



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 THERMOENERGETICS AND
RENEWABLE ENERGY***

RE-ACCREDITATION

REPORT OF THE EXPERT TEAM



27th of May, Pristina

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	2
1. INTRODUCTION	2
1.1. Context	2
1.2. Site visit schedule	3
1.3. A brief overview of the institution and program under evaluation.....	6
2. PROGRAM EVALUATION	7
2.1. Mission, objectives and administration	7
2.2. Quality management.....	10
2.3. Academic staff.....	12
2.4. Educational process content	16
2.5. Students	21
2.6. Research	24
2.7. Infrastructure and resources.....	27
3. OVERALL EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE ET	31
4. APPENDICES (<i>if available</i>).....	32

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Context

Date of site visit: 5th of May 2024

Expert Team (ET) members:

- *Dr. Francisco Javier Farfan Orozco*
- *Dr. Gabor Dombay*



- *Assoc. Prof. D. Sc. Tea Marohnić*
- *Arnoldas Solovjovas (Student Expert)*

Coordinators from Kosovo Accreditation Agency (KAA):

- *Milot Hasangjekaj*
- *Leona Kovaci*

Sources of information for the Report:

- *Self-evaluation report “Bachelor of Science in Thermoenergetics and Renewable Energy”*
- *KAA Accreditation Manual (February 2021)*
- *KAA Accreditation report template*
- *KAA Manual for External Reviewers*
- *Syllabi*
- *Staff CVs*
- *Requested documents: Corrected syllabi for discrepancies, Syllabi metadata file, FME Strategic plan, FME Statistics.*

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 Pristina “Hasan Prishtina” Faculty of Mechanical Engineering	
Programmes:	Thermoenergetics and Renewable Energy, BSc, 180 ECTS (Re-accreditation) Thermoenergetics and Renewable Energy, MSc, 120 ECTS (Re-accreditation) Road Traffic, MSc, 120 ECTS (Re-accreditation)
Site visit on (hybrid):	27 May 2024
Expert Team:	Dr. Francisco Farfan Dr. Gabor Dombay Assoc. Prof. D. Sc. Tea Marohnić Mr. Arnoldas Solovjovas – Student expert.



Republika e Kosovës
Republika Kosova - Republic of Kosovo



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

Coordinators of the KAA:	Milot Hasangjekaj, KAA Officer Leona Kovaci, KAA Officer
--------------------------	---

Site Visit Programme

Time	Meeting	Participants
09:00 – 10:00	Meeting with the management of the faculty where the programme is integrated	Prof. Dr. Ahmet Shala Prof. Dr. Ilir Doçi Fatmire Kuçi, Faculty Secretary
10.05 – 10.55	Meeting with quality assurance representatives and administrative staff	Prof. Ass. Dr. Shkelzen Shabani, Coordinator for Academic Development Prof. Asoc. Dr. Afrim Gjelaj, Vice-Dean Besnik Loxha, Office for Academic Development and Quality Msc. Liridon Bytyqi, IT Officer Bsc. Fatlum Grisholli, Assets and Logistic Officer
11:00 – 12:00	Meeting with the heads of the study programme Thermoenergetics and Renewable Energy, BSc, 180 ECTS (Room 440) Dr. Francisco Farfan Mr. Arnoldas Solovjovas – Student expert.	Prof. Dr. Rexhep Selimaj Prof. Asoc. Dr. Bedri Dragusha Prof. Ass. Dr. Drenusha Krasniqi Alidema
11:00 – 12:00	Meeting with the heads of the study programme Thermoenergetics and Renewable Energy, MSc, 120 ECTS (Room L1) – Office of Vice-Dean Prof. Asoc. Dr. Xhevahir Bajrami Dr. Gabor Dombay	Prof. Dr. Naser Sahiti Prof. Ass. Dr. Drilon Meha Prof. Ass. Dr. Bukurije Hoxha
11:00 – 12:00	Meeting with the heads of the study programme Road Traffic, MSc, 120 ECTS (Room 423) Assoc. Prof. D. Sc. Tea Marohnić	Prof. Asoc. Dr. Ramadan Mazrekaj Prof. Asoc. Dr. Ferat Shala Prof. Asoc. Dr. Fitore Abdullahu
12:00 – 13:00	Lunch break	Vice-Dean Prof. Asoc. Dr. Xhevahir Bajrami
13:00 – 13.45	Visiting Facilities	Prof. Asoc. Dr. Xhevahir Bajrami, Vice-Dean Traffic and Transport Lab's Prof. Ass. Dr. Gëzim Hoxha Thermoenergetics and Renewable Energy Lab's Ass. Dr. Blerina Bylykbashi Dr. Arben Avdiu Other FME Lab's MSc. Mexhait Ristemi MSc. Mehmet Zeqiraj
13:45 – 14:45	Meeting with teaching staff	Prof. Ass. Dr. Arlinda Rrecaj

