

# EDUCATIONAL QUALITY ASSESSMENT

## ECONOMY MANAGEMENT

An evaluation of the quality of the bachelor's programme **Management of Enterprise at the Faculty of Economics, University of Zenica**

[Version/draft  
24/05/12

## Table of Contents

---

### Table of Contents

#### Part I

- Chapter 1 Introduction
- Chapter 2 The Assessment Panel
  - 2.1 Composition
  - 2.2 Task Description
  - 2.3 Working method
  - 2.4 Forming an Opinion

#### Part II

- Criterion 1 Educational Objectives and Learning Outcomes
  - Indicator 1.1 Level and Orientation
  - Indicator 1.2 Domain Specific demands
- Criterion 2 Curriculum
  - Indicator 2.1 Correspondence between Objectives and the Content of the Programme
  - Indicator 2.2 Demands Professional and Academic Alignment
  - Indicator 2.3 Coherence Programme
  - Indicator 2.4 Workload
  - Indicator 2.5 Coherence of the Organization of the Learning Process and Contents
  - Indicator 2.6 Master's Thesis
- Criterion 3 Staff
  - Indicator 3.1 Quality of Staff
  - Indicator 3.2 Demands Professional/Academic Alignment
  - Indicator 3.3 Quantity of Staff

Criterion 4      Students

Indicator 4.1 Assessment and Testing

Indicator 4.2 Practical training

Indicator 4.3 Condition of Admission

Indicator 4.4 Student Involvement in the Improvement of the  
Teaching/Learning Processes

Indicator 4.5 Measures for promoting Mobility, Including the Mutual  
Recognition of Credits

Indicator 4.6 Coaching of Students

Indicator 4.7 Information, Consultation and Complaining System

Criterion 5      Means and Facilities

Indicator 5.1 Material Aspects

Criterion 6      Internal Quality Control

Indicator 6.1 Evaluation Results

Indicator 6.2 Measures for Improvement

Indicator 6.3 Involving Co-workers, Students, Alumni and the  
Professional Field

Criterion 7      Results Achieved

Indicator 7.1 Realized Level

Indicator 7.2 Educational Output

Global Opinion

Overview of the opinions

List of the recommendations

Appendices

Curriculum vitae of the members of the assessment panel

Site visite schedule

List of abbreviations

## Part I

---

## General

## 1. Introduction

In accordance with its mission, the assessment panel (henceforth: the panel) presents its findings and its evaluation of **bachelor's programme in Management of Enterprise at Faculty of economics, University of Zenica** in this report.

This report can serve as a basis for the accreditation of the programme. This report is in accordance with the ESABIH guidelines, the panel assessed 7 criteria and 24 indicators. The marks can be adapted at the grading scale of the HEA.

## 2. The Assessment Panel

### 2.1 Composition

The assessment panel is composed in conformity with the ESABIH guidelines.

The panel assigned to evaluate the **bachelor's programme in Management of Enterprise at the Faculty of Economics, University of Zenica**, includes the following members.

Chairperson: Cristina Pinto da Silva

Expert 1: Dražena Gašpar

Student member: Ljubiša Mičić

The assessment of **bachelor's programme in Management of Enterprise at the Faculty of Economics, University of Zenica**, was accompanied and supported by **Slavica Škoro, senior adviser in Agency for Development of Higher Education and Quality Assurance**. She was appointed as secretary of this assessment.

### 2.2 Task Description

Based on the programme's self-evaluation report (SER) and the interviews that were conducted during the assessment visit, the assessment panel will provide the following in its report:

- An evaluation of the criteria and the indicators as defined in the ESABIH framework;
- An all-encompassing evaluation of the programme;
- A formulation of recommendations to bring about quality improvement in the programme.

### 2.3 Working Method

The assessment of the **bachelor's programme in Management of Enterprise at the Faculty of Economics, University of Zenica**, is conducted in conformity with the guidelines of the ESABIH project.

The panel's procedure is characterised by four identifiable phases:

- Phase 1 Preparation
- Phase 2 Visit to the institution of higher education
- Phase 3 Reporting

#### Phase 1 Preparation

Every panel member studies the self-evaluation report and its appendices. The panel members also provide an individual checklist that lists all their questions, their temporary evaluation and their argumentation. The secretary creates a synthesis out of these lists. Following that, the synthesis is thoroughly discussed and provided with arguments.

Based on the discussion and the panel members' questionnaires; the secretary finally makes an inventory of the key points and priorities that should be kept in mind during the interviews and the inspection of materials.

#### Phase 2 Visit to the higher education institution

ESABIH consortium group provides a visit schedule template that can be adjusted to the specific situation of a certain programme if necessary. The visit schedule is included as appendix.

During the assessment, the panel interviews a representative group of all the programme's stakeholders, studies additional information and visits the institution to be able to assess the students' accommodation and available facilities. The panel uses the checklists' and questionnaires' synthesis for further interviews.

The visit schedule contains a few consultation meetings that allow the panel members to exchange their findings with each other and to come to mutual, more definitive evaluations.

At the end of the assessment visit, the panel's chairperson gives an oral report on the panel's experiences and findings, without uttering any explicit value judgments with regard to its contents.

#### Phase 3 Creation of the assessment report

Based on the self-evaluation report, the checklists and the motivations, the secretary draws up a draft of the assessment report, in dialogue with the chairperson and the other panel members.

This draft assessment report describes the panel's evaluation and the motivation per criterium and per indicator. In addition to that, points of attention and possible recommendations for improvement are formulated if found necessary or desirable by the panel members.

The draft assessment report is sent to the study programme for verification of factual errors and formulation of possible remarks with regard to the report's content. The programme's reaction on the report is then discussed by the assessment panel.

## 2.4 Forming an Opinion

In the first phase, the panel establishes an evaluation per indicator. Afterwards, the panel establishes an evaluation per criterium, based on the evaluation of the indicators that make up that criterion.

The criterion evaluation always gives an overview of the indicators' evaluations. In case of a compensation of indicators, the evaluation on criterion level is followed by a motivation and the weighting factor that was used by the panel to come to an evaluation on criterion level. In all other cases, the motivation of the evaluation on criterion level refers to the indicator's argumentation.

All evaluations and weightings follow the decision regulations as formulated in the ESABIH guidelines. At indicator level, the panel grants one of the following scores from this quadruple scale: 'unsatisfactory', 'satisfactory', 'good' or 'excellent'. The score 'unsatisfactory' indicates that the programme does not comply with the generic quality demands for that indicator. The score 'satisfactory' implies that the generic quality demands are met.

The score 'good' indicates that the quality of the programme stands above the generic quality demands that are related to that indicator. The score 'excellent' implies that the quality of the indicator can be seen both nationally and internationally as an example of best practice. The panel intends to motivate every score given to the evaluated indicators as adequately as possible, taking into account the assessment criteria as formulated in the ESABIH framework.

On the basis of the indicator scores, the panel gives a summarising evaluation at criterium level. A positive evaluation means that the generic quality demands of a specific criterium are met, whereas a negative evaluation indicates that they are not.

Lastly, the panel will make a judgement on the overall quality of the programme at the end of the report.

E

These marks can be adopted to the future grading scale of HEA.

