete, since as for the day of the virtual visit, there were three elective courses of the third year of*

12



*the study program that had not been assigned to any specific staff member, thus opening the possibility for additional staff to be needed, or for more courses to be assigned to staff already mentioned.*

*Regarding Standard 3.1, the current list of academic staff shows four academic staff as retired, thus eligible to part time contracts, and twenty full time staff. However, the standard requires the tabular information to be more comprehensive. The presented table by the SER does not present the specifically required workloads for teaching, exams, consultation, administrative activities and research. Therefore, this standard is not met. It is further necessary to verify, by KAA or responsible body, that the full time/part time contracts are respected across institutions.*

*Standard 3.2 addresses the legal requirements for the staff at their occupation level. According to the article 26 of the administrative instruction of the ministry of education and the table list of staff and their employment level, it appears to be compliant with the legal requirements.*

*Similar to what it was mentioned on Standard 3.1, for Standard 3.3 regarding the verification of the full-time/part-time employment of the staff across organizations is for KAA to verify in detail. Since it is mentioned in the SER that this verification has already taken place, it will be marked as compliant and pending from KAA to corroborate.*

*On Standard 3.4, it addresses the share of staff on a full-time basis, and the share of classes of the study programme to be managed by those on full time contracts. Firstly, the standard specifies that at least 50% of the staff related to the program must work on a full-time basis. In this regard and according to the list in the SER 20 out of 24 members of the staff are hired on a full-time basis, representing more than 83% of the staff related to the program, which perfectly covers the requirement. Secondly, it is required that the staff on full time contracts take care of at least 50% of the classes. Out of the 47 courses in the syllabi only four are allocated to staff on part time basis, therefore covering this requirement handsomely both in number of courses and amount of teaching hours.*

*About Standard 3.5, it refers to the amount of staff hired per 60 ECTS and per student group. In this regard, it is not clear what is the definition of student group, and I was not able to find it in the documents easily. The SER makes no clarification either on what is the ratio*



*Staff/Student/ECTS, although it claims compliance. It will be marked as non-compliant until further clarification.*

*Standard 3.6 addresses the opportunities for development of the teaching staff, and the consideration of additional assistance to those facing difficulties. This particular standard definition is very broad, as development can take many shapes and directions. In accordance, the SER presents a list of publications as evidence of continuous academic development, which can perfectly fit the standard under the current broad definition. In the future, KAA could be more specific on the definition of development. There is no particular mention in the SER about the additional assistance with those facing difficulties, this is something lacking or at least not specified in the SER. As a two-part standard, with one part in compliance and the second part in doubt, the compliance of the standard will be marked as accepted. However, future accreditation applications should concisely and explicitly address the second part.*

*Regarding Standard 3.7, it is evaluated the engagement of the teaching staff with the academic community, with the students for consultations, and with the society. In this regard the syllabus of each course clearly allocated time for consultation, which is then corroborated in the SER. The list of publications brought up in the SER for the previous point shows also a degree of engagement with the academic community. Furthermore, according to the SER expert consultations extend also to the industry, thus addressing the engagement with society.*

*Standard 3.8 relates to staff evaluations and their periodicity, which should be at least once a year. In response, the SER states that the evaluations take place at the end of each semester by students and at the end of each year as self-evaluation, fulfilling the minimum frequency required. The evaluations by peers and superiors are not mentioned in the SER, however it is indicated that the results of the conducted evaluations are made publicly available. For further accreditation iterations, explicit reference should be made about the peers and superiors evaluation of the academic staff.*

*Standard 3.9 refers to the continuous improvement of teaching strategies and materials. In response to this, the SER refers to the constant improvement through feedback from internal and external evaluations for their constant improvement. Moreover, during the visit it was made clear the adaptability to changing conditions and new technologies as unfortunately showcased by the COVID pandemic.*



