UNIVERSITY OF PRISHTINA

POWER SYSTEMS AND ENERGY MANAGEMENT
MSC, 120 ECTS
ACCREDITATION

REPORT OF THE EXPERT TEAM

31/January/2025, Prishtina, Kosovo

AKA | Qendra e Studentëve, kati 2-të, 10000 Prishtinë, Kosovë
Tel. +381 38 213722 | Fax +381 38 213087 | www.akreditimi-ks.org

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Sources of information for the Report:

- *Self-evaluation report*
- *Syllabi of courses*
- *Staff CVs'*
- *Contracts and property deeds*
- *Syllabi metadata file*
- *KAA Accreditation Manual*
- *Administrative Instruction for Accreditation of Higher Education Institutions in the Republic of Kosova*
- *Official website of UP*
- *Complimentary documentation requested and received after the visit*

Criteria used for institutional and program evaluations

- *List of enrolled / dropped students for the past 3 years*
- *Grade average of active students*
- *Teacher to student ratio*
- *Example of feedback questionnaires/forms for the four levels mentioned by the QA representatives*
- *Quality KPIs*
- *Previous program evaluation reports*
- *Evidence list for Standard 3*
- *Etc.*

Site visit schedule

Programme Accreditation Procedure at **Faculty of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Prishtina**	
Programmes:	**Power Systems, BSc, 180 ECTS (Re-accreditation)** **Power Systems and Energy Management, MSc**
Site visit on:	**31 January 2025**
Expert Team:	Dr. Francisco Javier Farfan Dr. Faouzi Derbel Issabek Muratov, Student expert
Coordinators of the KAA:	Fjolle Ajeti, KAA Officer Shkelzen Gerxhaliu KAA Department Director

Time	Meeting	Participants
9:00 - 9:50	Meeting with the management of the faculty where the programs are integrated	Isak Shabani, *Dean* Qamil Kabashi, *Vice Dean for Teaching and Student Affairs* Milaim Zabeli, *Vice Dean for Finance and Infrastructure* Bujar Krasniqi, *Vice Dean for Research and Development*
09:55 – 10:30	Meeting with quality assurance representatives and administrative staff	Besnik Loxha, *Responsibility of Quality Assurance at UP* Dhuratë Hyseni, *Coordinator for academic development at the FECE* Vlora Shileku, *Administrative staff at the FECE* Rreze Rudi, *Administrative staff at the FECE*
10:35 – 11:40	Meeting with the program holders of the study program **Power Systems, BSc** Meeting with the program holders of the study program **Power Systems and Energy Management, MSc**	Arben Gjukaj, *Chairperson* Shqipe Lohaj, *Responsible staff* Nuri Berisha, *Responsible staff* Vezir Rexhepi Nora Sadiku Dushi
11:40 – 12:40	Lunch break	
12:50 - 13:30	Visiting Facilities	
13:35 – 14:10	Meeting with teaching staff	Blerim Rexha, *Teaching staff*

		Mimoza Ibrani, *Teaching staff* Veziri Rexhepi, *Teaching staff* Kadri Sylejmani, *Teaching staff* Nore Sadiku Dushi, *Teaching staff* Faton Maliqi, *Teaching staff* Petriti Emini, (PhD can.), *Teaching staff* Nafije Shabani Dallku (PhD can.) *Teaching staff (part-time)* Mendim Hajdari,(PhD can.) *Teaching staff (part-time)* Enis Riza, (PhD can.) *Teaching staff (part-time)*
14:15 – 14:55	Meeting with students	Nisa Komoni Greta Gashi Dea Dinaj Shefki Sllamniku Elvira Zogaj Gembi Uka Legjenda Thaçi Allmedin Shehu
15:00 – 15:40	Meeting with graduates	Hazir Miftari Shkëlqim Syla Kaltrina Imeri Arjan Alimi Anda Kukaj Anita Kelmendi Erigon Behluli Blerand Mjeku
15:45 – 16:20	Meeting with employers of graduates and external stakeholders	Petrit Pepaj – ERO Luixh Imeri – KEK Gazmend Kabashi - KOSTT Valbona Kadriu – KEDS

		Lutfi Gashi – Electra Trim Ternava – SunVolta Ilir Gashi – UKAB Zenel Dinaj – Decon
16:20 – 16:30	Internal meeting of KAA staff and experts	
16:30 – 16:40	Closing meeting with the management of the faculty and program	Isak Shabani, *Dean* Qamil Kabashi, *Vice Dean for Teaching and Student Affairs* Milaim Zabeli, *Vice Dean for Finance and Infrastructure* Bujar Krasniqi, *Vice Dean for Research and Development*

A brief overview of the programme 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 accreditation after a long period without a MSc program on the subject. The program 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 MSc 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.

PROGRAMME EVALUATION

The programme evaluation consists of 7 standard areas through which the programme is evaluated.

1. MISSION, OBJECTIVES AND ADMINISTRATION

Standard 1.1 The study program is in line with the higher education institution's mission and strategic goals, needs of society and it is publicly available. (ESG 1.1)

The mission of the university of Prishtina is based on academic development, scientific and artistic research, and the provision of higher education through programs of strategic and developmental interest to the Republic of Kosovo. The mission of the Faculty of Electrical and Computer Engineering (FECE) aligns with the core mission of the University of Prishtina. Its primary goal is to educate and train students in the fields of Electrical and Computer Engineering across all levels of higher education. FECE aims to equip graduates with the skills and knowledge needed to meet labor market demands both locally and internationally, foster continuous learning in this rapidly evolving field, and actively contribute to Kosovo's sustainable technological, social, and scientific development.
The study program aligns with the institution's mission and strategic goals, is publicly available at webpage: https://uni-pr.edu/page.aspx?id=2,47, considers the HEI's geographic and research position, has well-defined learning outcomes.
Learning outcomes of the study program Power systems and Energy management MSc inline with the strategic goal and mission of the university and Faculty, further information can be found in the SER, p.9-10.