## Part II

---

# Assessment Report

## General information on the bachelor's programme

### **Management of Enterprise at the Faculty of Economics, University of Zenica** (provided by the Study Programme and part of the SER)

The Study program "Management of Enterprise" is offered at the Faculty of Economics of the University of Zenica (EF UNZE). This study program is taught within the scientific field of Management and Organization. It lasts for four years (or 8 semesters) and students take 39 courses, including 35 mandatory and 5 elective courses, with 240 ECTS credits in total. There is also a diploma paper as obligatory activity in this study program. Upon graduation, students receive a diploma with the following title: Bachelor in Economics Science, orientation to Management of Enterprise. Zenica – Dobož Canton as a region in the sense of economy, geography, communications, infrastructure, culture and history is located in the central part of Bosnia and Herzegovina (B&H) with twelve municipalities and more than 400.000 inhabitants. This canton has a very favorable geographical location, as well as rich natural resources, industrial and entrepreneurial tradition, investment opportunities, connection with European regions and its own cultural-spiritual identity. However, these economic characteristics did not match with its higher education system since it was prevailed by mono-structural educational institutions represented by two faculties of technical sciences. Before establishing of the study program Management of enterprise at the UNZE, in Zenica City a dislocated study of Faculty of Economics was operating but at the University of Sarajevo during 1970s, which indicates the existence of interest of young people for study disciplines in the field of economics. This dislocated study program was at the very beginning organized as economic academy (a two-year study programme) and afterwards as a four-year study programme (eight semesters). By the time of establishing of the study program of management of enterprise in Zenica-Dobož Canton (ZDC) a high scientific-educational institution for economic research and education in the field of economics did not exist. Considerable public financial resources were paid for financing various projects in the field of economics which, mostly, ended in institutions of other cantons. Some of characteristics which brought about setting up of this study program are: lack of knowledge and experience in the field of management, marketing, quality management, as well as high unemployment rate, lack of entrepreneurial initiative and poor efficiency of economic units. From the perspective of enhancement of existing higher educational system in ZDC the leading ideas for introduction of study program of Management of enterprise were: to ease and accelerate accession of economic subjects to European integration processes, to boost the development of entrepreneurship especially among young people (about 17% of total population of the Federation of B&H resides in ZDC), to foster technical support for small and medium enterprises (SME's).



## Criterion 1. Educational Objectives

### Indicator 1.1 Level and Orientation

Assessment criteria:

The educational objectives are focussed on getting the student to possess general and specific competences mentioned by the study programme. Graduates should have basic knowledge, skills and attitudes that are defined and planned by educational objectives. Students must have an understanding of the scientific-disciplinary basic knowledge that is specific for a certain domain of science, a systematic knowledge of the core elements of a discipline, including the acquisition of a coherent, detailed knowledge partly inspired by the latest developments of the discipline, and knowledge of the structure of the field of study and the connection with other fields of study.

The educational objectives are focussed on getting the student to master general competences such as:

- Obtaining and processing information;
- Ability to reflect critically and to be creative;
- Ability to perform leadership tasks;
- Ability to communicate information, ideas, problems and solutions;
- An attitude of life-long learning.

The educational objectives are also focused on getting the student to master general scientific or (academic) competences such as:

- A research attitude;
- Knowledge of research methods and techniques;
- Ability to collect relevant data that can influence the judgment of social, scientific and ethical questions;
- Ability to appreciate uncertainty and ambiguity;
- The limits of knowledge and the ability to problem guided initiating of research.

The educational objectives are focused on getting the student to master the specific competences in the domain and the scientific field of the study program.

#### **The opinion of the assessment panel: Opinion 1.1**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination and consideration of the following:

**Objectives of the different subjects are well defined in the syllabi. The areas for improvement include: definition of general and specific objectives of the SP and desired academic profile of graduates**

### **Recommendations for improvement:**

**The panel puts forward that a list of general and specific educational goals should be elaborated and included in the programme's description, in order to help assess its alignment with the European Qualification Framework, other national and international programmes and the professional needs and demands.**

## **Indicator 1.2 Domain Specific Demands**

Assessment criteria:

The educational objectives (mentioned as the end qualifications of the student) join the demands that are set by (foreign) colleagues and the relevant work field for an education within the domain (field of study/discipline and / or professional practice). They are in line with the regulations. The end qualifications for bachelor's degrees and master's degrees are derived from the scientific disciplines, the internationally performed research and the courses that are considered to put research into practice in the relevant professional field.

- General study programme objectives (desired final qualifications of the graduates at study programme level) and their genesis;
- Alignment of the objectives with the bachelor's/ master's competences in the Bologna declaration and European Qualification framework;
- Attention for the international dimension in the study programme's objectives;
- Attention for academic/professional/artistic skills in the objectives;
- Familiarity with the objectives among students and staff involved in the study programme;
- Profiling the study programme with regards to domestic and/or foreign study programmes in order to determine the study programme objectives and (including recent and imminent developments) to make the comparison with the own vision on the vocation/discipline;
- Alignment of the objectives with the professional regulations/legislation;
- Alignment of the objectives with the needs and wants of the intended work field;
- Genesis of the discipline-specific objectives.

### **The opinion of the assessment panel: Opinion 1.2**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination and consideration of the following:

- **Domain specific objectives are aligned with international requirements. Areas for improvement: definition of desired professional profile of graduates.**

### **Recommendations for improvement:**

**Procedures for curriculum revision should be clearly defined (who contributes, whether comparative studies with international study programmes are conducted), so that it includes the participation of all stakeholders (teachers, students, alumni, employers). The alignment of the curriculum with new developments in the field, international criteria and professional needs should be assured.**

## **Opinion on Criterion 1, Educational Objectives: Opinion 1**

Based on the opinions of:

Indicator 1.1, level and orientation: opinion 1.1,

Indicator 1.2, domain specific demands: opinion 1.2,

The assessment panel holds the opinion that generic quality, concerning criterion 1, is present in the study programme.

## Criterion 2. Curriculum

### Indicator 2.1 Correspondence Between Objectives and the Content of the Programme

Assessment criteria:

The programme is an adequate realization of the end qualifications of the education, as to level, orientation and demands specific for the domain. The end qualifications are adequately translated towards the learning objectives in (parts) of the programme. The content of the programme offers students the possibility to achieve the end qualifications.

- Translation of the objectives in the curriculum;
- Level (bachelor, master) and content of the study programme components;
- Presence of inter-disciplinary elements;
- International dimension in the study programme/internationalisation of the curriculum (policy, participation rate, cooperation forms, international contacts, etc.);
- Degree to which recent advancements in education at home and abroad have found expression in the curriculum;
- Procedures for curriculum revision and innovation;
- Participation of relevant stakeholders in curriculum development, revision and innovation.

#### **The opinion of the assessment panel: Opinion 2.1**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination and consideration of the following:

**The curriculum is well-structured, in that it provides students with a solid theoretical and practical background in basic disciplines (Economics, Accounting, Mathematics, Statistics, IT), as well as in more specialised subject areas pertaining to the study program, such as Management, Entrepreneurship, and Decision Making. ECTS distribution according to workload and importance of each subject in the overall desired end academic profile of graduates should be considered.**

#### **Recommendations for improvement:**

**The panel recommends the re-evaluation of the ECTS distribution of certain subjects, preferably according to similar domestic and international SP and also the re-examination of the adequacy of 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> year compulsory subjects to the core areas of the SP (management and entrepreneurship), with input from different stakeholders (students, alumni, employers).**

### Indicator 2.2 Demands Professional and Academic Alignment

Assessment criteria:

The development of knowledge by students when there is an interaction between the education and the scientific research within relevant disciplines. The programme matches with the developments in the relevant scientific discipline(s) by demonstrable connections with topical scientific theories. The programme guarantees the development of scientific research skills. With certain courses, there are demonstrable connections with the topical practice of the relevant professions.

- Attention in the curriculum for knowledge development;
- Attention in the curriculum for skills that support professional functioning;
- Attention in the curriculum for work field experience: interaction with professional practice, attitude, content, level and guidance of practical training final projects, etc.;
- Alignment with recent (international) developments in the field/discipline and professional practice (among other things, as researcher);
- Research alignment of the study programme; among other things: feedback of (own) research to the study programme, active involvement of students in research within the study programme;
- Attention in the curriculum for development of research skills – conveying the research attitude – research skills. Interaction between study programme and academic services.

### **The opinion of the assessment panel: Opinion 2.2**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination of and on the consideration of the following:

**SP fosters research skills in students. There is periodic organization of international conferences, publication of a scientific journal and participation in international research projects. The area for improvement is dissemination of research endeavours and interests of academic staff.**

#### **Recommendations for improvement:**

**The panel finds that research activities should be encouraged, preferably with the emphasis on applied research. The scientific journal should be better promoted, as it is a significant tool for disseminating the academic, scientific and professionally-oriented activities of the Faculty.**

### **Indicator 2.3 Coherence Programme**

Assessment criteria:

Students take a coherent course programme with regard to content.

- Sequential structure and coherence of the curriculum in terms of the standard process;
- Harmony of the curriculum in the cooperation with other university departments and institutions;
- Relation between the curriculum and flexible learning process.