*Finally, regarding Standard 3.10 it refers to the engagement level of academic staff over the retirement age. In this case, all academic staff over the retirement age are correctly labelled as part-time contracts, and are given the responsibility of a maximum of one course, therefore remaining compliant.*

| Standard   | Compliance |    |
|--|------------|----|
|  | Yes        | No |
| Standard 3.1. Candidates for employment are provided with full position descriptions and conditions of employment. To be presented in tabular form data about full time (FT) and part time (PT) academic/ artistic staff, such as: name, qualification, academic title, duration of official (valid) contract, workload for teaching, exams, consulting, administrative activities, research, etc. for the study program under evaluation. |            | X  |
| Standard 3.2. The teaching staff must comply with the legal requirements concerning the occupation of teaching positions included in the Administrative instruction on Accreditation.  | X          |    |
| Standard 3.3. Academic staff do not cover, within an academic year, more than two teaching positions (one full-time, one part-time), regardless of the educational institution where they carry out their activity.  | X          |    |
| Standard 3.4. At least 50% of the academic staff in the study program are full time employees, and account for at least 50% of the classes of the study program.   | X          |    |
| Standard 3.5. For each student group (defined by the statute of the institution) and for every 60 ECTS credits in the study program, the institution has employed at least one full time staff with PhD title or equivalent title in the case of artistic/applied science institutions.  |            | X  |
| Standard 3.6. Opportunities are provided for additional professional development of teaching staff, with special assistance given to any who are facing difficulties.  | X          |    |
| Standard 3.7. The responsibilities of all teaching staff, especially full-time, include the engagement in the academic community, availability for consultations with students and community service.  | X          |    |
| Standard 3.8. Academic staff evaluation is conducted regularly at least through self-evaluation, students, peer and superiors' evaluations, and occur on a formal basis at least once each year. The results of the evaluation are made  | X          |    |



|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| publicly available.  |   |  |
| Standard 3.9. Strategies for quality enhancement include improving the teaching strategies and quality of learning materials.                  | X |  |
| Standard 3.10. Teachers retired at age limit or for other reasons lose the status of full-time teachers and are considered part-time teachers. | X |  |

**Compliance level:** Substantially compliant (8/10)

**ET recommendations:**

- 1. The presented table by the SER does not present the specifically required workloads for teaching, exams, consultation, administrative activities and research. This should be addressed for future accreditation applications. This issue has been noted and a commitment has been made to fix this issue for next accreditation rounds.*
- 2. The SER should give a clear definition of student groups, and also give clarification on what is the ratio Staff/Student/ECTS. This will further help the institution on future accreditation applications. This recommendation has been noted.*
- 3. The evaluations by peers and superiors are not mentioned in the SER as required for Standard 3.8. For future applications this will be needed. The Issue has been noted and will receive further emphasis in future accreditation rounds.*

**2.4. Educational process content**

*The following area addresses the evaluation of the content of the study program and educational process itself. The creation of the program clearly follows the specific objective of training highly skilled professionals that can cover the need for specialists in energy, electricity transmission and distribution, electricity markets and electrical engineering, to mention some. Throughout the program, clear emphasis is made on environmental values and the transition of the energy sector to reduce the carbon intensity of electricity generation, which is absolutely necessary for the future Kosovo and the world.*

*On the evaluation of the program, Standard 4.1 refers to the overall structure of the program and its content, as well as prospects of employment and contribution to the society and personal development of the students. As required by this standard, the program starts correctly generic and interdisciplinary background of mathematics, physics and*





*programming, as well as program specific courses for basics on digital circuits and electrical engineering. The program further expands, through mandatory and elective courses, into deeper and broader knowledge related to electrical and energy engineering. The fact that the program even includes a course on domestic electrical installation significantly increases the prospects of employment of students. Therefore, the program addresses multiple needs of skilled workforce in society.*

*On Standard 4.2, after the virtual visit and meetings with the staff engaged in the program, the few discrepancies between the program syllabi and the framework for qualifications of European higher education area, the program is now fully compliant on this standard.*

*Moreover, Standard 4.3 addresses the logical flow of the program, general and specific competences and learning outcomes. As mentioned in the intro for this area, the expert team agrees generally with the order of the courses, as in the current structure the program progresses accordingly in my assessment. Moreover, the SER reports significantly more than the minimum seven learning outcomes expected of those completing the program.*

*Standard 4.4 addresses the creation and availability of detailed syllabi for each subject as well as the plan for hours of specific activities like lectures, laboratory, exercises, self-study, consultations, etc. For 48 out of the 49 courses this was the case, missing the specifics on the lecture structure for the course 5-2 “Transmission and distribution of electricity”. The lack of this course’s specific lecture outline makes it so this standard is not met, which is to be considered for future accreditation applications. Also, it is important to mention that the University has established an Electronic Student Management System (SEMS) to which students have individual access. The SEMS contains all course syllabuses, materials and other important information.*