Standard 1.2 The study program Is subject to policies and procedures on academic integrity and freedom that prevent all types of unethical behaviour. The documents are publicly available, and staff and students are informed thereof. (ESG 1.1)

The Code of Ethics of the University of Pristina, the regulations for the integrity of teaching and scientific research, as well as the policies for quality assurance and evaluation are

mandatory documents for all staff (academic and administrative) in the face of their daily academic activities and administrative including ethical behavior.
Articles 4-6 describes rights and ethical conduct for academic staff, articles 7-10 teacher-student relationship. The definition of unacceptable conduct given in the articles 14-16 of above-mentioned code.
Any person (within or outside the University of Prishtina) has the right to denounce or report violations of the provisions of this Code to members of the Council of Ethics, the governing authority of the academic unit, or the rector. Any report addressed to the academic unit's governing authorities and the rector shall be forwarded to the Council of Ethics.
Code of Ethics, Regulation on Master's studies, Regulations for the procedure and disciplinary measures for students at the University of Pristina 'Hasan Prishtina' with no. 426, and other regulations can be found: https://uni-pr.edu/page.aspx?id=2,76

Standard 1.3 Relevant information is collected, analysed and used to ensure the effective management of the study program and other relevant activities and such information is publicly available. (ESG 1.7)

The University of Pristina has developed a fully digitized educational infrastructure through the Electronic Student Management System (SEMS), which securely manages course attendance, exam results, and course evaluations. In addition to its core features, SEMS includes an Educational CMS module for distributing teaching materials.
To monitor course completion, student progress, and program evaluations, automated data summaries are regularly generated for administrators and relevant committees. This digital system enhances transparency, efficiency, and adaptability in academic information management.
The University's academic programs, particularly within the Faculty of Electrical and Computer Engineering (FECE), implement measures to safeguard student data and privacy concerning courses, evaluations, and other learning activities in accordance with statutory regulations. Through digital platforms and the FECE website, students and faculty can access SEMS and other informational resources, including updates on academic activities, teaching schedules, scientific research, seminars, workshops, and various events.
As outlined in SER (p.12), SEMS functions as intended, as confirmed during the sessions. The system operates under the Regulation on the Electronic Student Management System, with Article 3 clearly defining its modules.

Standard 1.4 The delivery of the study program is supported by appropriate and sufficient administrative support to achieve its goals in teaching, learning, research, and community service. (ESG 1.6)

The University of Pristina has a sufficient number of academic and administrative staff to effectively design study program curricula and courses. Each year, the Faculty of Electrical and Computer Engineering (FECE) allocates a budget to ensure adequate funding for academic and administrative support, including the acquisition of advanced laboratory equipment. The administrative structure is specialized in managing study programs, with a dedicated team responsible for coordinating and overseeing administrative tasks, utilizing information technology to streamline processes (SER, pp. 11-12).
As confirmed by an expert team, academic staff regularly participate in training programs focused on curriculum design, teaching methods, and higher education instruction at the University of Pristina's Center for Teaching Excellence. These training sessions are typically conducted by experienced professors with certifications from universities in the U.S. and Europe. For instance, a sampled certificate from Blerim Rexha demonstrates successful completion of the 'Train the Trainers – Preparation of Training Pilots' workshop.
Additionally, the university's administrative staff have opportunities for professional development and skill enhancement through programs such as Erasmus+, NTERBA (Internationalization at Home), and DI-PhDICTKES (The Development and Implementation of PhD Curricula in ICT for the Kosovo Education System).

Standard 1.5 The recommendations for quality improvement of the study program from previous internal and external quality assurance procedures are implemented. (ESG 1.10)

SER (p.12) provides a general overview of the implementation of recommendations from previous reviews and feedback from external stakeholders, academic staff, and students but does not include specific examples. As Power Systems and Energy management MSc is accredited for the first time, no previous recommendations are evidenced. However, during sessions with the administrative staff and based on past accreditation recommendations, improvements in the curriculum of Power systems BSc were observed. For example, a previous expert evaluation noted that the course 5-2 "Transmission and Distribution of Electricity" lacked a specific lecture outline in the syllabus, even after multiple updates. In the current evaluation, this issue has been addressed, and the course now includes a detailed lecture outline.
Despite these improvements, a clearly defined mechanism for systematically implementing recommendations is still needed.

ET recommendations:

1. *The regulations for studies, statute, codes, and other relevant documents shall be in machine readable format for convenient navigation. As this is issue can be solved*

within a short timeframe, it was expected to be implemented before the start of new academic year.

2. *Clear mechanism of implementation of recommendations from previous evaluations, stakeholders, etc., should be demonstrated. This can be corrected by next accreditation round.*
3. *With the new KAA evaluation protocol, the evaluation of a program is no longer just at the standard level, but at the indicator level. With new indicators defined for the evaluation of every individual standard, future SERs should be redacted to address every indicator for every standard. This will make the evaluation of the program more transparent, and should be implemented for the next accreditation round.*

2. QUALITY MANAGEMENT

Quality assurance is of utmost importance when it comes to the development and success of the study program.

Standard 2.1 The study program delivery is subject to an established and functional internal quality assurance system, in which all relevant stakeholders are included. (ESG 1.1)

Indicator 2.1.1 refers to the existence of an active quality assurance system or protocol that should be in line with international standards. In this regard, the SER presents several quality assurance systems which are in place, regulated both internally and externally. Therefore, the indicator is clearly covered. On indicator 2.1.2, refers to the coverage of the quality assurance systems. In this case it has been made clear that, both in the visit and in the SER, the quality assurance system covers for courses, program, students, institution and staff, thus it clearly covers all aspects of the program and meets the indicator. For indicator 2.1.3, the SER cites a list of multiple regulations that relate to the quality assurance at the HEI and faculty level, thus covering for this indicator. About indicator 2.1.4 requires that the quality assurance representatives of both the faculty and the program have dedicated positions to the role, meaning that they do not take on teaching responsibilities. I this regard, all of the five quality assurance representatives of the program do not have teaching roles within the program under accreditation, thus meeting the requirements for the indicator. As for indicator 2.1.5 it addresses the internal quality continuous improvement cycle of the quality assurance system. In this case, it is elaborated in the SER as well as during the visit that quality evaluations are carried out periodically. Some evaluations take place more often than others, for example, at the end of every semester there are feedback questionnaires distributed among students. Other evaluations take place yearly and others every several years, like the accreditation evaluation. In this case, it could be considered that the indicator is complied with. Finally, indicator 2.1.6 it refers to the availability of different stakeholder groups to input for the continuous quality improvement of the program. In this regard, during the visit it was made clear that students,

teaching staff and even industry representatives had channels for providing feedback about the performance and development of the program, thus this standard can be considered as fully met.