4



		<p>Prof. Dr. Xhevat Berisha Prof. Ass. Dr. Riad Ramadani Prof. Ass. Dr. Ramadan Duraku Ass. Msc. Rifat Krasniqi Ass. MSc. Arlinda Bresaj Ass. MSc. Liridon Sejdiu Ass. Msc. Besart Berisha Ass. Dr. Gazmend Krasniqi</p>
14:45 – 15:45	Meeting with students and graduates	<p>Master students:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Eronita Jasiqi2. Leunita Sadiku3. Genc Rexhaj4. Shaban Thaci5. Flori Cikaqi6. Florjana Osmanaj <p>leunita.sadiku@student.uni-pr.edu eronita.Jasiqi@student.uni-pr.edu genc.rexhaj@student.uni-pr.edu</p> <p>Bachelor students:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">7. Albin Zharjani8. Valjeta Haxhiu9. Eriona Fetahaj <p>eriona.fetahaj@student.uni-pr.edu albin.zharjani@student.uni-pr.edu valjeta.haxhiu@student.uni-pr.edu</p> <p>Graduated:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">10. Yll Prebreza11. Alma Rexhepi12. Ermira Gashi13. Perparim Dragusha14. Habib Sahitolli <p>yllprebreza19@gmail.com rexhepia14@gmail.com</p>
15:45 – 16:30	Meeting with employers of graduates and external stakeholders	<p>From companies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Zeqir Fetoshi - Select Prima SH.P.K-2. Ismajl Bafjari - INSI3. Selman Kolgeci - N.SH Liriu4. Bujar Istogu, Ministry of Industry, Entrepreneurship and Trade



		<p>5. Dr. sc. Fisnik Osmani- Termokos 6. Msc. Mimoza Shahini- Comfort Clima</p> <p>fisnik.o@gmail.com mimoza.shahini@comfort-clima.com</p>
16:30 – 16:35	Internal meeting of KAA staff and experts	
16:35 – 16:40	Closing meeting with the management of the faculty and program	<p>Prof. Dr. Ahmet Shala Prof. Dr. Ilir Doçi Prof. Asoc. Dr. Xhevahir Bajrami Prof. Asoc. Dr. Afrim Gjelaj Fatmire Kuçi, Faculty Secretary</p>

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

The Higher Technical School in Pristina was established in 1961, while the Technical Faculty was established in 1965, from which the Faculty of Mechanical Engineering (FME) derived. This summer 2024, FME is postulating for re-accreditation of a renewed bachelor program on “Thermoenergetics and Renewable Energy”. The UP is presenting the program for re-accreditation after 14 years of continuous accreditation.

FME’s mission is declared as “FME trains students in the fields of mechanical engineering, industry, technology, transport, etc, for the labor market; contributes to scientific development, research and educational work, cooperation with the economy, with public and private institutions-companies by carrying out scientific - research work, development and professional projects in the field of mechanical engineering and industry”.

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, FME’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 Thermoenergetics and Renewable Energy, the FME 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 has a well-defined didactic and research concept”, the study program does have a well-defined didactic structure. Starting with



mandatory foundation courses in math and physics as such programmes absolutely require, and moving forward to increasingly advanced topics, both in mandatory courses and elective choices.

Standard 1.4 states “There are formal policies, guidelines and regulations dealing with recurring procedural or academic matters. These are made public to all staff and students”. as clarified in the conversations during the visit, 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 that apply to the program. The pointed out public regulations are;

- *Law on Higher Education of the Republic of Kosovo, 2010,*
- *The Statute of the University of Pristina,*
- *The strategic plan of the University of Pristina "Hasan Prishtina" 2017-2019,*
- *Strategic Education Plan of Kosovo 2017-2021,*
- *Strategy for Scientific/Artistic Research and Development Activity 2013-2015*
- *UPHP regulations,*
- *Internal regulations of the academic unit.*

These laws, statues and regulations are publicly available online, and thus available to students and staff. Therefore, the compliance of this standard will be considered as met.