*The specific case of Standard 4.5 does not apply for this program, as the teaching language for all technical courses is in Albanian at the moment of application for the accreditation, as commented also during the virtual visit.*

*Regarding Standard 4.6, the roles and responsibilities of teachers and students regarding reaching the learning outcomes. Besides the responsibilities of both teachers and students being defined by the regulations of the law and institutions. Moreover, the learning outcomes are already defined in the syllabus of every course, and it is mandatory for the teaching staff*



*to present and discuss them with students at the beginning of every course according to the regulations.*

*Standard 4.7 evaluates the flexibility of the teaching strategies to achieve the learning outcome and accommodate the needs of different groups of students. In this regard, the SER points out to the close communication expected between students and teachers, and the availability for mentoring and consultation that is built in the syllabi of the courses. These activities would cover for the different needs of individual students when needed.*

*Standard 4.8 addresses the assessment mechanisms and the conveyance of the relevance of such mechanisms to the students. The mechanisms are varied and adapted to the content of every course, and include attendance to the lecture, essays, laboratory work and reports, mid-term and final exams to name some. These evaluation mechanisms are made available upfront in the syllabus of each course, with a handful of small adjustments to be made.*

*Standard 4.9 follows a similar line of reasoning, referring to the comparison between the way the evaluations are proposed for the program of Power Systems and similar programs in other universities. The evaluation methods and tools appear reasonable and comparable with equivalent or similar programs.*

*On Standard 4.10, refers to the policies of procedures to adjust to correct inconsistencies in the evaluation methods. The SER instead makes reference to the ability or right of individual students to have a review in their own assessments. In this case those are completely unrelated things, at it would seem like there is no protocol in place at this moment to adjust the evaluation methods, and thus this standard is not compliant. Students who are not satisfied with the evaluation of their work have the right to appeal. The procedures are described in the Statute of the University (Article 147, 153, 154).*

*Standard 4.11 refers to the practice share of the program. Professional practice is assigned ECTS credits as required by the standard, six in total. As required by the standard, the practice stage is supervised by a mentor in the company, as well as by a staff member at UP, as clearly described in the syllabus of course 6-3 “Professional practice”. The SER in this respect diverges into something non-related and should be corrected.*



*Finally, Standard 4.12 addresses the facilitation of professional practices to students. As required by the standard and mentioned in the SER, agreements are signed with local businesses and institutions represented by the Advisory Body.*

| Standard   | Compliance |    |
|--|------------|----|
|  | Yes        | No |
| Standard 4.1. The study program is modelled on qualification objectives. These include subject-related and interdisciplinary aspects as well as the acquisition of disciplinary, methodological and generic skills and competencies. The aspects refer especially to academic or artistic competencies, to the capability of taking up adequate employment, contributing to the civil society and of developing the students' personality.   | X          |    |
| Standard 4.2. The study program complies with the National Qualifications Framework and the Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area. The individual components of the program are combined in a way to best achieve the specified qualification objectives and provide for adequate forms of teaching and learning.   | X          |    |
| Standard 4.3. The disciplines within the curriculum are provided in a logical flow and meet the definition and precise determination of the general and specific competencies, as well as the compatibility with the study programs and curricula delivered in the EHEA. To be listed at least 7 learning outcomes for the study program under evaluation.   | X          |    |
| Standard 4.4. The disciplines within the curriculum have analytical syllabuses which comprise at least the following: the discipline's objectives, the basic thematic content, learning outcomes, the distribution of classes, seminars and applicative activities, students' assessment system, the minimal bibliography, etc. The full course description/ syllabuses of each subject/ module should be attached only in electronic form to the self-assessment report for the study program under evaluation. |            | X  |
| Standard 4.5. If the language of instruction is other than Albanian, actions are taken to ensure that language skills of both students and academic staff are adequate for instruction in that language when students begin their studies. This may be done through language training prior to the commencement of the program.  | -          | -  |
| Standard 4.6. The student-teacher relationship is a partnership in which each assumes the responsibility of  | X          |    |