Standard 2.2 The study program is subject to a process of design and approval established by the HEI. (ESG 1.2)

Indicator 2.2.1 refers to the alignment of the program with the institution and faculty's strategic goals. In this case, the learning outcomes provided by the program align clearly with the institution and the faculty goals and strategies. For indicator 2.2.2, refers to the transparency of the internal quality assurance processes. Unfortunately in this case the SER is still drafted with the outdated protocols, and instead it addresses only the accreditation protocols at the faculty and institutional level. For indicator 2.2.3, it addresses the protocols for development and approval of the program. In this case, the protocols are presented in the form of flow diagrams both at an institutional level and faculty level, thus the indicator is met. For the final indicator, it requires the clear definition of key performance indicators for monitoring the quality of the program, and the continuous monitoring of said indicators. In this case, the indicators are not mentioned in the SER, but have been provided at the first round of requested documents, and should be included in the SER in the future. Altogether with three out of 4 indicators met the standard can be considered as complied.

Standard 2.3 The study program is periodically monitored and reviewed to ensure its objectives are achieved. The monitoring of the study program involves stakeholder participation. (ESG 1.9)

On indicator 2.3.1, refers to the regular monitoring to assess the needs of society. In this regard, both in the SER and during the visit it was pointed out that, through entities such as the industrial advisory board, external stakeholders have the opportunity to voice their needs, thus contributing to the development of the program. Therefore this indicator is met. For indicator 2.3.2, it refers to the balance of ECTS to workload of the courses. In this case, the balance in the presented courses meet this indicator. Some examples are "Fundamentals of electrical Engineering 1", "Communication skills" and "Basic software tools". In total 6 courses did not meet this criterion. For indicator 2.3.3, refers to the variety of the stakeholders that give input to the quality of the program through questionnaires. In this regard, it was clear that all four groups mentioned by the indicator: students, staff, employers and alumni had channels to provide input to the program, however, there is no mention of questionnaires being created for interest groups other than students. In this case, the indicator is thus not complied. For indicator 2.3.4 refers to the regularity of questionnaires distributed to all stakeholder groups. Once again, particularly with external stakeholders it is mentioned that forums for general feedback are regularly offered, but no mention of an structured questionnaire is made

for other than students, and thus this indicator is not met. On indicator 2.3.5, refers to the clear definition of a process for monitoring and improving the student practice. Unfortunately, no mention of such is made in the SER, and thus this indicator is not met. For indicator 2.3.6, it refers to the event of how the information obtained through the feedback leads to improvements. In this regard, it is mentioned both in the SER as during the visit on how the feedback provided has led to improvements in courses and the program as a whole, thus it can be considered that this indicator is met. Finally, for indicator 2.3.7 refers to the communication of the results of the quality monitoring to all stakeholders. In this regard, when questioned about it during the visit it became apparent that, although the feedback clearly leads to change, the communication part of it is still lacking, and thus this indicator is considered as failed. Overall, with four out of seven indicators met the standard is considered as complied.

Standard 2.4 All relevant information about the study program is clear, accurate, objective, up-to-date and is publicly available. (ESG 1.8)

On indicator 2.4.1, it refers to the availability of regulations to the general public. In this regard, it is possible to reach a list of regulations from the front page of the university, and although the regulations are in Albanian mostly, the indicator can be considered as met. For indicator 2.4.2, it addresses the publication of the information regarding the details of the program and its courses. Although the information about the courses and the criteria is made available in the SER, it does not appear to be public in the webpage of the university, at least not in a quick search. In addition, while verifying if the equivalent information was available to other programs, in some cases the link available in the university's website sent to a "not found" error. Therefore, this indicator will be considered as failed. For indicator 2.4.3, refers to the public availability of the dropout rates, graduate employment and pass rates. In this case, these numbers were requested and presented by the institution. However, the indicator requires this information to be publicly available, and it appears not to be the case. Our understanding is that it is available to the staff through the internal system only. Therefore, this indicator will be considered as failed. The final indicator refers to the accuracy of the publicly available information about the program. Unfortunately, although the program has been running for 3 years already, after some navigation at the university's website no information about the program was found (and the search bar kept returning errors). Therefore, it was not possible to verify this indicator and will be considered as failed. With three out of four indicators failed, the standard will be considered as failed as well.

ET recommendations:

1. *Just as for the other standards, the SER will have to be tailored to address the new regulations system for future applications.*

2. *Although the SER refers to the regulations for quality, open access to the regulations should be provided in the form of links to all relevant regulations mentioned, and this should be included for the next accreditation evaluation.*
3. *The protocols for internal quality assurance evaluation should be presented and made accessible to anyone from the university's website. This can and should be implemented before the start of the next academic cycle.*
4. *For the next application round, the KPIs for quality should be included in the SER and indexed with the relevant indicator according to the new regulations.*
5. *As required by the new regulations, a process for the monitoring and improvement of the students' professional practice should be clearly defined, and made to include other stakeholders' feedback as well. This process should be created and presented by the end of the ongoing academic year.*
6. *Questionnaires for all stakeholders of the program (including staff, alumni and employers) should be formulated and conducted at regular intervals. The results of said questionnaires should also be made available to the general public.*
7. *During the visit, it became apparent that, although feedback is considered and actions are taken, there is no top-down communication of the actions taken to address the feedback. Therefore, for the end of the current academic year, a report should be made available with open access to the general public, which presents the results of all feedback received in the year (from students, staff and other stakeholders) with action points and timelines for the actions to be taken.*
8. *Information about the program, including selection criteria, grading criteria, learning outcomes, syllabi of courses, etc. should be made available to the general public through the university's website. This should be implemented by the end of the current academic year.*
9. *Information of the dropout rate, pass rate, graduate employment, etc. (as defined for indicator 2.4.3) should be made available to the general public at a program and at a faculty level. This should be implemented by the end of the current academic year.*
10. *Information about the program should be made available and easily accessible from the university's website. This is to be implemented by the end of the current academic year.*

3. ACADEMIC STAFF

Standard 3.1 The study program delivery is supported by teaching staff who are recruited in line with national legislation, and internal regulations in effect, and it is based on objective and transparent procedure. (ESG 1.5)

The central governing institution UP announces a formal public notice for available full-time positions across all academic departments, including FECE. This information is supported by the HEI website.