Regarding Standard 1.5 “All staff and students comply with internal regulations relating to ethical conduct in research, teaching and assessment in all academic and administrative activities.”, the regulations provided in the SER and mentioned during the visit 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. The regulations specifically mentioned in the SER are;

- *Regulations for quality assurance and assessment at the University of Pristina, 2016,*
- *Regulations for academic mobility of students at the University of Pristina, 2017,*
- *Guidelines for reviewing and revising the Syllabus, 2018,*
- *Guidelines for the evaluation of subjects by students and their use in UP, 2018,*
- *Regulation for Supplementing the amendment of Regulation no. 163, dt. 15.1.2015, for the establishment and principles of operation of the academic unit's advisory body, 2018,*
- *Regulations for Bachelor studies, 2022,*
- *Regulations for Master studies, 2023,*



- *The regulation for scientific publications in UPHP.
Thus, the standard can be considered as compliant.*

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 FME.

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: Substantially compliant (83%)



ET recommendations:

- 1. I highly recommend establishing a program review protocol with specific periodicity that can be declared and reported. It is the only thing that was not particularly clear and resulted on the non-compliant standard.*

2.2. Quality management

FME Quality Assurance heavily relies on UP Quality Assurance documents and the Office for Academic Development and Quality, especially for the analysis of questionnaires and providing feedback. Survey data are collected through the electronic platform SMC, centrally at the University level. They evaluate available resources, faculty policies, and procedures among other aspects.

Academic and administrative staff assesses their own performance through UP defined questionnaires. ET was informed this is performed once every 3-4 years. These evaluations encourage reflection on performance, identification of strengths and areas for improvement, and consideration of how effectively responsibilities and goals are being met. Additionally, staff contribute to external evaluation processes and collaborate in drafting relevant documents.

Evaluation processes and planning for improvement are integrated into normal planning processes through collecting data, analysing results and reviewing outcomes according to documents and procedures defined at UP level. This involves actions for performance and quality based on results of evaluations, also regulated through relevant documents. The FME strategic plan sets clear objectives, identifies areas for enhancement, and outlines actions to achieve these improvements. Most activities are planned to be done continuously.

As is stated in SER, results of the internal QA system are taken into account for further development of the study program. For example, working hours have been harmonized to ECTS assigned for particular course. From syllabi presented, this seems to be implemented properly. Advisory board and communication with external stakeholders have resulted in improving of study program curricula (for example introducing new, contemporary subjects). Survey data is being collected from students, graduates and employers. Data collected from students are processed by Office for Academic Development and Quality at UP, through electronic platform SMC. Data are presented to Dean of FME by Coordinator for Academic Development. Academic staff can see the results using their individual accounts. Data from



graduates and employers are mostly collected through collaboration with Advisory board. However, survey data is not publicly available.

As is stated in SER, results of the internal QA system are taken into account for further development of the study program. For example, working hours have been harmonized to ECTS assigned for particular course. From syllabi presented, this seems to be implemented properly. Advisory board and communication with external stakeholders have resulted in improving of study program curricula (for example introducing new, contemporary subjects). FME ensures that reports on the overall quality of the program are prepared along with reaccreditation cycles for the study program. SER is indeed thoroughly prepared with sufficient proofs, performance indicators (written rather descriptive than given in numbers), an SWOT analysis.

As was mentioned before, the systems, processes, and policies put in place to ensure that the program maintains high standards of quality are set on University level. As is observed, QA system is implemented at FME level, well-functioning and in line with contemporary standards.

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 student workload, academic success and employment of graduates.	X	
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 (89%)

ET recommendations:

1. *ET recommends systematic analysis of relatively low number of graduations per year in order to determine underlying issues and mitigate the dropout rate.*
2. *ET recommends collecting information from graduates and employers through designated questionnaires.*
3. *ET recommends summarized results of student evaluations to be publicly available for each academic year.*
4. *ET recommends that in future detailed results of survey data results are included in SER.*

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 was one elective courses of the second year of the study program that had not been assigned to any specific staff member, thus opening the possibility for additional staff to be needed, although due to the topic of the course the staff member should come from the faculty of chemistry as specified in the first response to experts.