**The opinion of the assessment panel: Opinion 2.3**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination and consideration of the following:

**The curriculum is well-balanced and coherent. Number of elective courses is satisfactory. 4-year programme is seen as an advantage. The areas for improvement refer to further development of transversal, practical and ICT skills.**

**Recommendations for improvement:**

**The panel puts forward the inclusion of optional courses from fields from other departments as a way of improving flexible learning paths and also the introduction of electives / extra-curricular courses on transversal / practical / ICT skills.**

## Indicator 2.4 Workload

Assessment criteria:

The actual amount of study hours per academic year is being checked and reaches the standard of 60 credits.

- The study programme fulfils the formal requirements with regard to the size of the curriculum for bachelor and master:
- It is possible to follow the programme adequately since factors that hinder the learning process are being eliminated as much as possible;
- Study time measurements and follow-up;
- Agreement between estimated and actual study time;
- Spread of the study time in the study programme;
- Presence of factors obstructing or promoting study and any steps.

### **The opinion of the assessment panel: Opinion 2.4**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination and consideration of the following:

**The study programme fulfils the formal requirements related to duration and number of ECTS. The ECTS scoring followed meets the requirements of the European Commission. Students are inquired about their perceptions of workload, which is highly commendable, as well as the fact that the information gathered is analysed by the ECTS coordinators. Presentation of the curriculum could be improved.**

**Recommendations for improvement:**

**The panel recommends that the curriculum should include information about total hours of workload.**

## Indicator 2.5 Coherence of the Organisation of the Learning Process and Contents

Assessment criteria:

The structure and the content of the curriculum are coherent and it is in line with modern didactic approaches (new teaching methodologies, innovations in teaching, etc.). The quality of the educational resources is high and there is an alignment of the learning resources with the didactic concept and the objectives (at study programme level).

- The didactic concept is in line with the objectives;
- The work forms are aligned with the didactic concept. Work forms used (lectures, working groups, project work, practical work, self-study, workshops, etc.);
- Alignment of the didactic work forms with the objectives, the didactic concept and the characteristics of the student intake;
- Attention for recent educational developments at home and abroad in the didactic concept and its elaboration;
- Variation of educational forms;
- Educational resources used and quality (syllabi, guides, courses, teaching and learning aids, etc.): Alignment of the learning resources with the didactic concept, the objectives (at study programme level and study programme component level) and the characteristics of the student intake.

### **The opinion of the assessment panel: Opinion 2.5**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination of and on the consideration of the following:

**The quality of the educational resources is satisfactory.**

**Great emphasis is laid on developing students' research skills, which, even if indirectly, is conducive to the development of students' autonomy and further education, especially at master's level. The area for improvement relates to teachers' pedagogical training (methodology and support IT).**

#### **Recommendations for improvement:**

**The panel recommends that formal support to teachers on teaching methodologies and IT should be offered.**

### **Indicator 2.6 Master's Thesis**

Assessment criteria:

Before obtaining the master's degree students have to make a final project, by which the student has to prove his/her analytic and synthetic capability or independent problem solving capability on academic level or his/her artistic capability. The final project reflects the general critical reflection of the student's intentions to do research.

- Place/relative weight of the master's thesis in the study programme;
- Content and concept of the master's thesis;
- Preparation for the master's thesis;
- Guidance of the master's thesis;
- Cooperation between students and researchers;
- Cooperation between students and the professional field;



- Orientation of the (proposed problem of the) master's thesis to the actual academic/professional context;
- Assessment of the master's thesis.

### **The opinion of the assessment panel: Opinion 2.6**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination and consideration of the following:

**There are formal, well-defined procedures for the Final Paper. The Final thesis sometimes includes 1 month internship. Most topics are related to problem-solving in the community. Each student has a mentor for the final thesis. The Final Paper should be used as opportunity for developing practical and research skills.**

### **Recommendations for improvement:**

**The Final Paper should promote practical implementation of theoretical knowledge, as well as creativity, and be predominantly focussed on applied research, so that students improve their professional skills.**

## **Opinion on Criterion 2, Curriculum: Opinion 2**

Based on the opinions of:

Indicator 2.1, correspondence between objectives and the content of the programme: opinion 2.1,

Indicator 2.2, demands professional and academic alignment: opinion 2.2,

Indicator 2.3, coherence programme: opinion 2.3,

Indicator 2.4, workload: opinion 2.4,

Indicator 2.5, coherence of the organization of the learning process and contents: opinion 2.5

Indicator 2.6, master's thesis: opinion 2.6

The assessment panel holds the opinion that generic quality, concerning criterion 2, is present in the study programme.

## Criterion 3. Staff

### Indicator 3.1 Quality of the Staff

Assessment criteria:

The staff is qualified for the educational, organizational realization of the programme. They are also qualified to take care of the content of the programme.

- Human resources policy (including recruitment, determination of tasks, appointments, promotions, evaluation procedure, advice and decision making bodies);
- Impact of substantive, educational and didactic qualities in the recruitment and promotion, evaluation and monitoring of the staff;
- Policy with regard to the staff for educational activities;
- Factors obstructing the pursuit of a good human resources policy;
- Professionalization (life-long learning approach) of the staff;
- Expertise of the teaching/academic staff (substantive, educational and didactic);
- Involvement of the teaching/academic staff;
- Technical, administrative and organisational expertise of the staff;
- Introduction and guidance of staff and equal opportunities policy.

#### **The opinion of the assessment panel: Opinion 3.1**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination and consideration of the following:

**The panel considers that SP has committed, well-qualified staff. There are well-established procedures for appointments, promotions and evaluation of staff. Recruitment and promotion regulations are well-defined and specified. The staff is academically highly-qualified. The area for improvement refers to detailed description of staff academic qualifications and research interests.**

#### **Recommendations for improvement:**

**Staff qualifications (including area of specialization of research activity) should be included in the description of the SP. A Lifelong Learning approach should be adopted for teaching and non-teaching staff. Training for non-teaching staff should be offered.**

### Indicator 3.2 Demands Professional/Academic Alignment

Assessment criteria:

For some courses it is necessary that a sufficient amount of staff members have knowledge and insight with regard to the profession. The course matches with the following criteria with regards to the effort of staff made within a professional, academic education:

- Professional experience and knowledge of the professional practice among the staff with educational or education-supporting tasks;
- Research expertise and research activity in the practice and the development of the arts;
- Range of specialisations among the staff with research tasks;
- Educational contribution from the professional field and the staff's international contacts, including feedback with regards to the study programme, the participation in international networks and the partnerships with domestic and foreign partner institutions.

### **The opinion of the assessment panel: Opinion 3.2**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination and consideration of the following:

**Professional profiles of staff should be more detailed.**

**Study programme employs some part-time teachers who have work experience outside academia.**

#### **Recommendations for improvement:**

**The Faculty should keep a detailed and updated list of staff research activities, namely publications, papers, participation in projects, and titles of dissertations.**

**It should be made overt how research activities of the staff impinge on the study programme (e.g. involvement of students; curriculum revision; cooperation between different fields in common projects; research applied to the needs of the regional/national enterprises).**

**Renowned professionals should be invited for seminars, short courses and conferences.**

**An Advisory Council could be set up in order to provide feedback to curriculum revision, course content, practical training, etc.)**

### **Indicator 3.3 Quantity of Staff**

Assessment criteria:

A sufficient amount of staff is being appointed to organize the course with the desired quality. Human resource policy is organized in a good and proper way. Recruitment policy is based on good selection of staff.

- Size of the workforce;
- Size of the workforce in proportion to the number of students;
- Ratios between the various categories of staff;
- Number and percentage of visiting professors;
- Age structure;
- Share of the various staff categories in education and research.

### **The opinion of the assessment panel: Opinion 3.2**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination of and on the consideration of the following:

**There is sufficient number of staff; there are legal restrictions in place as far as hiring more staff is concerned. The main strength is the youth and commitment of the academic staff, as well as the dedication of the non-teaching staff.**

### **Recommendations for improvement:**

**The panel recommends that the possibility of selecting student “demonstrators” should be formalized. The possibility of hiring part-time staff through projects should be explored and promoted. Professionals should be invited for seminars, short courses and conferences. Volunteer work from students should also be encouraged (e.g. induction of incoming students).**

## Opinion on Criterion 3, Staff: Opinion 3

Based on the opinions of:

Indicator 3.1, quality of staff: opinion 3.1,

Indicator 3.2, demands professional/academic alignment: opinion 3.2,

Indicator 3.3, quantity of staff: opinion 3.3,

the assessment panel holds the opinion that generic quality, concerning criterion 3, is present in the study programme.