The public announcements, serving as a competition for the appointment, reappointment, and promotion of academic staff across UP faculties, offer detailed information on the available positions and their classifications. Specifically, for FECE, the documented evidence from 14.05.2021 details lecturer and assistant positions across various disciplines. The announcement outlines the general and specific criteria required for the appointment, reappointment, or promotion of academic personnel.
The announcement outlines the general and specific criteria for the appointment, reappointment, or promotion of academic staff, facilitating a quality management process in selecting the most suitable candidates. For example, eligibility to apply and be selected is restricted to candidates who have completed their studies at an institution ranked within the top 400 universities according to the World University Rankings (https://www.topuniversities.com/qs-world-university-rankings).

The announcement details the general and specific criteria for appointing, reappointing, or promoting academic staff. Additional regulations, such as the Code of Ethics for UP academic staff (number 1/175, dated 19.07.2013) and the regulations for communication within UP (dated 05.01.2024), are also included.

Standard 3.2 The study program is supported by sufficient permanent academic staff who are adequately qualified to deliver the study program. (ESG 1.5)

The list of academic staff includes both full-time and part-time members at various levels. The number and qualifications of the academic staff are sufficient to effectively implement the study program.

The involved academic staff in this study program, are primarily full-time, with some engaged on a part-time basis. Certain staff members are associated with only one higher education institution, fully adhering to the 2018 Administrative Instruction from the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology, specifically Article 26, Sections 5.3.14 and 5.3.15. This compliance has been confirmed by the KAA itself.
The involvement of the academic staff aligns with the standards of European institutions concerning teaching hours and the number of courses.

More than 75% of the academic staff participating in this study program are employed under regular terms, surpassing the requirement outlined in Article 26, point 5.3.3 of the Administrative Instruction, which mandates a minimum of 50%.

The organization of academic staff, ensuring full-time members who hold a doctoral degree or an equivalent title for every 60 ECTS, fully adheres to the UP Statute, the internal regulations of FECE, and Article 26, point 5.3.4 of the 2018 Administrative Instruction from the Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology.

The staff-to-student ratio is approximately 27 students per professor. The academic staff within the Power Systems Department at FECE comprises a total of 55 members, including 36 full-time and 19 part-time instructors. Across all study levels, there are 2,050 students, about 1,500 of whom are actively engaged.

The number is adequate and appropriate for the study program.

The academic staff's workload complies with the regulations outlined in the SER.

According to the interview with representatives of the academic staff, it was indicated that the staff is capable of fulfilling their designated tasks.

According to the interview with representatives of the academic staff, it was indicated that the number of qualified mentors is appropriate.

Standard 3.3 The study program is supported by teaching staff who are subject to advancement and reappointment based on objective and transparent procedures which include the evaluation of excellence. The advancement of staff arises from the higher education institution's strategic goals and is in line with the legislation and internal regulations in effect. (ESG 1.5)

The management consistently engages with the teaching staff to enhance syllabuses, laboratory exercises, integrate new didactic equipment into the teaching process, and organize study visits. These initiatives are integral to the strategies for improving teaching quality.

Regular staff evaluations are conducted to ensure that teaching quality adheres to best practices and institutional priorities. This method guarantees that the study program benefits from ongoing staff development, meeting the ESG 1.5 standards for quality assurance. The FECE management annually monitors the advancement of teaching staff, including participation in training, certifications, scientific publications, and literature publications. The results of academic staff assessments are taken into account when evaluating their performance and advancement process.

Interviews with various representatives revealed an open feedback relationship between stakeholders and a willingness to enhance study programs. Evidence supporting this observation has been provided

Standard 3.4 The academic staff engaged in the delivery of the study program is entitled to institutional support for professional development. (ESG 1.5)

FECE including its departments and study programs, consistently offers opportunities and creates favourable conditions for capacity building and quality enhancement in teaching and research for its staff. This is facilitated through the organization of professional training in partnership with various international organizations.

Professional development is encouraged through regular seminars and opportunities for international mobility. Notable events mentioned in the SER include:
- A training session on "PhD Supervision" conducted by Prof. Dr. Fatos Xhafa from the Polytechnic University of Catalonia, Spain, on March 25-26, 2024.
- A seminar titled "Research Methodology, Academic Writing, and Scientific Presentations" was held in January 2023, as part of the INTERBA project.
The HEI supports the academic staff of the study program in enhancing their skills related to testing and assessment, such as through workshops on developing a viable performance evaluation system in collaboration with UP.
FECE has established cooperation agreements for student and staff mobility with institutions such as the University of Pannonia in Veszprém, Hungary, and the University of Applied Sciences in Köthen, Germany. These agreements enable teaching staff to gain valuable knowledge and adopt best practices and models, enhancing their professional development both directly and indirectly.

The HEI has presented evidence demonstrating its support for academic staff in the preparation and delivery of teaching and assessment, as well as their introduction to higher education regulations and practices. This includes resources such as a "Short Guide for Reviewing and Revising Syllabi for Teaching Staff and for Staff Supporting and Supervising Curriculum Development".

The HEI has provided evidence of its support for newly employed teachers, ensuring they receive adequate training to enhance their teaching competencies before beginning their teaching activity. This support includes the establishment of the Center for Teaching Excellence, which offers continuous and sustainable teaching development, innovative services, and resources to foster a culture of excellence in teaching and learning at UP.

Examples of regulations have been provided as evidence, including the "Regulation on Disciplinary Procedures and Measures for Students of the University of Prishtina", the "Regulations for Communication in the University of Prishtina", and the "Regulations for the

Prevention and Protection from Sexual Harassment and Harassment in the University of Prishtina".

The HEI supports academic staff in developing their research programs by encouraging participation in scientific conferences, symposiums, seminars, and other scholarly activities. These opportunities allow them to exchange experiences and receive valuable feedback to improve their performance. Additionally, teaching staff are encouraged to publish their research in reputable international journals, facilitating their advancement as academic professionals.