|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| reaching the learning outcomes. Learning outcomes are explained and discussed with students from the perspective of their relevance to the students' development.  |   |   |
| Standard 4.7. Teaching strategies are fit for the different types of learning outcome programs are intended to develop. Strategies of teaching and assessment set out in program and course specifications are followed with flexibility to meet the needs of different groups of students.  | X |   |
| Standard 4.8. Student assessment mechanisms are conducted fairly and objectively, are appropriate for the different forms of learning sought and are clearly communicated to students at the beginning of courses.   | X |   |
| Standard 4.9. Appropriate, valid and reliable mechanisms are used for verifying standards of student achievement. The standard of work required for different grades is consistent over time, comparable in courses offered within a program, and in comparison with other study programs at highly regarded institutions.   | X |   |
| Standard 4.10. Policies and procedures include actions to be taken in to dealing with situations where standards of student achievement are inadequate or inconsistently assessed.   |   | X |
| 4.11. If the study program includes practice stages, the intended student learning outcomes are clearly specified and effective processes are followed to ensure that those learning outcomes and the strategies to develop that learning are understood by students. The practice stages are allocated ETCS credits and the work of the students at the practical training organizations is monitored through activity reports; students during practice stages have assigned tutors among the academic staff in the study program. | X |   |
| Standard 4.12. In order to facilitate the practice stages, the higher education institution signs cooperation agreements, contracts or other documents with institutions/organizations /practical training units.  | X |   |

**Compliance level:** Substantially compliant (9/11)

**ET recommendations:**

1. *The course 5-2 "Transmission and distribution of electricity" is missing the specific lecture outline in the syllabus, even after all updates. This can be improved for future applications. This issue has already been addressed.*



2. *In the syllabi, the hours for lab and theory exercises are aggregated into one single category. I suggest that for future applications, lab work and theory exercises are separated into two different categories. This recommendation has been noted and is considered for implementation in the next round of accreditation.*
3. *The assessment methods for the courses 2-4 “Algorithms and data structures”, 4-6-3 “Data communication” and 5-6-2 “Power electronics” add up to a number different to 100% and should be corrected. This issue has already been addressed.*
4. *There is currently no statement relating to the protocols for the review of grading mechanisms for the courses. A clear protocol for the review of assessment mechanisms should be developed and presented to be eventually applied as the program evolves and for future accreditation applications, in reference to standard 4.10. This issue has been noted and will be addressed in future accreditation rounds.*
5. *On Standard 4.11, the SER diverges into something irrelevant to the standard, this should be corrected for future applications, it is enough to use the information available in the syllabus for course 6.3. This issue has been acknowledged.*

## 2.5. Students

*As a first accreditation application, the area of students will not be evaluated as indicated by the KAA.*

**Compliance level:** Not applicable

### **ET recommendations:**

1. *N/A*

## 2.6. Research

*In the area evaluation for research, the academic research performance of the program and academic staff is evaluated according to the university regulations. Starting with Standard 6.1, which addresses the specific research targets of the institution, and the corresponding allocation of necessary resources to meet the targets. In this regard, it is clear that the aims of the program under consideration aligns to the targets of FECE. According to the SER, a dedicated budget has been allocated to allow the participation of staff in international conferences as well as the publication in international peer-review high quality journals.*



*About the specific allocation of time by the staff to do research, this is not particularly clear, and budget without the dedicated time will not meet the research targets. However, the consideration of strengthening collaborations with diaspora to increase the research output of the institution is a brilliant idea, as many extremely talented Kosovo scientists continuously move research forward abroad.*

*On Standard 6.2, it makes reference to the research publication requirements for being set for the hiring and promoting of academic staff. In this regard, the SER points to the “Regulation for selection procedures in regard to appointment, re-appointment and advancement of academic staff of the University of Prishtina”, which sets clear requirements for the appointment of a position in each level, thus this standard is compliant.*

*Standard 6.3 requires a clear definition of policies that define what is considered research and making sure it compares to international standards. In this regard, the SER points at the regulation mentioned for the previous standard, according to which for articles to be considered as part of the promotion they should be in the field of study, and internationally indexed either by Thomson Reuters or by Scopus. Therefore, the requirements match international standards.*