## Criterion 4. Students

### Indicator 4.1 Assessment and Testing (Learning Assessment)

Assessment criteria:

By means of assessments, tests and exams, students have been adequately tested. The learning assessment is in accordance with the proclaimed learning objectives (parts) of the programme.

- Student guidance during assessment;
- Organisation of tests and examinations;
- Various assessment standards with regards to the objectives of the study programme components and the study programme as a whole: concept, orientation of the evaluation to the (integrated) tests of knowledge, insight, skills and attitudes, degree of difficulty;
- Criteria and method of the assessment by the evaluators;
- Criteria and method of the assessment by the examination committee;
- Transparency of the assessment: Familiarity of students with the requirements connected to the evaluation;
- Familiarity of students and staff with the assessment procedures;
- Quality assurance of examination matters.

#### The opinion of the assessment panel: Opinion 4.1

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination and consideration of the following:

**The study programme is well-recognized and attracts a considerable number of candidates. Although norms and regulations are fully-established and transparent, pass rates should be looked into. Organization, transparency and equanimity of assessment methodologies are assured by the regulations in use, as well as application procedures (viz. Contract of Study, p. 25). The areas for**

**improvement include re-examining pass rates in some subjects and diversifying types of assessment.**

#### **Recommendations for improvement:**

**The panel recommends that alternative assessment methodologies should be considered in order to improve pass rates.**

### **Indicator 4.2 Practical Training**

#### Assessment criteria:

The practical training enables students to acquire practical experience. Students develop professional skills and attitudes required for the independent practice under guidance and under conditions of increasing independence. The training is the result of an independent study on a problem that is relevant to the study programme and the field of action. The results of the training reflect the student's reasoning capacity, the information processing and critical reflection capacity and the competence in applying solution strategies in problem situations from professional practice.

- Place/relative weight of the practical training/thesis in the study programme;
- Contents and concept of the practical training;
- Preparation for the practical training;
- Guidance in the practical training;
- Assessment of the practical training.

#### **The opinion of the assessment panel: Opinion 4.2**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination and consideration of the following:

**There are references to field research, surveys and case studies conducted by students in the course of their study programme. The inclusion of work practice in the curriculum should be considered.**

#### **Recommendations for improvement:**

**Given the logistical difficulties of including a compulsory work practice in the curriculum, the possibility of replacing the Final Paper a report by those students who manage to find the opportunity to have a practicum should be considered. Different practical training "modules" should be included in some subjects such are: case studies, practice in local companies/institutions, project oriented student work etc.**

### Indicator 4.3 Conditions of Admission

Assessment criteria:

Content of the programme fits in with the qualifications of the incoming students. Admission procedures are clear and transparent.

- Internal procedures for admission of students;
- Characteristics of the student intake and related policy;
- The curriculum is in line with the preliminary training;
- Specific activities with regard to the alignment between the preliminary training and the study programme.

#### **The opinion of the assessment panel: Opinion 4.3**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination and consideration of the following:

**Admission procedures are clear and transparent. Admission procedures are adequate and well-regulated. However, there are heterogeneous qualifications of incoming students.**

**Recommendations for improvement:**

**The panel recommends that procedures for profiling incoming students should be set up and extra coaching / remedial teaching provided, especially in subjects with high failure rates.**

### Indicator 4.4 Student Involvement in the Improvement of the Teaching/Learning Processes

Assessment criteria:

The institution evaluates the curriculum and the teaching processes itself by introducing student enquiries and satisfaction questionnaires. Student representatives are involved in the decision making process and in the managerial structures.

- Handling the results of enquiries;
- Influence of students on curriculum;
- Participation of students in different decision making bodies and influence on managerial structures.

#### **The opinion of the assessment panel: Opinion 4.4**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination of and on the consideration of the following:



**Student participation at different levels (Faculty Teaching Council, Quality Assurance Board of the Faculty, Disciplinary Commission) is adequate.**

**QA of Faculty provides robust analysis of student questionnaires on the teaching /learning process. The President of the Students' Union is a member of the QA team**

**Recommendations for improvement:**

**Involvement of students should be promoted through better information channels, at all levels: SP / Faculty / University.**

**Meetings between student representatives and decision-making bodies should be regularly held. Student should be encouraged to propose solutions and improvements for teaching/learning process especially practice improvements.**

### **Indicator 4.5 Measures for Promoting Mobility, Including the Mutual Recognition of Credits**

Assessment criteria:

The existence of bilateral and multilateral agreements with domestic and foreign institutions for the exchange of students. Participation of institution and students in different exchange programs. Existence of ECTS and/or internal credit system

- Existence of bilateral and multilateral agreements in the country and abroad;
- Existence of student exchange programs;
- Acceptance of credits gain during exchange programs;
- Existence of ECTS or other credit systems.

**The opinion of the assessment panel: Opinion 4.5**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination and consideration of the following:

**ECTS is used as a tool for improvement of students' mobility. There is a defined procedure for acceptance of credits gained during mobility programmes. University and Faculty have signed bilateral and multilateral agreements with HEIs in the country and abroad. There are summer schools and international cooperation agreements at Faculty level, and an ECTS system is well-established.**

**Recommendations for improvement:**

**The panel recommends better dissemination of existing mobility programmes within the student body. An IRO at Faculty level should be set up in order to facilitate student and staff mobility.**

**Student participation in international mobility programs could be on higher level. Student and staff should be supported to develop information channels so that more students of University get quality information on time.**

## **Indicator 4.6 Coaching of Students**

Assessment criteria:

Coaching system is introduced. The coaching and the providing of information meet the students' needs.

- Existence of coaching system and regular consultations;
- Way of coaching students.

### **The opinion of the assessment panel: Opinion 4.6**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination and consideration of the following:

**A coaching system seems to be in place but only partly formalized. Teachers offer office hours and students preparing their bachelor theses are designated a mentor. Training courses for prospective students are offered, as well as the role of teaching assistants.**

**Recommendations for improvement:**

**The panel recommends the formalization and dissemination of both the coaching system and teacher office hours.**

**A peer coaching system should be implemented.**

## **Indicator 4.7 Information, Consultation and Complaint System**

Assessment criteria:

- Way of handling students' complaints;
- Measures for student support;
- Information and advice during the study programme by the study programme/central services;
- Communication of educational objectives as well as education and examination regulations;
- Organisation and guidance of international student exchange (including guidance for and integration of foreign students).

**The opinion of the assessment panel: Opinion 4.7**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination of and on the consideration of the following:

**A complaint system is well-regulated and transparent. Measures and regulations are adequate  
Dissemination of information through ICT / social networks could be improved.**

**Recommendations for improvement:**

**The panel recommends the increase of the quantity and quality of information using ICT and social networks.**

## **Opinion on Criterion 4, Students: Opinion 4**

Based on the opinions of:

Indicator 4.1, assessment and testing: opinion 4.1,

Indicator 4.2, practical training: opinion 4.2,

Indicator 4.3, condition of admission: opinion 4.3,

Indicator 4.4, student involvement in the improvement of the teaching/learning process: opinion 4.4,

Indicator 4.5, measures for promoting mobility, including mutual recognition of credits: opinion 4.5

Indicator 4.6, coaching of students: opinion 4.6,

Indicator 4.7 information, consultation and complaining system: opinion 4.7,

The assessment panel holds the opinion that generic quality, concerning criterion 4, is present in the study programme.

## **Criterion 5. Means and Facilities**

### **Indicator 5.1 Material Aspects**

Assessment criteria:

Housing and facilities are adequate to realize the programme. Teaching tools are adequate for introducing new teaching methodologies and for introducing innovations in teaching process.

- Policy on premises and facilities;
- Size and quality (= degree to which they are geared to the objectives of the study programme) of lecture halls;
- Practical rooms and laboratories;
- Library facilities; books and periodicals;
- Self-study centres;
- Computer facilities;
- Study programme-related research infrastructure;
- Student and teacher facilities;
- Accessibility of the facilities;
- Size of the available financial resources.