Regarding Standard 3.1, the current list of academic staff as either part time employees or permanent (8 permanent, 5 part time and 8 under fixed term contract). 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. Although this information is given with further detail in the syllabus of every course, the requirement is for the information to be clearly presented in a table in the SER. Therefore, this standard is not met. Moreover, in the table presented in the SER the program responsible #3 Drenusha Krasniqi Alidema is presented with an expired contract of several months (as expired in February 7th 2024). Also, the program responsible #2 Bedri Dragusha, along with 3 other professors present a contract expiration date that would be shorter than the academic cycle of the program of the next 3 years. 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. The SER states that over 75% of the staff are full-time, but I suggest that they clarify this in the table presented for Standard 3.1, specifying which staff is full-time. From the staff CV's, there are 14 staff presented as full-time and 11 presented as part-time. According to this share, more than 50% of the staff is full-time and thus the standard is met, however not at the 75% rate stated in the SER.



About Standard 3.5, it refers to the amount of full-time 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, seminars, symposiums and conferences 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, during the visit in the meeting with the stakeholders it was clear that some state enterprises often consulted with the staff for problem solving, thus addressing the engagement with society. This standard is clearly met.

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. It is further indicated that the results of the conducted evaluations are made publicly available. The information in the SER is consistent with the discussions with the staff during the visit, thus the standard is met.



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 that the teaching staff was open to incorporating new scientific findings into their work, and that students are encouraged to get the state of the art from scientific publications made available to them. Therefore, the standard is considered as complied.

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 given the responsibility of a maximum of one course, however, two members of the staff that get past retirement age this year, Hysni Osmani and Sadullah Avdiu are still marked as full-time employees, while by the start of the next academic cycle they cannot be full-time anymore. This can be considered a discrepancy and thus this standard is not met.

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 publicly available.	X	
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 (70%)

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.*
- 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.*
- 3. The situation regarding the two full-time employees that are now under retirement age should be clarified, especially considering that if those 2 employees are moved from the full-time list to the part-time list, Standard 3.4 would then be also failed.*
- 4. The situation with the fixed-term contract staff members whose contract term is expired or would expire during the first cycle of the program should be clarified.*

2.4. Educational process content

The following section 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,



renewable energy, energy storage, 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 and languages. The program further expands, through mandatory and elective courses, into deeper and broader knowledge related to energy engineering and mechanics. Therefore, the program addresses multiple needs of skilled workforce in society, and the standard can be considered as met.

On Standard 4.2, after the 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 were pointed out. These discrepancies, mostly in terms of course load hours to ECTS credits, were subsequently clarified. Thus, the program is now considered 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. The syllabi of the courses establish the time spent in the different activities and thus the standard can be considered as met.

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, both students and teaching staff were consistent with the bilateral interactions between them. 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. Therefore, the standard will be considered as met.

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, and the evaluation methods and grading methods were incorporated after the discussions during the visit. This standard is met.

Standard 4.9 follows a similar line of reasoning, referring to the comparison between the way the evaluations are proposed for the program under evaluation and similar programs in other universities. The evaluation methods and tools appear reasonable and comparable with equivalent or similar programs. In addition, they offer specific assessment methods tailored to every course, thus the standard is complied with.

On Standard 4.10, refers to the policies of procedures to adjust to correct inconsistencies in the evaluation methods. The SER makes reference to the statutes of the University of Prishtina. 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). Thus the standard is met.

Standard 4.11 refers to the practice share of the program. Professional practice is assigned ECTS credits as required by the standard. 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 “Professional internship”.

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. This is also consistent with the conversations with the stakeholders during the site visit.

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 reaching the learning outcomes. Learning outcomes are explained and discussed with students from the perspective of their relevance to the students' development.	X	
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: Fully compliant (100%)

ET recommendations:



1. *The definition of “different groups of students” (Standard 4.7) could be more specific both from the KAA side as well as from the UP side. This would add clarity and specificity for the experts to more accurately be able to measure compliance with this standard.*

2.5. Students

Based on the provided SER document and observations during the site visit, it is clear that the admission procedures for the Bachelor’s program in Thermoenergetics and Renewable Energy are transparent and fair for prospective students. To gain admission, candidates must complete their national Matura exams (receive a graduation diploma) and additionally, the university tests their mathematical knowledge in an admission exam (SER 155). To be accepted, students must pass both exams (Matura and admission) with at least the minimum required scores. A specially formed commission checks and publishes the results, and students have the right to file an appeal within three days (SER 155). During the site visit, program students explained that the admission procedure is well-designed and that the mathematics-based admission exam effectively filters out students who lack the necessary foundational knowledge.