*About Standard 6.4, it refers to the existence of an academic track record for the academic staff. This standard is extremely broad, and under this broad definition the bar for compliance is quite low, and thus met. The academic track record, in the case of at least one academic staff member did not meet the requirements of set by Standard 6.2, however it exist and thus is compliant.*

*Moreover, Standard 6.5 addresses the promotion of the research conducted by the FECE in national and international venues and collaboration engagement external to the organization. Once again, the standard is very broad, as under the current definition, one member of the staff being engaged in such activities is enough. A better definition for such standard would demand for X% of the staff engaged in such activities, for example 40%. In this case, in absence of a clear limit, the SER showcases the engagement of five members of the staff, thus meeting the standard limit.*

*Standard 6.6 refers to the validation mechanisms for the conducted research. This is another very broad standard, as publications in reputable journals and conference are by default*



*validated as they are peer-reviewed. In this regard, the SER cites the validation in peer review journals as well as an additional mechanism that involves applied research, thus meeting the standard.*

*In contrast, Standard 6.7 refers to the frequency of research publications from the academic staff. The quantitative metric is very concise and specific, requiring an average of at least one publication per year over the previous three years for each academic staff member. This particular requirement is far from met, as only 25% of the academic staff meets this requirement.*

*Standard 6.8 aims to verify that the publications made by the academic staff affiliated as full-time are made under the affiliation of the UP and FECE. This was declared as compliant in the SER and verified by the expert team. This applied not for all publications but for the most recent publications, which is perfectly normal as people change positions and affiliations over time.*

*Standard 6.9 addresses the presence of encouragement mechanisms for including ongoing research into the courses taught. In this regard, the SER makes reference to the availability of new research to be constantly included in the courses, potentially including artifacts and data from ongoing projects, when not limited by intellectual property. However, it is not clear that an actual encouragement strategy is in place or if this just a natural flow of action. Therefore, an actual encouragement strategy should be put in place, for example a regulation that requests teachers to include in their course program at least a 10% of new content, related to their field of research when possible. This would apply only to courses specific to the program, and that have a research component to it.*

*Following to Standard 6.10, which refers to the policies in place for the protection of the intellectual property of staff and students. In this regard, the SER cites the “LAW NO. 04/L-065 ON COPYRIGHT AND RELATED RIGHTS” which appears to cover for all individuals, regardless of the position or organization. This would of course cover for students and staff as well.*

*Finally, Standard 6.11 makes reference to the current engagement of students in research projects and other activities. In response, the SER shows examples of research projects that include some students at bachelor, master and PhD level. However, since the program under*



*accreditation has no students yet, this particular standard is considered as not applicable, and will be evaluated accordingly on reaccreditation. For now, it will be excluded from the evaluation.*

| Standard   | Compliance |    |
|--|------------|----|
|  | Yes        | No |
| Standard 6.1. The study program has defined scientific/applied research objectives (on its own or as part of a research center or interdisciplinary program), which are also reflected in the research development plan of the institution; sufficient financial, logistic and human resources are allocated for achieving the proposed research objectives. | X          |    |
| Standard 6.2. Expectations for teaching staff involvement in research and scholarly activities are clearly specified, and performance in relation to these expectations is considered in staff evaluation and promotion criteria.  | X          |    |
| Standard 6.3. Clear policies are established for defining what is recognized as research, consistent with international standards and established norms in the field of study of the program.  | X          |    |
| Standard 6.4. The academic staff has a proven track record of research results on the same topics as their teaching activity.  | X          |    |
| Standard 6.5. The academic and research staff publish their work in specialty magazines or publishing houses, scientific/applied/artistic products are presented at conferences, sessions, symposiums, seminars etc. and contracts, expertise, consultancy, conventions, etc. are provided to partners inside the country and/or abroad.                     | X          |    |
| Standard 6.6. Research is validated through: scientific and applied research publications, artistic products, technological transfer through consultancy centers, scientific parks and other structures for validation.  | X          |    |
| Standard 6.7. Each academic staff member and researcher has produced at least an average of one scientific/applied research publication or artistic outcome/product per year for the past three years.   |            | X  |
| Standard 6.8. Academic and research staff publish under the name of the institution in Kosovo they are affiliated to as full-time staff.   | X          |    |
| Standard 6.9. Academic staff are encouraged to include in their teaching information about their research and scholarly activities that are relevant to courses they teach, together with other significant research developments in the field.  |            | X  |





|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| Standard 6.10. Policies are established for ownership of intellectual property and clear procedures set out for commercialization of ideas developed by staff and students.. | X |   |
| Standard 6.11. Students are engaged in research projects and other activities.   | - | - |