**The opinion of the assessment panel: Opinion 5.1**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination and consideration of the following:

**Since a new Faculty building is under construction, improvement of material resources can be expected. There is good use of available space, computer facilities, wifi, study spaces.**

**Recommendations for improvement:**

**Teaching and non teaching staff and student representatives should be consulted about allocation of spaces in the new building.**

**Special attention should be paid to student facilities, namely study spaces, computer facilities and internet access.**

**Alternative financial support (e.g. international cooperation projects, local business sponsorship) should be actively sought.**

**Special attention should be paid to teaching/learning tools.**

## Opinion on Criterion 5, Means and Facilities: Opinion 5

Based on the opinions of:

Indicator 5.1, material aspects: opinion 5.1,

The assessment panel holds the opinion that generic quality, concerning criterion 5, is present in the study programme.

## Criterion 6. Internal Quality Control

### Indicator 6.1 Evaluation Results

Assessment criteria:

The course is being evaluated periodically through usage of different testable targets. Systematic measures to follow up on the teaching process are introduced. Quality structures are established and the quality of teaching within the study programme is permanently monitored.

- Description of the quality policy and of the approach of the internal quality assurance;
- Existence of quality structures;
- Depersonalised summary of the measured results of the study programme;
- Dynamics of evaluation procedures;
- Usage of results obtained during evaluation process.

#### The opinion of the assessment panel: Opinion 6.1

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination and consideration of the following:

**A robust QA system is well established. There is adequate organisational structure for QA with all necessary bodies and stakeholders included. There is an established quality assurance structure within the University and the Faculty, and several monitoring procedures are in place. Previous external evaluations have diagnosed weaknesses, and steps are being taken to correct them.**

#### Recommendations for improvement:

**The panel recommends that hard data from the SP should be gathered and disseminated on issues such as: student profile; drop-out rate; time of completion of grade; employability rate of graduates.**

**Information should be provided on how the data gathered by the quality assurance procedures are used in order to improve the study programme.**

**The involvement of external stakeholders in the decision-making process should be strengthened.**

## **Indicator 6.2 Measures for Improvement**

Assessment criteria:

The results of evaluation are the starting point for a strategic and operational approach in the introduction, the improvement and the development of demonstrable measures necessary for the realization of the educational objectives. Improvement measures are based on threats and weaknesses noticed during the evaluation process.

- Degree to which past targets were achieved;
- Degree to which the targets for the future are well founded;
- Improvement actions in the study programme (allocation of resources, designation of responsibilities and powers, planning and monitoring project management);
- Special attention for the response to findings and recommendations of the former assessment visit and results of student evaluations.

### **The opinion of the assessment panel: Opinion 6.2**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination and consideration of the following:

**The results of internal/external evaluations have been used for defining and implementing corrective actions. Albeit summarily, areas that are considered to be a priority for improvement have been earmarked in the SER.**

### **Recommendations for improvement:**

**Systematic SWOT analyses should be carried out, as well as a thorough compilation of opportunities for improvement. Given the economic, legal and staff-related constraints, this should consist of a list of realistic, small-scale, low-cost actions that can be set up within a well-defined time frame.**

**An annual plan of action should be drawn up that will contribute to the improvement of the study program. This plan should be realistic and clearly define times, goals, responsibilities and means involved. It should cover organizational issues, as well as other activities that will open up the programme to the wider community through simple, low-cost activities. Needless to say, this plan should take on board the contributions of all parties concerned and respect the bounds of the hierarchical organization of the department and the Faculty.**

**Student-initiated activities should be encouraged as a means to develop transversal skills, enhance entrepreneurship and improve their employability.**

## **Indicator 6.3 Involving Co-workers, Students, Alumni and the Professional Field**

Assessment criteria:

Co-workers, students, alumni and the professional field are being involved in the internal quality control.

- Performance of the boards and assessment panels involved in the internal quality assurance (including the student participation);
- Involvement of the staff in decision-making and evaluations as part of the internal quality assurance;
- Involvement of students in decision-making and evaluations as part of the internal quality assurance;
- Involvement of graduates and the professional fields in educational evaluations and curriculum innovations;
- Contacts between the study programme and the graduates/professional field.

### **The opinion of the assessment panel: Opinion 6.3**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination and consideration of the following:

**The study programme and its graduates have a good reputation in the wider community.**

#### **Recommendations for improvement:**

**Links with the local community should be strengthened, be it through the organization of short conferences and seminars with invited speakers with a well-established local reputation in the specialised fields of the programme, be it with the organization of fee-paying short refresher courses for employed people or unemployed graduates in need of updating their knowledge.**

**The Faculty should actively seek forms of strengthening different forms of cooperation with the labour market. An Alumni network should be set up and a Career Centre should also be established by the Faculty.**



## Opinion on Criterion 6, Internal Quality Control: Opinion 6

Based on the opinions of:

Indicator 6.1, evaluation results: opinion 6.1,

Indicator 6.2, measures for improvement: opinion 6.2,

Indicator 6.3, involving co-workers, students, alumni and professional field,

the assessment panel holds the opinion that generic quality, concerning criterion 6, is present in the study programme.

## Criterion 7. Results Achieved

### Indicator 7.1 Realized Level

Assessment criteria:

The realized end qualifications are in accordance with the pursued competences as for level, orientation and domain specific demands.

- Degree to which objectives are achieved;
- Quality of the master's thesis;
- Quality of the practical training;
- Realisations in terms of internationalisation of the education: participation of students (number and percentage of students, ratio of incoming vs. outgoing students) and staff in international exchange programmes;
- Preparation of the graduates for entry into the job market;
- Content of the programme and level of employment;
- Satisfaction of the graduates about their employment;
- Appreciation for the graduates by the professional field;
- Satisfaction of the graduates about the study programme

### The opinion of the assessment panel: Opinion 7.1

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination and consideration of the following:

**Formalized activities for promoting employability are adequate, but they could be significantly improved. A significant number of graduates find employment in local enterprises**

#### **Recommendations for improvement:**

**The panel recommend the promotion of short courses / seminars on how to apply for a job (CV, motivation letters, interviews).**

**All extra-curricular activities of students should be included in DS and / or certified.**

**Some courses should be offered in English.**

**Student-initiated activities related to professional development should be actively supported by the Faculty.**

### **Indicator 7.2 Educational Output**

Assessment criteria:

Target figures are being set for the educational output in comparison with other relevant courses. The educational output meets these target figures.

- Policy of the study programme with respect to the study progress;
- Target figures used and their comparison to other relevant study programmes;
- Pass rates and discussion;
- Analysis of student advancement;
- Diploma supplement;
- Average study duration and assessment;
- Results of study into the study programme's failures and dropouts.

#### **The opinion of the assessment panel: Opinion 7.2**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination of and on the consideration of the following:

**Educational output is adequate. There is an adequate system for rewarding learner excellence.**

#### **Recommendations for improvement:**

**Given existing circumstances, realistic target figures for graduates should be set up and monitored. The panel recommends the collection of hard data on pass rates and time of completion of graduates of the SP.**

## **Opinion on Criterion 7, Results Achieved: Opinion 7**

Based on the opinions of:

Indicator 7.1, realized level: opinion 7.1,

Indicator 7.2, educational output: opinion 7.2,

the assessment panel holds the opinion that generic quality, concerning criterion 7, is present in the study programme.

## Global Opinion

The assessment panel based its opinion and its motivation on the following sources:

- The study programme's self-evaluation report (SER) and its appendices, the conducted interviews with all parties concerned,
  - The available documents during the assessment visit,
  - The requested documents,
  - The study programme's reaction on the assessment report.
- 
- Based on the opinions of:
    - Criterion 1, educational objectives and learning outcomes: opinion 1
    - Criterion 2, curriculum: opinion 2
    - Criterion 3, staff: opinion 3,
    - Criterion 4, students: opinion 4,
    - Criterion 5, means and facilities: opinion 5,
    - Criterion 6, internal quality control: opinion 6,
    - Criterion 7, results achieved: opinion 7,
  - The assessment panel holds the opinion that there is a satisfactory generic quality present in the study programme. **The panel is of the opinion that the study program "Management of Enterprise" meets the criteria for its accreditation.**

The rationale for the creation of the program reflects the needs of the surrounding community (ZDC), namely by fostering managerial qualifications and entrepreneurial initiative of its graduates who will undoubtedly contribute to the economic development of the country in general and the region in particular.