Standard 3.5 External associates who teach at the study program have adequate qualifications and work experience for the delivery of the study program and achievement of the intended learning outcomes. (ESG1.5)

Incorporating external associates into the teaching process is highly advantageous, as they contribute the latest research, trends, and market insights, thereby enhancing the quality and relevance of education. Their current industry experience offers students fresh perspectives, real case studies, and practical applications, aiding in the application of theoretical knowledge to real-world situations. This collaboration aligns students' skills and knowledge with market demands, effectively bridging the gap between academic learning and industry requirements. According to the interview, these external associates have the necessary qualifications and work experience to deliver the study program effectively and achieve the intended learning outcomes. This being said, there are no external associates linked to any of the courses, and thus this standard is not applicable.

ET recommendations:

1. *Just as for the other standards, the SER will have to be tailored to address the new regulations system for future applications.*

4. EDUCATIONAL PROCESS CONTENT

Standard 4.1 The study program intended learning outcomes are formulated clearly, precisely, and comprehensively according to the best practices; they are aligned with the published institution's/academic unit's mission and strategic goals and are publicly available. (ESG 1.2)

Indicators 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 addresses the alignment of the program learning outcomes to the HEI mission and strategic goals and to the program objectives, respectively. In this regard, the SER elaborates in detail how the learning outcomes align with the missions and goals of

the institution and the program, and therefore both can be considered as complied with. As for indicator 4.1.3 requires that the learning outcomes to be established from the student's perspective, and to be available in written form on the university's website to the general public. In this regard, the learning outcomes are defined in a way that could be considered as taking the student's perspective. Although the learning outcomes for the program were not found in the university website, it might be due to the ongoing accreditation, as equivalent information is present for other programs. Therefore, it will be considered as met, under the condition that is published in the website as for the other programs. On indicator 4.1.4, it refers to the evidence of using good practices to define the intended learning outcomes. In this regard, the SER explicitly mentions taking into account the outlook of analyzing competition, labor markets, the academic staff, etc. for the development of their program. Considering these as the requested good practices, it can be determined that this indicator is complied with. About indicator 4.1.5, refers to the distribution of the learning outcomes from the generic to the specific, and divided into knowledge, skills and competences. In this regard, the SER elaborates in detail how the learning outcomes distribute among the requested categories, and therefore it can be considered as complied with. Finally, indicator 4.1.6 refers to how the program compares to equivalent programs in Europe. In this regard, the content, learning outcomes and materials of the program are clearly competitive and equivalent with similar programs in other institutions national and international. Overall, this standard is complied with.

Standard 4.2 The study program intended learning outcomes comply with the National Qualification Framework and the European Qualifications Framework level descriptors. (ESG1.2)

Indicator 4.2.1 refers to the alignment of the program's learning outcomes with the national qualifications framework as well as the European qualifications framework. In this regard, the SER elaborates on the compatibility and alignment of the program with said frameworks, thus meeting the requirements for this indicator. About indicator 4.2.2, refers to the difference between graduate and undergraduate at the learning outcomes level. In this case, it is not clear what is the KAA understanding of graduate versus undergraduate, but under the interpretation of graduate as a masters degree, and undergraduate as a bachelors degree, in this case the same program under different academic levels does differ substantially in the learning outcomes. Naturally, some overlapping still takes place but with two degrees in the same field that is not avoidable. Therefore, the indicator will be considered as complied with. Finally, indicator 4.2.3 refers to the degree of overlap between the program under accreditation and other active programs. In this regard, the proposed program differs substantially from every other program in the HEI, thus justifying the proposal of the program. With all the above considered, the standard is thus fully complied with.

Standard 4.3 The content and structure of the curriculum is coherent and enable the students to achieve the intended learning outcomes and to progress smoothly through their studies. (ESG 1.2)

Indicator 4.3.1 refers to the educational flow of the courses proposed under the structure and plan provided. In this case, the program layout requires some adjustments, as in its current state is too management-centered. In this regard, the courses "Project Management", "Financial Management" and "Strategic Management", although are great options to have, should not be made mandatory. In exchange, the proposal would be to have the courses "Power distribution and Industrial Systems", "Modern system planning" and "Energy storage systems and advanced technologies" be made mandatory instead. Until then, this indicator will be considered as non-compliant. On indicator 4.3.2, it refers to the links between basic and advanced courses and the requirements of one to another. In this regard, the syllabi do not specify the requirements of previous courses in order to progress. In this regard, this indicator will be considered as failed. On indicator 4.3.3, refers to the link between the learning outcomes and their assigned competencies. In this regard, the learning outcomes do reflect the development required to reach the skills and competencies provided. Therefore, the indicator can be considered as met. Finally, indicator 4.3.4 refers to how the program compares to equivalent programs abroad, both in the content and in the layout, thus facilitating students' exchanges. In this regard, the program is still considered too much leaning towards management, as described for indicator 4.3.1, and thus it will be considered as non-compliant. Will all the above taken into account, and only one out of four indicators complied with, the standard can be considered as failed.

Standard 4.4 If the study program leads to degrees in regulated professions, it is aligned with the EU Directives and national and international professional associations. (ESG 1.2)

Indicator 4.4.1 refers to the compatibility of the program with EU directives. In this regard, the SER elaborates in detail such compatibilities, as well as the continuous work to expand on said compatibilities, including the deep consideration of expert advice during accreditation rounds. Taking that into account, it can be considered that the indicator is complied with. Finally, indicator 4.4.2 refers to the consideration of the feedback provided by professional associations. In this regard, the SER specifically indicates that meetings with representatives from the related industries are conducted in order to provide feedback to the development of the program. In addition, during the evaluation visit it was similarly noted by the industry representatives that the inputs from the professional sector do influence the development of the program. Therefore, the indicator and the program could be considered as met.

Standard 4.5 The intended learning outcomes of the student practise period are clearly specified, and effective processes are followed to ensure that learning outcomes and the strategies to develop that learning are understood by students (if applicable). (ESG 1.2)

On indicator 4.5.1, it refers to the existence of a regulation specific to the professional practice. In this regard, although the SER elaborates on the implemented protocols for the conduction of the student practice, as well as agreements with the industry and public sector. However, no mention is made of a specific regulation that would cover the student practice. Therefore, this indicator will be considered as failed. For indicator 4.5.2 it refers to the assignment of a mentor from the university's side and the cooperation agreements with the industrial sector. In this regard, it is very clear that there are agreements established and mentors for the practice are assigned. Therefore, the indicator is complied with. As for indicator 4.5.3 it refers to the monitoring of the practice work and the ECTS assigned to it. In this regard, the program plan has clearly the respective amount of ECTS assigned to the student practice, and the SER further elaborates on how the monitoring strategies for the student practice. Therefore, the indicator can be considered as complied with. Finally, indicator 4.5.4 refers to the alignment and support of the industrial sector with the development of the student practice deployment. In this regard, both from the SER as during the visit, the commitment of the industrial sector through agreements with the institutions, therefore the indicator could be considered as complied with. Overall, with three out of four indicators the standard is considered as met.