**Compliance level:** Substantially compliant (8/10)

**ET recommendations:**

- 1. Good idea of stablishing more research collaborations with Kosovo researchers abroad, there is a lot of talent and this could significantly increase the research output of the FECE or any other unit at UP. This recommendation has been noted and taken into account.*
- 2. As the publications were being reviewed, it was noticed that some journals still don't accept Kosovo as a country. This is terrible in too many levels, and of course to no fault of any of the people involved in this accreditation process. However, I would like to suggest for the regulations on what research is considered as valid for hiring, promotion and performance evaluation, that preference is given to scientific outlets that accept Kosovo as a country. Of course, not to make it mandatory, as I am not sure of how restrictive it could be, but to promote publication in those journals that meet the requirements and also accept Kosovo as a country, as a mini-protest/boycott. The UP could publish yearly a list of reputable journals that recognise Kosovo as a country, for example. The words Prishtina and Serbia should not appear together if it can be avoided! This recommendation has been noted, and the expert team looks forward to the promotion of Kosovo also through science.*
- 3. Encouragement policies or protocols should be put in place for the professors to include as much as their research, when possible, into the courses, therefore promoting the constant inclusion of cutting-edge knowledge into the program. This recommendation has been noted and considered for implementation.*

**2.7. Infrastructure and resources**

*The final area under evaluation focuses on the physical infrastructure and resources available to the program under accreditation. Part of the laboratory facilities has gone through updates and renovation recently, and there are some updates still coming. All of this is taken into account for the evaluation.*



*Starting with Standard 7.1, which focuses on the resources as premises, equipment and human resources for long term implementation of the program, in a quantitative and qualitative manner. In response to this, the SER reports on area available for students in different labs, auditoriums, bathrooms, common spaces etc. along with a broad list of equipment without much specification. From a qualitative perspective, most of the lab equipment for the dedicate labs looked quite updated, with the exception of the Lab of Electrical materials, in which the equipment needed some urgent updates. From the quantitative front, I used the corrected syllabus metadata with the specific laboratory assignments, and aggregated from the syllabi the lab exercise hours for each laboratory, which resulted in the following totals:*

*Table 1: Lab hour needs as indicated in the syllabi*

| Laboratory             | Hours |
|------------------------|-------|
| Lab Elect Meas         | 45    |
| Lab Elect Mats         | 30    |
| Lab Pow dis&trans      | 90    |
| Lab Elect Machines     | 85    |
| Lab Elect Installation | 45    |

*Therefore, every group of students should have access to at least that amount of hours each year to those labs. Following the virtual visit, it was mentioned that the school year has 30 weeks, (15 per semester), and that labs were available for students every day for twelve hours from 8:00 to 20:00. This would mean that a lab is available for students for a total of 1800 hours per year (30 weeks \* 5 days a week \* 12 hours per day). However, in practice this availability is not realistic, as students don't really have use for the laboratory from day one, and they also have to attend to other courses, lab exercises, practices, etc. Therefore, an assumption was made for the labs to be accessible to students realistically for about 2/3 of the time, or an estimated 1200 hours per academic year. Next, to determine the available time for each student group, the following calculation was made:*

$$LabT_g = \frac{1200h}{N/g}$$



Where  $LabT_g$  stands for the lab time per group, the 1200h are the hours available realistically for students as discussed earlier, “N” is the number of students accepted for the program and “g” is the size of lab group. The calculation resulted in the following:

Table 2: Lab time availability for student groups of different sizes and number of students admitted to the program

| Lab hours per teams of: | ↓   | ↓   |     |     | # Students |
|-------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|------------|
| g → 1                   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 10  | N ↓        |
| 15                      | 45  | 60  | 75  | 150 | 80         |
| 20                      | 60  | 80  | 100 | 200 | 60         |
| 30                      | 90  | 120 | 150 | 300 | 40         |
| 40                      | 120 | 160 | 200 | 400 | 30         |