Furthermore, the curriculum seems to be well-structured, in that it provides students with a solid theoretical and practical background in basic disciplines (Mathematics, Statistics, IT, Accounting, Economics), as well as in more specialised subject areas pertaining to the study program, such as Management, Entrepreneurship, and Decision Making. Internationalization of the course, either through the provision of means of access to foreign bibliography (courses in foreign languages) or the inclusion of disciplines that offer knowledge of a globalised economy, is also satisfactorily catered for by the curriculum.

As far as the SER is concerned, it is well-organized and includes the most relevant information. However, it is somewhat cryptic and/or too synthetic at times, especially for a reader that is not familiar with the legal and educational framework of the ZDC. A more fastidious SER will not only help outsiders have a clearer picture of the course, but can also become a precious self-reflection exercise that will clarify internal procedures and commit all stakeholders (management, teachers, students) to a common goal, i.e. the improvement of the quality of the study programme. Hard data is often missing, as well as thorough SWOT analysis.

The involvement of students at all levels is highly commendable and therefore worth mentioning, especially the fact that the self-assessment report included the participation of 5 students. There is also mention of several tools for monitoring students' opinions and perceptions, although no examples or results are provided.

The Faculty in general and the study programme in particular seem to follow well-established quality assurance procedures, in line with University policy.

Research seems to be part and parcel of this study programme and there is evidence of a deep commitment to the dissemination and internationalization of the research endeavours of the Faculty (cf. periodic organization of international conferences, publication of a scientific journal and participation in international research projects). This commitment is extended to undergraduates, who are required to write up a thesis in order to graduate. However, the research endeavours of the staff and students should be more detailed in the description of the Study Programme as well as the means by which its dissemination helps to build stronger links with the community (applied research, projects with enterprises, etc.).

The educational goals are clear, although very economically formulated, which means they have to be subsumed from the SER and the different syllabi. The inclusion of a clearly-defined list of general and specific educational goals would help assess its alignment with the European Qualification Framework, other national and international programmes and the professional needs and demands.

Notwithstanding the above-mentioned strengths, the panel thinks there is room for improvement, namely in the reinforcement of the practical, more "hands-on" aspect of the curriculum. As mentioned in the SER and during the site visit the absence of a compulsory, curricular practicum is especially noticeable, as it would provide students with an invaluable work experience, where they could put to the test the competences acquired. Moreover, it would also help enhance the visibility of the study program within the labour market and, importantly, create job opportunities for its graduates. Besides, the input from the workplace mentors of the trainee students could be used as feedback information in future revisions of the curriculum.

Desired competences to be acquired by students are not evenly mentioned in the syllabi, which detail objectives but not learning outcomes. The shift of emphasis to competences is not merely cosmetic, as it would help re-centre the focus on the learning process and help teachers and learners evaluate the success of the learning process more effectively.

Revisions of the curriculum seem to be well-regulated within the Faculty. However, it is not clear who promotes/is responsible for/involved in the revision process. Within the established regulations, a more systematic procedure of involvement of all stakeholders should be established. In spite of the constraints mentioned in the SER (among others, high unemployment rate in the canton and adverse economic conditions), there should be greater engagement between the study programme and the wider community. This could be achieved through low-key, low-cost activities that, without overburdening the management, academic staff and students, would help bridge the gap between academia and the outside world. The advantages are manifold: contact between the faculty and enterprises and local and national organizations would help update the study programme's content, provide students with opportunities for applying and testing their newly-acquired competences, enhance job opportunities for graduates and, not the least, create opportunities for the department to generate extra income through external sponsorship.

Although the SER is peppered with references to strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats, systematic SWOT analyses have not been included, nor is there a thorough compilation of opportunities for improvement. As the panel sees it, this should consist of a list of realistic, small-scale, low-cost actions that can be set up within a well-defined time frame, and not just a list of intentions. Having said that, the panel is aware of the economic, legal and staff-related constraints – but are precisely these constraints that make it the more necessary for a comprehensive planning of a doable list of activities that, with the full involvement of all parties concerned (i.e. Faculty governing bodies, management, teachers, students, non-teaching staff, alumni, and potential employers), will result in the improvement of the study programme.

After a careful analysis of the evaluation procedures of the different courses, it seems that the prevailing ethos is solely based on oral and written exams. This, in turn, may be evidence of a predominantly underlying teacher-centred methodology. Without trying to question the validity of such an approach, I would suggest that alternative means of student evaluation may be considered, with the concomitant wash-back effect on teaching methodologies. Indeed, continuous assessment, project work or student presentations are generally considered to be conducive to higher learner autonomy and motivation, not to mention an improved pass rate.

As to recommendations for improvement, the panel would like to forward the following suggestions:

1. Articulate educational goals (both general and specific) more clearly. This will confer greater transparency to the study programme and help monitor the quality of the preparation of the graduates for entry onto the job market.
2. The possibility of including a practicum in the 4-year curriculum should be considered in a future revision, which would further prepare students for the labour market and enhance the visibility of the study program within the entrepreneurial community.
3. Syllabi should be revised in order to evince explicitly desired competences, rather than just course objectives. This would help shift the emphasis from teaching to learning and also facilitate the monitoring of learning outcomes by the management team, teachers, and learners alike. It would also help articulate the competences of graduates for potential employers.
4. Procedures for the revision of the curriculum should be adapted in order to include the participation of all stakeholders (teachers, students, alumni, employers).
5. Links with the local community should be strengthened, be it through the organization of short conferences and seminars with invited speakers with a well-established local reputation in the specialised fields of the programme, be it with the organization of fee-paying short refresher courses for employed people or unemployed graduates in need of updating their knowledge.
6. Devising an annual plan of action that will contribute to the improvement of the study program. This plan should be realistic and clearly define times, goals, responsibilities and means involved. It should cover organizational issues (e.g. revision of syllabi according to a common template that will include definition of competences; revision of learner evaluation procedures), as well as other activities that will open up the programme to the wider community through simple, low-cost activities. Needless to say, this plan should take on board the contributions of all parties concerned and respect the bounds of the hierarchical organization of the department and the Faculty.
7. Consider the introduction of alternative means of learner evaluation, after consultation of the teachers and students involved. The panel is aware that this recommendation may face the opposition of those who are used to tried and tested traditional methodologies; therefore, it should be looked upon as a suggestion that needs to gather consensus and not be imposed upon the academic staff and indeed the students themselves.

## Overview of the Opinions

|  | Indicator Score | Criterion Score |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|
| Criterion 1: Educational Objectives and Learning Outcomes                                  |                 | satisfactory    |
| Indicator 1.1 Level and Orientation  | opinion 1.1     |                 |
| Indicator 1.2 Domain Specific demands  | opinion 1.2     |                 |
| Criterion 2: Curriculum  |                 | satisfactory    |
| Indicator 2.1 Correspondence between Objectives and the Content of the Programme           | opinion 2.1     |                 |
| Indicator 2.2 Demands Professional and Academic Alignment                                  | opinion 2.2     |                 |
| Indicator 2.3 Coherence Programme  | opinion 2.3     |                 |
| Indicator 2.4 Workload   | Opinion 2.4     |                 |
| Indicator 2.5 Coherence of the Organization of the Learning Process and Contents           | opinion 2.5     |                 |
| Indicator 2.6 Master's Thesis  | opinion 2.6     |                 |
| Criterion 3: Staff   |                 |                 |
| Indicator 3.1 Quality of Staff   | opinion 3.1     |                 |
| Indicator 3.2 Demands Professional/Academic Alignment                                      | opinion 3.2     |                 |
| Indicator 3.3 Quantity of Staff  | opinion 3.3     |                 |
| Criterion 4: Students  |                 | satisfactory    |
| Indicator 4.1 Assessment and Testing   | opinion 4.1     |                 |
| Indicator 4.2 Practical training   | opinion 4.2     |                 |
| Indicator 4.3 Condition of Admission   | opinion 4.3     |                 |
| Indicator 4.4 Student Involvement in the Improvement of the Teaching/Learning Processes    | opinion 4.4     |                 |
| Indicator 4.5 Measures for promoting Mobility, Including the Mutual recognition of Credits | opinion 4.5     |                 |
| Indicator 4.6 Coaching of Students   | opinion 4.6     |                 |
| Indicator 4.7 Information, Consultation and Complaining System                             | opinion 4.7     |                 |

|   |             |              |
|---|-------------|--------------|
| Criterion 5: Means and Facilities   |             | satisfactory |
| Indicator 5.1 Material Aspects  | opinion 5.1 |              |
| Criterion 6: Internal Quality Control   |             | satisfactory |
| Indicator 6.1 Evaluation Results  | opinion 6.1 |              |
| Indicator 6.2 Measures for Improvement  | opinion 6.2 |              |
| Indicator 6.3 Involving Co-workers, Students, Alumni and the Professional Field | opinion 6.3 |              |
| Criterion 7: Results Achieved   |             | satisfactory |
| Indicator 7.1 Realized Level  | opinion 7.1 |              |
| Indicator 7.2 Educational Output  | opinion 7.2 |              |

The opinions are applicable to:

[Abbreviation institution Z

- Abbreviation specialization      name specialization
- Abbreviation location              name location
- A combination of specialization and location
- Variants: bridging programmes, programmes in another language,...