According to the provided statistics on enrolled students, the average number of enrolled students from 2020 to 2023 was around 50, while the maximum allowed number of students is 80 (SAR 21). The number of government-funded places may vary depending on the university's capabilities, the needs of social partners, and approval from the Ministry of Education. The expert team was interested in the average drop-out rates for this bachelor’s program. Based on the provided table, the drop-out rate ranges from 10-20%, which is relatively low, considering the high drop-out rates in many engineering programs during the first year due to challenging fundamental courses (Mathematics, Physics, Programming, etc.). During the site visit, faculty heads and program managers explained that many students drop out because they only enrolled to receive government support, some find the study modules too difficult, and others leave for job opportunities in the private sector. However, statistics show that students often return after a few years to complete their studies.

Student groups are organized to ensure that both practical and theoretical learning outcomes are efficiently achieved. Group sizes are planned to facilitate effective discussions during lectures and seminars. For laboratory work, students are divided into smaller groups, each with specific tasks. The results are stored in the university's SEMS electronic system. During the site visit, students mentioned that the study program is flexible, allowing them to extend



the duration of their studies if they find a job. Teachers also adjust deadlines for final projects or reports based on student requests and can make necessary changes (SAR 156).

The University has an established feedback system in place, where questionnaires are distributed to students, teachers, and staff at the end of each semester (SAR 212-228). Although the student survey is mandatory, the faculty administration noted that the feedback provided is not always efficient. The collected data is reviewed by the central quality committee, which formulates an action plan based on the responses. Subsequently, the data is shared with the dean, who may meet with teachers whose performance was poorly evaluated. In some cases, teachers have been dismissed based on student feedback, demonstrating the effectiveness of the feedback system at both the faculty and university levels. During meetings with program teachers, various feedback methods were discussed, ranging from one-on-one discussions to written feedback on reports. Students confirmed that they receive substantial support from their teachers. For instance, teachers are supportive of students' research efforts and may even facilitate their participation in conferences. Additionally, teachers and support staff assist students in choosing appropriate career paths.

The University offers various services, including career consultations, program transfer consultations, emotional support, and assistance with financial and family issues (SAR 160). The International Office strives to increase the number of international exchange programs and placements for students. However, participation in exchange programs is low, as observed during meetings where only one student mentioned knowing someone who studied abroad. Some students cited a lack of attractive foreign universities on the list. Nonetheless, students benefit from summer lectures by visiting professors, and the administration is easily accessible (SAR 158). The expert team believes that these services help reduce dropout rates and support better career choices during and after studies. In the SAR 176, it was noted that "The Library of the Faculty is not linked to regional or European network of libraries." When questioned about this, faculty heads explained that financial constraints prevented maintaining these connections but assured that future plans aim to resolve this issue. Each faculty has its own library, regularly updated with necessary literature as requested by teachers. Students reported no significant issues accessing required books or articles, indicating that current resources are adequate. Most services are in good condition, except for one issue mentioned in SAR 62. It was reported that an international student received translations from other students during classes due to not knowing the Albanian language. This situation raises concerns about the initial acceptance of students who do not know Albanian. To ensure learning outcomes are met, it is recommended that such cases be prevented in the future.



During the site visit, the experts inquired about the state of the academic ethics culture. It was explained that each year, students are informed about the main rules of academic ethics, including proper citation and copyrights. Ethical and disciplinary committees are established at the faculty level. However, the experts learned that the faculty currently does not have a plagiarism detection system for any written work. Each submission is checked manually, and any suspected cases of plagiarism are referred to the responsible committee. The experts strongly recommend installing a plagiarism detection system as soon as possible, as it is challenging for academic staff to thoroughly analyze and identify plagiarism without such tools.

The experts also asked students if they felt integrated into the academic community at the faculty level. The students affirmed this, stating that they are aware of their rights and obligations and feel empowered to pursue their interests. They have the opportunity to join the Student Parliament, which selects their representatives at both the Faculty and University levels. Student representatives mentioned that their voices are heard in all governing bodies and that tangible changes are made based on their needs. The faculty administration also noted that the student organization is influential and contributes valuable solutions and discussions during meetings.