In the table, the cells marked as green are the number of students, the cells marked as blue are the group size per student exercise and in light orange the cells are marked the amount of hours available to each student group. The laboratories presented interesting set ups, in which the exercises to be held are pre-set in specific work stations for students to carry out. As seen in the videos delivered before the online meeting, those work stations appear to have a capacity for no more than 4 or 5 students per group. During the visit it was mentioned that groups of students for lab are divided into groups of 10 for the exercises, however the space seems insufficient for groups of 10. Although groups of 10 would result in sufficient lab time, as the lab hours available per group is higher than the highest lab need presented in Table 1 (90 hours for the lab of transmission and distribution), however the space may not accommodate that number of students. If reduced the group size to groups of 5 students, which is more realistic, (fourth column of Table 2), the total available lab time per group of students is no longer sufficient for the admittance of 80 students per year, but it is sufficient for 60 students. Similarly, groups of four students would result on restricting the admittance per year to only 40 students per year. Based in the aforementioned reasoning, this particular standard will be considered as not met, and recommendation will be made for a maximum of 60 students per year admittance. Close follow up to the real student lab access and needs will should be taken into account and evaluated for reaccreditation rounds.

Regarding Standard 7.2, it addresses the financial plan for the study program to assure its sustainability. In this regard, the SER presents multiple sources of funding with a variety of purposes, including laboratory equipment, acquisition of software licences, consumables for



*labs, etc. Therefore there is a clear financial plan for the program and this requirement is met.*

*On Standard 7.3, it refers to the ownership or lease of the spaces and equipment to be used by the program to be for at least three years, so it can sustain the program at full length. In this regard, the SER elaborates on the facilities, which are owned by the UP, and thus available for the length of the program and beyond. The same is clarified for the labs and lab equipment. In addition, the library is stocked with the textbooks for the program. Licences for some software platforms are pending the accreditation of the program, something that will have to be closely verified in reaccreditation rounds.*

*About Standard 7.4, it evaluates the seating capacity of classrooms, seminar rooms, labs, etc. In this regard it is hard to accurately evaluate the sufficiency of the classrooms, as those are most likely shared with other study programmes (as they should) and the capacity of those study programmes is unknown from this perspective. In total are mentioned 13 rooms that can be used for lecturing with different capacities, and seven labs with different capacities also, as well as a couple of computer rooms. Percentage of room occupancy should be reported (current and projected with the proposed program) for further accreditation and reaccreditation applications for further clarification. For now, the standard will be marked as compliant.*

*Next, Standard 7.5 addresses the library's sufficiency and readiness for the program. AS declared in response in the SER, the number of seats available in the reading rooms far exceeds the 10% of admittance required. On the next two points for the standard, as referred for number of seats in working rooms and number books, particularly relevant and recent books, the SER states that are in both cases compliant. Particularly in the case of books, the standard should be updated, as a digital version of the book in principle represents access to a potentially infinite number of students. Regarding the work rooms, they are no where mentioned specifically regarding the seat capacity, availability, etc. Therefore, this must be made specific for further accreditation rounds. Moreover, for access to international scientific outlets it is mentioned that all staff members have access to digital libraries*

*Finally, Standard 7.6 refers to the accessibility of the facilities to students with especial needs and reduced mobility. As showcased in the videos made available before the virtual meeting, but also commented during the meeting, there are accessibility ramps and elevators, the*



*elevators being for exclusive use for those with reduced mobility. Especial access tags are issued to students with reduced mobility for access to this infrastructure, as commented during the visit. Whether if these accesses and elevators provide access to each library, bathroom, lab or classroom it is unclear, so this could be something for the KAA to verify. In the meantime, it will remain as compliant.*