Standard 4.6 The study program is delivered through student-centred teaching and learning. (ESG 1.3)

Indicator 4.6.1 refers to the didactic concept of the program. In this case, the SER elaborates on the multiple didactic strategies to be applied according to the needs of different students, thus facilitating the reaching of the learning outcomes. Therefore, this indicator can be considered as met. Next, indicator 4.6.2 refers to the variety of the pedagogical methods used to deliver the learning outcomes. In this regard, both during the visit as well as in the SER a fair variety of pedagogical strategies which clearly align with the delivery of the learning outcomes. Therefore, this indicator can be considered as complied with. As for indicator 4.6.3 it addresses the encouragement of research-based learning, problem-solving and critical thinking. In this case, the SER elaborates, although vaguely, in the presence and use of predetermined strategies to promote the delivery of critical thinking and problem solving, therefore the indicator can be considered as complied with. As for indicator 4.6.4, it addresses the different modes of teaching delivery. Both during the visit as well as in the SER, a variety of delivery methods for the teaching, from onsite, remote and online, flexible to adapt to student needs when possible. Therefore, this indicator can be considered as met. For indicator 4.6.5 it refers to the flexibility of the program to adapt to different student populations. In this

regard, the indicator feels redundant with the previous one, as flexibility of teaching methods could apply to both indicators. Therefore, this indicator is considered as complied with. Finally, indicator 4.6.6 refers to the use of technology to deliver the learning outcomes. In this regard, the laboratories contain a fair amount of state-of-the-art equipment, which could be considered as a response to this indicator. Moreover, classrooms are also equipped with smart screens and projectors, further incorporating technology into the teaching. Therefore, the indicator as well as the standard will be considered complied with.

Standard 4.7 The evaluation and assessment used in the study program are objective and consistent and ensures that intended learning outcomes are achieved. (ESG 1.3)

Indicator 4.7.1 refers to the establishment of a clear link between learning outcomes and the contribution of each module to those outcomes. In this regard, the SER does not address this specific links, and without that being clearly stablished, the indicator is not met. Indicator 4.7.2 refers to the adequacy of the assessment methodologies implemented in the program. In this regard, for a program with a dominant technical component, laboratory experiments are incorporated, as well as the traditional essays and examinations. Therefore, the assessment methodologies appear fitting to the program in question, and thus this indicator is considered as compliant. As for indicator 4.7.3 refers to the transparency of the assessment methods to students before the course. In this regard, the syllabi presents the assessment methods for all courses in clear manner. Therefore, this indicator is considered as complied with. Next, indicator 4.7.4 addresses the objectivity and reliability of the assessment methods. This is an unclear indicator, as it is not clear how could an assessment method be considered unobjective or unreliable. Nevertheless, there is no indication that it is the case with the assessment methods proposed in the program, and thus the indicator will be considered as complied. As for indicator 4.7.5 refers to the timeliness of feedback regarding the evaluations, and the opportunity to make adjustments to the learning process. However, no mention of this is mentioned in the SER, and therefore, it will not be considered as compliant. Finally, indicator 4.7.6 refers to the opportunity of the students to make an appeal to the evaluation results and methods. In this regard, the SER mentions something about giving the students the feedback they need with the possibility to appeal for both the results and the evaluation methods. Therefore, this indicator will be considered as complied with. Overall, with four out of six indicators compliant, the standard will be considered as passed.

Standard 4.8 Learning outcomes are evaluated in terms of student workload and expressed in ECTS. (ECTS 1.2)

On standard 4.8.1, it addresses the understanding from students of the skills acquired by demonstrating the learning outcomes. In this regard, the skills acquired and the expected learning outcomes are clearly presented at a program level as well as at a course level. Therefore, with this information clearly conveyed the indicator can be considered as complied with. Finally, on indicator 4.8.2, refers once more to the proper assignment of ECTS and workload, as well as the assignment of learning activities to the learning outcomes. Since the activities and learning outcomes are clearly presented at the syllabi and SER level, this indicator will be considered as met. With both indicators out of two met, this standard will be considered as not passed.

ET recommendations:

1. *Just as for the other standards, the SER will have to be tailored to address the new regulations system for future applications.*
2. *At the current state of the program, the focus is too leaned towards administration and management. Although it makes perfect sense to have these courses available, there should be a reassessment of which courses should be mandatory or elective. The suggestion at the moment would be for the courses "Project Management", "Financial Management" and "Strategic Management", although are great options to have, should not be made mandatory. In exchange, the proposal would be to have the courses "Power distribution and Industrial Systems", "Modern system planning" and "Energy storage systems and advanced technologies" be made mandatory instead. This change or equivalent should take place before the enrollment period for the program could start.*
3. *The learning outcomes for the program should be published and made available to the general public in the university's website. This should be implemented before the end of the ongoing academic year.*
4. *In the syllabus of every course, it should be clearly stated which courses, if any, are required to be completed before in order to register the course. This should be implemented before the next enrollment cycle.*
5. *A regulation focusing on the practice of students should be developed and published by the university before the start of next academic year.*
6. *To be defined clearly, preferably in table form, a connection between each course and the specific learning outcomes that are listed in the SER. This should be addressed before the start of the next academic year.*
7. *A protocol should be developed to link in a timely manner the results from the assessments to the strengths and weaknesses of the student as well as guidelines or pathways for the improvement of the student's performance. This should be generated and published before the start of the next academic year.*

5. STUDENTS

Standard 5.1 Clear admission policies, including requirements, criteria and processes for the study program are clearly defined and are publicly available. (ESG 1.4)