Standard	Compliance	
	Yes	No
<i>Standard 5.1.</i> There is a clear and formally adopted admission procedure at institutional level that the study program respects when organising students' recruitment. Admission requirements are consistently and fairly applied for all students.	X	
<i>Standard 5.2.</i> All students enrolled in the study program possess a high school graduation diploma or other equivalent document of study, according to MEST requirements.	X	
<i>Standard 5.3.</i> The study groups are dimensioned so as to ensure an effective and interactive teaching and learning process.	X	
<i>Standard 5.4.</i> Feedback to students on their performance and results of assessments is given promptly and accompanied by mechanisms for assistance if needed.	X	
<i>Standard 5.5.</i> The results obtained by the students throughout the study cycles are certified by the academic record.	X	
<i>Standard 5.6.</i> Flexible treatment of students in special situations is ensured with respect to deadlines and formal requirements in the program and to all examinations.	X	



<i>Standard 5.7.</i> Records of student completion rates are kept for all courses and for the program as a whole and included among quality indicators.	X	
<i>Standard 5.8.</i> Effective procedures are being used to ensure that work submitted by students is original.		X
<i>Standard 5.9.</i> Students' rights and obligations are made publicly available, promoted to all those concerned and enforced equitably; these will include the right to academic appeals.	X	
<i>Standard 5.10.</i> The students' transfer between higher education institutions, faculties and study programs is clearly regulated in formal internal documents.	X	
<i>Standard 5.11.</i> Academic staff is available at sufficient scheduled times for consultation and advice to students. Adequate tutorial assistance is provided to ensure understanding and ability to apply learning.	X	

Compliance level: Fully compliant (91%)

ET recommendations:

- 1. Experts recommend for the University to install plagiarism system for more efficient student work check.*
- 2. Promote international exchange programmes with more possibilities for the local students.*
- 3. Ensure that future incoming foreign students would have the minimum needed language skills.*
- 4. Ensure that the non existing connection to the European network of libraries will not have an influence on the learnig outcomes.*

2.6. Research

In the 2021 re-accreditation report the expert team (ET) expressed the lack of strategic research plan of the Faculty. Now the Strategic Action Plan of 2023-2025 of FME includes an entire chapter for research related strategic steps, which the ET considers a reasonable development. At the same time the ET still misses that the Faculty has not defined specific directions where it would like to focus its research activity. The ET believes that research activity is still mostly based on individual initiatives, which are although beneficial, are not subsequent and fairly accidental. The SER list a number of energy related research projects the Faculty is or has been undertaking, many of them are in co-operation with other institutions, which are a welcome scenario.



Republika e Kosovës
Republika Kosova - Republic of Kosovo



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

The Faculty has introduced a reward system to encourage the publication activity of the staff. In the last 3 years the publication output of the Faculty has been spectacularly increased, possibly the reward system had a fair share in this result.

In The SER the SWOT analyses of research identifies certain weaknesses as follows:

- *The lack of sufficient funds for the publication of scientific works,*
- *Lack of sufficient funds for scientific research,*
- *Lack of funds for participation in conferences,*
- *Lack of scientific journal of FME due to lack of funds for financing,*
- *Access to the basics of indexing scientific works.*

The ET might see some contradiction between the some points and the information that was given during the meetings: the reward system of publications and a university fund to participate in conferences seems to tackle some of these weaknesses.

If FME considers that its own scientific journal would be beneficial, it can surely find the ways to establish it on an open access basis without significant financial requirements.

Overall, the ET can see a significant advancement in FME's research and publication activities in the last 3 years, which outlines a fairly positive direction of development, and shows the commitment of the faculty management.



Compliance calculation

<i>Standard</i>	Compliance	
	Yes	No
<i>Standard 6.1.</i> The study program has defined scientific/applied research objectives (on its own or as part of a research centre 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	
<i>Standard 6.2.</i> 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	
<i>Standard 6.3.</i> 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	
<i>Standard 6.4.</i> The academic staff has a proven track record of research results on the same topics as their teaching activity.	X	
<i>Standard 6.5.</i> The academic and research staff publish their work in speciality 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	
<i>Standard 6.6.</i> Research is validated through: scientific and applied research publications, artistic products, technological transfer through consultancy centres, scientific parks and other structures for validation.	X	
<i>Standard 6.7.</i> 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
<i>Standard 6.8.</i> Academic and research staff publish under the name of the institution in Kosovo they are affiliated to as full time staff.	X	
<i>Standard 6.9.</i> 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	
<i>Standard 6.10.</i> Policies are established for ownership of intellectual property and clear procedures set out for commercialization of ideas developed by staff and students.	X	
<i>Standard 6.11.</i> Students are engaged in research projects and other activities.	X	