| Standard   | Compliance |    |
|--|------------|----|
|  | Yes        | No |
| Standard 7.1. The adequate long-term implementation of the study program is ensured in quantitative terms as regards premises, human resources and equipment. At the same time, it is guaranteed that qualitative aspects are also taken into account.   |            | X  |
| Standard 7.2. There is a financial plan at the level of the study program that would demonstrate the sustainability of the study program for the next minimum three years.   | X          |    |
| Standard 7.3. The higher education institution must demonstrate with adequate documents (property deeds, lease contracts, inventories, invoices etc.) that, for the study program submitted for evaluation it possesses the following, for the next at least three years:<br>a) owned or rented spaces adequate for the educational process;<br>b) owned or rented laboratories, with the adequate equipment for all the compulsory disciplines within the curriculum, wherever the analytical syllabus includes such activities;<br>c) adequate software for the disciplines of study included in the curriculum, with utilisation licence;<br>d) library equipped with reading rooms, group work rooms and its own book stock according to the disciplines included in the curricula | X          |    |
| Standard 7.4. The number of seats in the lecture rooms, seminar rooms and laboratories must be related to the study groups' size (series, groups, subgroups); the applicative activities for the speciality disciplines included in the curricula are carried out in laboratories equipped with IT equipment.  | X          |    |
| Standard 7.5. The education institution's libraries must ensure, for each of the study programs:<br>a) a number of seats in the reading rooms corresponding to at least 10% of the total number of students in the study program;  | X          |    |



|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <p>b) a number of seats in the group work rooms corresponding to at least 10% of the total number of students in the study program;</p> <p>c) their own book stock from Albanian and foreign speciality literature, enough to cover the disciplines within the curricula, out of which at least 50% should represent book titles or speciality courses of recognised publishers, from the last 10 years;</p> <p>d) a book stock within its own library with a sufficient number of books so as to cover the needs of all students in the cycle and year of study the respective discipline is provided for;</p> <p>e) a sufficient number of subscriptions to Albanian and foreign publications and periodicals, according to the stated mission.</p> |   |  |
| <p>Standard 7.6. The infrastructure and facilities dedicated to the implementation of the program is adapted to students with special needs.</p>  | X |  |

**Compliance level:** Substantially compliant (5/6)

**ET recommendations:**

1. *For the student feedback questionnaire, specific questions on lab access should be added to gauge the sufficiency of the facilities. Questions such as “was the time you could access to the labs sufficient to conduct the tasks required by the course?”, “How difficult was it to find available times to use the lab? No problem/difficult/almost impossible”, and so forth. In this way only it will be possible to ensure that each student receives the very necessary practice needed to perform successfully in the professional life. This recommendation has been noted and is considered for implementation during the design of next year’s questionnaires.*
2. *There are no mentions of work rooms in the facilities descriptions, or anywhere else in the SER. A clear account of number of work rooms as well as their seating capacity is needed for further iterations for accreditation rounds. This issue has been addressed.*



### 3. OVERALL EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE ET

*The study program looks not only to the needs of the country, but also to the future. The strong influence of renewable energy to the program defines the path forward to sustainability as well as to EU integration, and education with that focus is needed in Kosovo and the whole world. That being said, several issues will have to be followed closely for further reaccreditation applications, such as student access to labs, renovation of the pending lab equipment (which during the visit was mentioned to happen within the next two years), the acquisition of software licences (when no open-source equivalent is available) and several other recommendations made by the expert team.*

In conclusion, the Expert Team considers that the study program in Power Systems offered by the University of Prishtina is *Substantially compliant* with the standards included in the *KAA Accreditation manual* and, therefore, recommends to *accredit* the study program for a duration of 3 years with a number of 60 students to be enrolled in the program.

| Area under evaluation                  | Compliance level        |
|--|-------------------------|
| Mission, objectives and administration | Partially compliant     |
| Quality management                     | Substantially compliant |
| Academic staff                         | Substantially compliant |
| Educational process content            | Substantially compliant |
| Students                               | -                       |
| Research                               | Substantially compliant |
| Infrastructure and resources           | Substantially compliant |

### 4. APPENDICES (if available)

1. NA



Republika e Kosovës  
Republika Kosova - Republic of Kosovo




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


---

### Expert Team

#### Chair

|   |   |                   |
|---|---|-------------------|
|  | <b>Dr. Francisco Javier Farfan Orozco</b> | <b>08/04/2022</b> |
| (Signature)   | (Print Name)                              | (Date)            |

#### Member

|   |                                     |                   |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------|
|  | <b>Laura Palac (Student Expert)</b> | <b>08/04/2022</b> |
| (Signature)   | (Print Name)                        | (Date)            |