## Appendices

---

Curriculum vitae of the members of the assessment panel

Name **Cristina Maria Ferreira Pinto da Silva**

E-mail csilva@sc.ipp.pt

Nationality Portuguese

### **Work experience**

Dates 2010 to date

Occupation or position held **Vice-President**

Main activities and responsibilities Evaluation and Quality Assurance

Name and address of employer Polytechnic Institute of Porto, Portugal

Type of business or sector Public Higher Education

Dates 2007-2010

Occupation or position held **Head of the Scientific Board**

Name and address of employer Institute of Accounting and Administration of the Polytechnic of Porto

Dates 2005-2010

Occupation or position held **Coordinator of English**

Name and address of employer Institute of Accounting and Administration of the Polytechnic of Porto

Dates 2004-2007

Occupation or position held **Deputy Head of the Scientific Board**

Name and address of employer Institute of Accounting and Administration of the Polytechnic of Porto

Dates 1983-2010

Occupation or position held **Teacher of Business English**

Name and address of employer Institute of Accounting and Administration of the Polytechnic of Porto

### **Education and training**

Dates 2001

Title of qualification awarded **PhD in Linguistics**

Organisation University of Lancaster, UK

Dates 1990

Title of qualification awarded **MA in TEFL**

Organisation University of Aveiro, Portugal

Dates 1982

Title of qualification awarded **Licenciatura (4-year first degree) in English and German Language and Literature**

Organisation University of Porto, Portugal

Porto, June 2012

First name(s) / Surname(s) **Drazena Gaspar**

Address(es) 1, Zrinski Frankopana, 88000, Mostar, Bosnia and Herzegovina

Telephone(s) +387 36 355 100 Mobile: +387 63 311 535

Fax(es) +387 36 355 100

E-mail drazena.gaspar@sve-mo.ba

Nationality Croat

Date of birth 18.07.1960.

Gender Female

**Desired employment /**

**Occupational field**

**Work experience**

Dates .... – 01.07.2012. Full time professor on Faculty of Economics, Faculty of Mechanical Engineering and Computers and Faculty of Natural Science and Education

30.06.2012. – 01.10.2007. Vice Rector at University of Mostar and full time professor on Faculty of

Economics, Faculty of Mechanical Engineering and Computers and Faculty of Natural Science and

Education

30.09.2007.- 01.04.2002. Vice Dean and professor on Faculty of Economics, University of Mostar

31.03.2002 - 15.11.2001. Professor on Faculty of Economics, University of Mostar

14.11.2001 - 01.03.2001. Assistant professor on Faculty of Economics, University of Mostar

28.02.2001. – 01.05.1996. Director of software, Optima-OR Mostar, BH

30.04.1996. – 01.02.1995. Director of software, Genel, Ploče, Croatia

31.01.1995. – 01.04.1993. Project manager, "Mas-Maf", Zagreb, Croatia

31.03.1993. – 01.06.1992. Director of Electronic Data Center, Velmos Holding company, Mostar, BH

28.02.2001. - 1990. Assistant Professor on the Faculty of Economic in Mostar, BH (part time job)

31.05.1992. – 01.01.1990. Project manager, Velmos Holding company, Mostar, BH

31.12.1989. – 01.07.1987. System Analyst, Velmos Holding company, Mostar, BH

30.06.1987. – 20.06.1985. Programmer, Velmos Holding company, Mostar, BH

Occupation or position held Full time professor, position: vice rector

Main activities and responsibilities

Name and address of employer University of Mostar, Faculty of Economics, Matice Hrvatske bb, Mostar

Type of business or sector Higher education

**Education and training**

Page 2/3 - Curriculum vitae of

Surname(s) First name(s)

For more information on Europass go to <http://europass.cedefop.europa.eu>

© European Communities, 2003 20060628

Dates 21.06.2001. earn doctoral degree on Faculty of Economics – University of Mostar

23.06.1991. earn master of science degree on Faculty of Organization Sciences – University of Belgrade

(group for Cybernetic and Automation)

18.09.1983. Graduated on Faculty of Economics Mostar – University of Mostar

Title of qualification awarded Doctoral degree – Doctor of Economic Sciences, field business informatics

Principal subjects/occupational skills

covered

Full time professor on the subjects: Database, Business Intelligence, Programming and Accounting Information Systems

Skills: IT Project management, Development of Business Information Systems, Database development

Name and type of organisation providing education and training

Faculty of Economics – University of Mostar, Bosnia and Herzegovina

Faculty of Organization Sciences – University of Belgrade, Serbia

Oracle Education Center Ljubljana, Slovenia

Oracle Education Center Zagreb, Croatia

Level in national or international classification

Doctoral degree

### **Personal skills and competences**

Mother tongue(s) **Croatian, Bosnian**

Other language(s) **English**

Self-assessment **Understanding Speaking Writing**

*European level* (\*) Listening Reading Spoken interaction Spoken production

**English** B1 B2 B1 B1 B2

### **Language**

(\*) *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages*

Social skills and competences Project management skills, team work

Organisational skills and competences

- Consultant on Project "Strategy of Development ICT in BH" (e-government) 2004
- Co-moderator for Round table Government (State/Entities level) – UNDP BH - ICT Forum 2002/2003.
- Project manager on Project: Modernization of Information System for Payment Agency Mostar (from February 1999 till October 2000.)
- Assistant Project manager and developer on Project: Development of Labor Market Statistics (2000)
- Assistant Project manager and developer on Project: Development of "Bilten" (Annual Report about Labor Market) (2000)
- Assistant Project manager on Project: LMIS (Labor Market Information System) (1998-2000)
- Project Manager on Project for Financial and Accounting Software Development for the Post Offices in Mostar, Livno, Čapljina, Vitez and Orašje (from June 1998 till December 1999.)
- Project Manager on Project for Financial and Accounting Software Development for the Ministry of Finance HNŽ in Mostar (from June 1998 till December 1999.)
- Project manager on Project for Ministry of Internal Affairs Mostar (from January 1997 till December 1997.)

- Project Manager on Project for Business Information System (from July 1996 till August 1997.)
- Retail project manager on Project for Hotel "Turist" Varaždin, Croatia (1994)
- Retail project manager on Project for "Brodokomerc" Rijeka, Croatia (1993)
- Project manager on Project: Financial Analysis and Liquidity of Velmos Company Mostar (1991)

Technical skills and competences

Computer skills and competences - Methodologies of System Analysis and Development: BSP, SDLC, Oracle PJM, Oracle CDM.

- Databases: Oracle 8i, Oracle Express, Oracle 8, Oracle 7, Access, FoxPro, Clipper.
- Software development tools: Oracle Designer, Oracle Developer, FoxPro
- Programming languages: PL/SQL, SQL\*Plus, FoxPro, Clipper, Cobol, Basic, Fortran
- Operating systems: Windows NT, Windows 2000, Windows 95/98, SCO Unix, MS-DOS, Novell
- Software packages: Oracle Sales Analyzer, Oracle Relational Access Administrator, Microsoft

Project, Microsoft Office Professional

Page 3/3 - Curriculum vitae of

Surname(s) First name(s)

For more information on Europass go to <http://europass.cedefop.europa.eu>

© European Communities, 2003 20060628

Artistic skills and competences

Other skills and competences

Driving licence Driving licence for B categories of vehicle.