Compliance level: 91% - Fully compliant

26



ET recommendations:

- 1. In the framework of UP's Research Development Plan, define the strategic research areas the Faculty should be focused on.*
- 2. Try to establish the Faculty's own scientific journal on a cost-effective, open access basis.*
- 3. The management of the Faculty should establish funding opportunities, and effectively support the departments and the staff to establish and carry out research projects, in accordance with the research development plan.*

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. From a qualitative perspective, most of the lab equipment for the dedicate labs looked quite updated. From the quantitative front, I used the corrected syllabi to estimate the amount of lab hours for the whole program cycle, which amounted to about 300 hours.

*Therefore, every group of students should have access to at least that amount of hours each year to those labs. It is assumed 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. It can thus be understood that for 60 students that the program is requesting, groups of as few as 2 students already have sufficient access to labs, thus the standard can be considered as complied.

Regarding Standard 7.2, it addresses the financial plan for the study program to assure its sustainability. In this regard, the SER presents a budget of about 400 thousand euros for the 3 year cycle, with additional budget for the department’ library. The SER in addition presents a financial cost for the academic staff over the program’s cycle, which is surprisingly low and only includes the cost for lectures and exercises hours. In comparison with the budget, the financial cost is much lower, which would indicate a relaxed budget coverage. However, without further itemized detail it is not possible to connect the budget with the cost, and further detail is definitely needed.

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 further reaccreditation rounds. However, the standard demands that the ownership or lease deeds are presented, rather than only mentioned. The SER makes reference to those being easily available, but give no further instructions on how to access them. Until these deeds are presented or made available to the expert team, this standard cannot be considered as met.

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 12 rooms that can be used for lecturing with different capacities, and 13 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 (it actually could accommodate 300%). 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. However, no specific number of seats is specified (in contrast with the abovementioned reading room), so beyond the statement the standard cannot be verified. For part C a similar situation, the SER states compliance, but actual number of books relevant to the standard is not provided. 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. A concise list of needed/provided books, licences and seats should be presented so the requirement can be verified.

Finally, Standard 7.6 refers to the accessibility of the facilities to students with especial needs and reduced mobility. As showcased in during the visit, there are accessibility ramps and elevators. 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: a) owned or rented spaces adequate for the educational process; b) owned or rented laboratories, with the adequate equipment for all the compulsory disciplines within the curriculum, wherever the analytical syllabus includes such activities; c) adequate software for the disciplines of study included in the curriculum, with utilisation licence; d) library equipped with reading rooms, group work rooms and its own book stock according to the disciplines included in the curricula	¼	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: a) a number of seats in the reading rooms corresponding to at least 10% of the total number of students in the study program; 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; c) their own book stock from Albanian and foreign speciality	X	



<p>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 (71%)

ET recommendations:

- 1. The specific deeds for ownership or lease of the buildings used by the program should be presented, in reference to standard 7.2.*
- 2. Only one of the four parts of the standard 7.3 is clearly presented, for the others, the total amount of available seats, books, etc. is not presented and that is needed to verify compliance of this standard.*

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, and follow several other recommendations made by the expert team.

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



Republika e Kosovës
Republika Kosova - Republic of Kosovo



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

Area under evaluation	Compliance level
Mission, objectives and administration	Substantially compliant (83%)
Quality management	Substantially compliant (89%)
Academic staff	Substantially compliant (70%)
Educational process content	Fully Compliant (100%)
Students	Fully compliant (91%)
Research	Fully Compliant (91%)
Infrastructure and resources	Substantially compliant (71%)

4. APPENDICES *(if available)*

1. NA



Expert Team

Member

PhD. Francisco Javier Farfan Orozco

14/06/2024

(Signature)

(Print Name)

(Date)

Member

MSc. Arnoldas Solovjovas

14/06/2024

(Signature)

(Print Name)

(Date)

Member

Prof. Dr. Gábor Dombay

14/06/2024

(Signature)

(Print Name)

(Date)

Member

Assoc. Prof. D. Sc. Tea Marohnić

14/06/2024

(Signature)

(Print Name)

(Date)