The admission criteria for students are outlined in the Statute of UP, in compliance with the legal regulations set by MEST and KAA. Public announcements regarding admissions are made on the University of Pristina (UP) website and the Faculty of Electrical and Computer Engineering (FECE) website. Article 103 of the UP Statute defines the general admission requirements, which apply uniformly to all candidates.
At FECE, Mathematics is typically chosen for the entry exam, with results published within 2–3 days. Candidates have the right to appeal within three days, and the Commission for result announcements is established by FECE.
The application and enrolment criteria for master's studies are published on the UP website in two separate calls, usually in July and September. Admission requirements for the master's level are set by the University of Pristina in accordance with relevant regulations.
The selection process for candidates across all faculties follows these criteria, with a maximum of 100 points distributed as follows:
Academic performance in undergraduate studies: up to 30 points
Entrance exam performance: up to 70 points
In addition to subject-specific exams, candidates are also assessed in English, which contributes up to 10% of the entrance exam score. Candidates with an international certificate, such as TOEFL (minimum 70 points) or IELTS (minimum 5.65 points), automatically receive 5 points, while additional points for English proficiency are awarded based on performance in the English section of the entrance exam.
For candidates who have completed their previous education outside Kosovo, specific admission requirements are outlined in Article 103 of the UP Statute.
Related admission information is publicly available by following link: https://uni-pr.edu/page.aspx?id=1,186

Standard 5.2 Student progression data for the study program are regularly collected and analyzed. Appropriate actions are taken to ensure the student's completion of the study program. (ESG 1.4)

SER p.99 provides detailed information on the data collection and analyses. Professors and assistants conduct continuous assessments through class participation, periodic tests (colloquiums), and final exams. To facilitate exam completion, the UP Senate occasionally

adds new exam deadlines, such as the April and graduate deadlines. Professors and assistants also offer consultations at least twice a week to support student progress.
Certification of results ensures proper documentation of student progress. Article 31 of the UP Regulation for bachelor's Programs mandates maintaining physical student files, managed by the student services office. The SEMS electronic system, governed by UP regulations, enables academic record storage and retrieval, accessible by offices such as the dean's office and student services.
Student transfer procedures within UP or from other institutions are detailed in the Regulation for Master's Studies, specifically in Articles 13–16.

Standard 5.3 The study program ensures appropriate conditions and support for outgoing and incoming students (national and international students). (ESG 1.4)

The process for transferring students between study programs, whether within the university or to/from other higher education institutions, is governed by the Regulation for Bachelor Studies of UP, specifically outlined in Articles 13–16. Relevant announcements and details regarding academic mobility are published on the university's website.
Students participating in international mobility programs at universities, research institutes, or similar research centers have their grades and ECTS transferred in accordance with the "Regulation No. 2/111, 2017 on Student Academic Mobility at the University of Prishtina."
The grade and ECTS equivalence process follows clear procedures under the supervision of the Vice-Dean for Teaching and Student Affairs, with support from the Head of the Study Program and the Coordinator for Academic Development at the Faculty of Electrical and Computer Engineering.
However, discussions with students revealed that there are no academic mobility opportunities available at FECE. While the university offers a variety of exchange and mobility programs, FECE has only a limited number of such opportunities.

Standard 5.4 The study program delivery is ensured through adequate resources for student support. The needs of a diverse student population (part-time students, mature students, students from abroad, students from under-represented and vulnerable groups, students with learning difficulties and disabilities, etc.) are taken into account. (ESG 1.6)

SER pp. 100-101 demonstrates the adequate support for students from academic staff .
For student counselling, UP provides several support centers, including the Health Center, the Career and Alumni Center, and the Office for International Affairs. However, as it was mentioned in the SER page 100, the university lacks a dedicated counselling center for emotional or family-related concerns and has no agreements with external institutions offering psychological support. Career guidance and international-related matters are managed by the Career Development Center and the External Relations Office, while students seeking legal advice can consult the faculty secretary.

As per the UP Senate, faculty staff are required to offer consultation services, providing two meeting slots per week where students can visit professors or university assistants to address any concerns. Professors must also offer additional consultation sessions, either in person or virtually, to support students with their bachelor thesis, seminar work, or internships.
Moreover, university assistants for specific courses provide tutoring sessions, either in person or online, as well as additional lab exercises to help students with case study projects, often conducted in groups.
The rights and responsibilities of students are clearly outlined in the Statute of UP and the Regulation for Master Studies, both accessible on the university and faculty websites. These documents define the entitlements and obligations students must adhere to throughout their academic journey.

ET recommendations:

2. *Encourage students to actively participate in the evaluation questionnaires of the courses and academic staff. This process should be done continuously, so it can be implemented by next academic year and present the results by next accreditation process.*
3. *Develop academic mobility schemes for students at the faculty level. By next accreditation round, the implementation of this recommendation shall be presented.*
4. *Just as for the other standards, the SER will have to be tailored to address the new regulations system for future applications.*

6. RESEARCH

Standard 6.1. The study program aligns with the institution's/academic unit's mission and the research strategic goals.

The research objectives of the study program are in line with the HEI's strategy and the University of Pristina's 2024-2028 strategic plan, which includes boosting research output of FECE by motivating staff to publish in internationally recognized journals relevant to their fields.

The program is supported by financial, logistical, and human resources. The faculty aids professional development by helping staff publish in peer-reviewed journals and present at conferences, using a dedicated budget and participation in research projects. To expand its budget, the faculty collaborates in international research projects and provides professional services to other institutions.

Research activities are governed by clear policies that adhere to international standards. For promotion and funding, only papers relevant to the field and published in recognized conferences and journals, e. g. indexed by Thomson Reuters and Scopus, are considered.

To encourage innovation, legal frameworks are being developed, and FECE's internal regulations are being aligned with the Law on Intellectual Property of the Republic of Kosovo.

Standard 6.2. The academic staff engaged in the study program is committed and supported to achieve high-quality research work and/or professional activity.

The research and professional activities of the academic staff are validated through multiple channels. FECE's staff including members of the department of power systems publish according to the "Regulation for selection procedures for appointment, re-appointment, and advancement," engage in applied research, e. g. through agreements with the Kosova Judicial Council and Tax Authority and participate in the annual research seminar of FECE featuring speakers from the Albanian diaspora and FECE staff.

Furthermore, some of the staff members present their research work within the framework of COST actions (European Cooperation in Science and Technology). Some of the listed topics may not focus on power systems.

Standard 6.3 The academic staff engaged in the delivery of the study program is encouraged to participate in different aspects of cooperation with national and international partners.