**Additional information**

**Annexes**

## **M i i c i i c L j u b i i š a**

Date of birth 21st October 1986

Place of birth Banja Luka, Bosnia and Herzegovina

Telephone number +387 65 988 986

E-mail ljubisa.micic@gmail.com

Address Vida Njezica 22, 78 000 Banja Luka

Citizenship Bosnia and Herzegovina

### Education

University education Master studies: Faculty of Economics, University of Banja Luka. Field of studies: Economics.

Diploma studies (4 years): Faculty of Economics, University of Banja Luka. Department: Management

and Entrepreneurship. Awarded: 4 year bachelor in Economics (original: diplomirani ekonomista).

### Secondary education

School for Economics in Banja Luka, Bosnia and Herzegovina. Awarded: Custom technician. Excellent

grades all four years.

### Non-formal education

April 2009 I took part “Proctor & Gamble IDS Challenge” as one of 24 successful students from Europe, Middle

East and Africa. I was one of two students from Balkans on this event, held in Paris, France. My team has won the challenge.

September 2008 I participated in World Bank Civil Society Fund sponsored conference “Young Peace Builders for Better

Future” in Sousse Tunisia.

June 2008 I took part in World Bank Institute workshop “Improving Government Performance and Accountability: Implications for Growth and Competitiveness”, supported by Bosnian Government and

Austrian Development Cooperation.

October 2007 I took part in seminar “Business reporting” organized by Media centre Sarajevo and Irving international London.

October 2007 I successfully finished Academy for youth leaders, organized by Civitas, Centre for democracy and human rights and supported by US embassy in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

March 2007 I participated in BH challenge, Model of United nations, organized by WUS (World University Service) Austria, which was organized in Sarajevo, B&H.

23.7.–22.8. 2006 Participant of “Railways of peace” project organized by Glocal forum from Rome. Project had main aim to promote peace and cooperation between nations in Balkan region.

November 2005 I took part in Council Of Europe study session “Establishing and Running Human rights student organization” in CoE Youth Centre in Budapest, Hungary.

July 2004

I took part in Obessu (Organizing Bureau of the European School Student Unions - organization which connects students Unions in Europe) conference and GA in Vilnius, Lithuania. I was first one from

B&H who was present on one so big event in work of Student Unions in Europe. This was a big step for students in B&H because it was the first time that anyone got opportunity to be present there.

Work experience

April 2010 I became president of Ferial Youth mobility and Tourism union of Republic Srpska (FERS). The main project was organized study visit to Austria, Czech Republic and Germany. Project was connected to visa liberalization for BH citizens. [www.ferijalnirs.org](http://www.ferijalnirs.org). Projects that are implemented by FERS includes study visits, public advocacy campaigns, information campaigns etc.

April 2010 I become student teaching fellow for subjects “Entrepreneurship” and “Entrepreneurial Economics” at Faculty of Economics, University of Banja Luka.

February 2009 I have founded first Career centre at Banja Luka University. We have developed info youth portal [www.cerk.info](http://www.cerk.info) in January 2011. Main project: Fair of Education, practice and scholarships (more than 2000 visitors per day)

May 2008 I have worked on research project “Financial markets for lower income clients in Bosnia and Herzegovina” done by international senior financial sector consultant from USA, Miss Ruth Goodwin Groen. I have worked as assistant.

Personal info

NGO/activismexperience

September 2007 I was selected and become a member of Youth Voices Group of World Bank, office in B&H.

July 2007 I was trainer on Brcko summer camp. Theme was "Friendship". It was organized by Civitas centre from Sarajevo, B&H.

September 2006 I become a member of Youth Advisory Panel of UNFPA (YAP). It is youth advisory committee of UN population fond in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

April 2006 Trainer in First conference of Civitas youth network organized in Sarajevo.  
Subject: Youth participation on local level.

November 2005 I become a regional coordinator of Civitas (Centre for Democracy and Human rights) Youth Network for BL region.

November 2005 Trainer on conference organized by Ombudsman of Republika Srpska.  
Subject of conference was "Participation is learning process".

August 2005 I was trainer on OSCE Student council gathering which was organized in Bihac, B&H. May 2005 I was selected for one of members of Youth Advisory Committee of Mayor of Banjaluka city .

2001-2005 I was president in Secondary school student's council, leader of council and its representative in different activities.

2003-2005 I was president and one of founders of Banjaluka Union of (secondary school) students.

May 2004-May 2005 I was member of Youth advisory mission in City parliament of Banjaluka for one year.

#### Foreign Languages

Language:

English

German

Certificates:

English: First Certificate in English- FCE (ESOL test). Testing was done by Cambridge centre Banja Luka and British Council B&H.

Additional CAE certificate, testing was done by Cambridge centre Banja Luka.

German: Finished A2/1, Tangram methode. Course finished in Sprahestudio Byblos, Banja Luka. Additionally, I got DAAD scholarship for

intensive course in Germany for summer 2010 where I have got B1 certificate. Testing was done by DID institute Berlin and GfdS. In summer

2011 I got scholarship from Austrian development agency and done 1-month course, B2/C1 in Diplomatic academy in Vienna.

#### Other activities

2011 I am idea founder and administrator of info portal for students [www.cerk.info](http://www.cerk.info) which supports and professionally develops students from mu University and further.

I enjoy cooking and food decoration. Hobbies: heraldic.

#### Awards and scholarships

2011 I got ADA - scholarship for language summer course in Diplomatic academy in Vienna, Austria.

2010 I got DAAD scholarship for Intensive German language course – two months in Berlin.

2009/2010 Awards for research paper: "Country as subject of branding with special reference on B&H as transitional country". Biggest award was given by Bosnian-American Academy of Arts and Science.

Additionally, in 2009 and 2010, both times, I took first place for social sciences in student scientific conference with international participation "Students encountering science" which took place in Banja Luka and was organised by Student parliament of our University.

2009 I got scholarship for successful student from Ministry of Education and Culture of Republic Srpska.

2009 Certificate for excellent contribution in YVG from World Bank, CO Bosnia and Herzegovina.

2007 Certificate of Achievement“ for successful finish of “Leaders academy” organized for youth leaders by US Embassy and Civitas B&H.

2007 I got scholarship for talented students from “Foundation of president of RS; Dr Milan Jelic“

2005

I got scholarship “Ernst & Young scholarships 2005” from “Ernst & Young Foundation” and Norwegian Embassy in Bosnia and Herzegovina. One of five scholars.

2005 Reward for first place on regional competition in subject “Democracy and human rights“.

2004-2005 I was selected for the most active secondary school student in year 2004-2005.



2002-2005 I got scholarship from Banja Luka city fond “Petar Kocic“ for excellent success.



## Faculty of economics – Management of enterprise

|                        |  |  |
|------------------------|--|--|
| <b>Date 14.03.2012</b> | Arrival to Zenica                      |  |
| Afternoon<br>17:00     | Meeting of external<br>assessment team |  |
| Evening                | Dinner                                 |  |

|                   |               |   |
|-------------------|---------------|---|
| <b>15.03.2012</b> |               |   |
| 08:30-9:00        | Study program | Meeting with self<br>assessment team  |
| 09:00-09:30       | Study program | Meeting management  |
| 09:30-10:00       | Study program | Meeting academic staff  |
| 10:00-10:15       | Study program | Coffee break  |
| 10:15-10:45       | Study program | Meeting academic staff  |
| 10:45-11:30       | Study program | Meeting students<br>representatives of first<br>and second year   |
| 11:30-12:15       | Study program | Meeting students<br>representatives of third<br>and fourth years  |
| 12:15-13:00       | Study program | Meeting administration  |
| 13:00-14:00       | Study program | Lunch break   |
| 14:00-14:30       | Study program | Meeting student service   |
| 14:30-15:00       | Study program | Meeting representatives<br>of international and/or<br>QA office   |
| 15:00-16:30       | Study program | Faculty tour  |
| 16:30-17:30       | Study program | Meeting alumni and<br>representatives of<br>workfield   |
| 17:30             | Study program | Meeting of external<br>assessment team  |
| 20:00             | Study program | Dinner  |
| <b>16.03.2011</b> |               |   |
| 07:30             |               | Breakfast   |
| 08:30-12.00       | Study program | Informal program-<br>discussion with<br>students, staff,<br>additional meetings and<br>documents and etc. |