FECE staff collaborate on research with colleagues locally and internationally and integrate their research into teaching, particularly in the "Power Systems" program. They use their research findings and project materials, including those from COST actions, as class examples and case studies.

The academic staff are supported in collaborating with local businesses through joint research, development strategies, and equipment sharing. FECE partners with local industries to facilitate student placements and professional work, having agreements with organizations like the Energy Corporation of Kosovo, KOSTT, and Kosovar Electricity Distribution Company. New partnerships are underway with IPKO, Solaborate, and others.

The academic staff are also supported in engaging in technology transfer and collaborations to share knowledge with industry and the public sector.

Standard 6.4 The teaching staff engaged in the study program has a proven record of research results on the same topics as their teaching activity.

Academic staff in the study program are encouraged to incorporate their research findings and scholarly work into their teaching, ensuring relevance to their courses.

They show a robust track record of research and accomplishments in their respective fields.

Students in the program participate in research activities alongside the academic staff, including involvement in FECE projects, though these projects are not specific to power systems.

ET recommendations:

1. *Regarding the SER as a whole, it has been prepared with the previous evaluation system in mind. For the next accreditation evaluations, the SER should address individually each standard indicator for easier evaluation.*
2. *Increasing the number of publications and citations is essential to demonstrate expertise and enhance the opportunity to acquire EU projects.*
3. *Increasing and introducing funds to motivate master graduates to do PhD and enhance the research oriented activities.*

7. INFRASTRUCTURE AND RESOURCES

During the visit to the campus of University of Prishtina, the premises have been well maintained, as well as slightly expanding in their spaces and equipment.

Standard 7.1. The HEI ensures adequate premises and equipment for performing education processes and research. ESG (1.6)

Indicators 7.1.1 and 7.1.2 refer to the adequacy of the premises and laboratories for conducting educational activities. As the top university in the country, that is clearly the case. Within the budget limitations that all educational institutions face in one way or another, the FECE's facilities are well equipped for the implementation of the program, thus meeting this requirement. Indicator 7.1.3 refers to the software available for use under the program. In this regard, the SER lists 12 different software programs used across the syllabi, some of which are license-based and others being open-source. Altogether, the requirement can be considered as met. Indicator 7.1.4 refers to the potential capacity for students. Based on calculations made for previous accreditation rounds, although more spaces have been commissioned, the capacity of the previously available labs and rooms remains the same, and

thus the capacity will continue to be 60 students. Finally, indicator 7.1.5 refers to the accessibility of the premises to students with disabilities. The accessibility present since previous accreditation rounds remains available, thus this indicator is considered as complied. Overall this standard and all its indicators are fully met.

Standard 7.2 The HEI ensures adequate library resources for study program. (ESG 1.6)

On the second standard the focus is on the library. Indicator 7.2.1 refers to the availability of reading spaces, working spaces and books in stock. Both reading rooms and working spaces are present in the faculty, as well as reported in the SER, although no detail is given on the book stock situation they had been sufficient in previous accreditation rounds. For indicator 7.2.2 is made in reference to the access hours of the library. No mention of this is made in the SER, thus this will be considered not compliant. On indicators 7.2.3 and 7.2.4 it refers to the number of seats in reading and working spaces, which is somewhat redundant with indicator 7.2.1. In both cases the library is considered sufficient. On indicator 7.2.5 is made reference to the book stock specifically, and no specific reference is made to this in the SER, and thus this indicator will be considered as not met. Finally, indicator 7.2.6 refers to the library's subscription to publications, to which the SER cites access to two online digital libraries, thus meeting the requirements. Overall, with four out of six compliant indicators the standard is considered as met.

Standard 7.3 The study program is appropriately funded to deliver its intended educational activities and research. (ESG 1.6)

On the first indicator of this standard, it refers to the financial plan of for the program. In this regard, the SER highlights several funding sources, some of which originate from the private sector but mainly from the government as a public institution. Although the SER could be more specific on the program, as it focuses mostly at the faculty level, it is clear that the funding for the program is available, and it is reflected in the constant improvements on the labs and equipment. On indicator 7.3.2 refers specifically to the external sources of funding, to which several examples are cited, and as the indicator itself does not express any level of detail, the mentions will suffice. Finally, on indicator 7.33 refers to the use of the externally acquired funds. Again, the faculty's budget plan covers a range of activities that include the development and improvement of the program, which naturally includes the program. Therefore, this standard is considered as complied with.

ET recommendations:

1. *Regarding the SER as a whole, it has been prepared with the previous evaluation system in mind. For the next accreditation evaluations, the SER should address individually each standard indicator for easier evaluation.*
2. *Opening or access hours to the library should be reported in the SER, in order to match with indicators of the new regulations. This should be reflected in the next accreditation rounds.*
3. *A table with a list of textbook titles, linked to their respective courses and amount available at the library should be produced and presented for the next accreditation evaluation.*
4. *A budget plan specific to the program under accreditation should be presented for the next accreditation evaluation, which should include a clear distinction between public granted funds and privately acquired funds.*

OVERALL EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE ET

In conclusion, the Expert Team considers that the study program in *Power Systems and Energy Management MSc* offered by the University Prishtina is ***Fully compliant*** with the standards included in the *KAA Accreditation manual* and, therefore, recommends *to accredit* the study program for a duration of 5 *years* with a number of *40* students to be enrolled in the program.

FINAL RECOMMENDATION OF THE EXPERT TEAM	
1. MISSION, OBJECTIVES AND ADMINISTRATION	Fully Compliant
2. QUALITY MANAGEMENT	Substantially Compliant
3. ACADEMIC STAFF *Mandatory	Fully Compliant
4. EDUCATIONAL PROCESS CONTENT	Substantially Compliant
5. STUDENTS	Substantially Compliant
6. RESEARCH	Fully Compliant
7. INFRASTRUCTURE AND RESOURCES *Mandatory	Fully compliant
Overall Compliance	**Fully Compliant**

Expert Team

Chair

Farfan	**Francisco Javier Farfan Orozco**	**10/03/25**
(Signature)	(Print Name)	(Date)

Member

	**Faouzi Derbel**	**10/03/25**
(Signature)	(Print Name)	(Date)

Member

	**Issabek Muratov**	**10/03/25**
(Signature)	(Print Name)	(Date)