

EDUCATIONAL QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Study program “Class teaching”

An evaluation of the quality of the bachelor’s programme
Class teaching at Pedagogical faculty University of
Zenica

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 recommendations

Appendices

Curriculum vitae of the members of the assessment panel

Site visit 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 Class teaching at Pedagogical faculty 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 **of bachelor's programme Class teaching at Pedagogical faculty University of Zenica** includes the following members:

- Chairman: Prof.dr Hans Günter Sonntag, Dean of the Medical Faculty in Heidelberg
- Expert 1: Prof.dr **Petar Stojaković**, Department of Psychology, University of Banja Luka,
- Student member: **Marijana Vajkanović**, Student of first degree studies, Faculty of Philology, University of Banja Luka,
- The assessment of **bachelor's programme Class teaching at Pedagogical faculty University of Zenica** was accompanied and supported by Sanela Pašić Delahmetović, associate at HEA. 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 **bachelor's programme Class teaching at Pedagogical faculty 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, it studies additional information and it 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 the verification of factual errors and for the 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 criterium.

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

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

Part II

Assessment Report

General information on the bachelor's programme Class teaching

Department for Class Teaching (i.e. education of teachers of the first four school grades) (in further text: the Department) is a study program that represented the basis for launching the Educational Academy which was formed 1994 in Zenica as a public institution for higher education. This study program lasted for two years and it trained students for the profession of teachers for the first four grades. The Educational Academy was a part of the University of Sarajevo and a significant number of part time associates, especially from Sarajevo, provided its efficient functioning. The Department was very attractive for students due to the lack of human resources in this field at the labor market.

The great transformation of the Department occurred in 2002 when the Education Academy changed its status and, after launching additional new departments, it changed its name to the Faculty of Education. The Department was also transformed to a four-year study program with new graduate outgoing diploma – professor for class lecturing. That meant the changing of curriculum that sought to include the contemporary trends in the field of pedagogy, didactics, psychology and methodology.

In this period the number of permanently employed teachers and assistants increased, but the educational process still depended on the engagement of part time associates. There was also an increase in the number of students that enrolled into the study program of the Department, while the Faculty of Education becomes an organizational unit of the newly formed University of Zenica in formal and academic sense. Operation and development of the Faculty of Education is still largely based on the functioning of this Department, although other departments started to attract more and more students and the attention of academic public with their programs and outgoing degrees.

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 of 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 of and on the consideration of the following:

General organisation of the programme could be seen as satisfactory, however there are some relevant limitations concerning the orientation of the programme.

General objectives are well-defined through categorization of knowledge, skills and attitudes (behaviour code). More attention needed for academic and research competences as basis for second and third cycle.

Recommendations for improvement:

- There should be a serious work on specifying the competences and learning outcomes so the quality of education can be improved. Students should be informed about this process and they should take part in it the process.

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 of and on the consideration of the following:

There is good intention for the harmonization with the curricula in region but more international dimension is needed. The international references and sources for the programme are weak and this is a handicap for the introduction of new educational approaches.

Recommendations for improvement:

In this study program is important to follow the modern tendencies and a development of the sciences related to Class Teaching, so there should be more cooperation with other universities, foreign universities and a research work (not only for students but also for teachers).

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 makes a positive consideration and puts forward that the study programme has the potential to remedy these shortcomings.

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 of and on the consideration of the following:

The programme is well established following criteria and modules and is in line with the current objectives. Learning objectives are partly translated in curriculum, for this level of education (undergraduate). International dimension has been achieved through projects but internationalisation could not be recognised in the realisation of the programme. Acquired modern teaching methodology is partly integrated in new curriculum but not accepted by all teaching staff.

Recommendations for improvement:

- There should be more practical training so the program should have more "space" for introducing the practical training from the first year of studies.

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:

Very important is the fact that many weaknesses in this field are recognized and stressed in SER. Scientific research subjects are optional and there is no evidence for teaching in the research methods for all students. Scientific research skills are basically learned during master courses that have not been organized for the last two years. Strategic and long-term sustainable approach should be taken in this field.

Recommendations for improvement:

- The Faculty should find some financial support in order to have resources for the improvement

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 of and on the consideration of the following:

- Talking to student the panel noticed that there is a need for better organization of the plan and program in order to create a space for implementation of modern ways of teaching.
- **The cooperation with other universities**

Recommendations for improvement:

- If the Faculty really follows modern tendencies there should be more practical training for the students. Modern tendencies in the teaching are centered on more practical work and less theory

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

ECTS is introduced as very important instrument for curriculum development, and students have to fulfil all obligations and pass exam to collect 60 ECTS points for one academic year (standard) Total time of studying is in accordance with standard. Students are satisfied with the distribution of

the work load

Recommendations for improvement:

- The ECTS board should be established as a central commission which is responsible for the actual development and implementation of the curriculum

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:

- A lot of different ways of teaching and learning is used in order to have good education background.

Recommendations for improvement:

- Students should have opportunity to say their opinion related to the organization of learning process

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 of and on the consideration of the following:

There is a opportunity for doing Master's Thesis and it is organized in system 4+1

Recommendations for improvement:

- Faculty should organize a revision of the program for MA thesis. This should have been done considering the opinion of students and also some other Universities with a longer tradition.

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 makes a positive consideration and puts forward that the study programme has the potential to remedy these shortcomings.

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 of and on the consideration of the following:

The panel thinks that at the study programs are engaged very motivated and enthusiastic staff.

The panel appreciates positive attitude for improvement.

Based on the available documents that the panel inspected and looked into, the panel concludes that the qualifications of the staff are on academic level.

There is a need for support from the management in research process and publication.

However, more attention should be paid on the teachers overwork and financial problems of the Faculty.

The review panel observes that the promotion system for the teachers is clear and accepted by the components of the faculty.

There are some financial limitations to hire permanent teachers, which is a limitation for research developments.

However, for future developments, the assessment panel observes that the internationalisation of the staff is weak. Ideally, this internationalisation could be coordinated with the professional field. The lack of internationalisation also is observed in the international relevance of their research. Most of the research articles are written in Bosnian and with very limited diffusion.

Recommendations for improvement:

- Faculty should provide financial support to their teachers in order to offer them the opportunity for the research work. The teachers should write more in English, this could be the key for the improvement. Maybe someone could be interested in offering financial support for some work if they appreciate the research work.
- Internationalisation through research collaboration and stays in other European countries will help the international dimension and more visible research outcomes from the staff.
- More active participation of teachers in international projects, for example in developing Erasmus agreements.

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 of and on the consideration of the following:

Demands for the academic promotion are well defined and if consistently followed it provides good basis for assurance of professional experience and expertise.

Lack of research activity, publications in international journals are recognized as the problem and need urgent systematic approach.

Recommendations for improvement:

- The Faculty must be more active in searching for financial autonomy because this can be a huge base for improvement of all sectors of organization of the Faculty
- Organisation of events such as congress in English language
- To increase international mobility
- International relations office should be expanded to include professors, assistants and students

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 3.3

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

The academic qualification of staff members is high. The teaching process is conducted by a qualified teaching staff employed at the Faculty. The Panel positively assessed the projects that study program participated in and elements implemented in study program. This practice should continue and bring different benefits to study program, staff and students.

Recommendations for improvement:

The panel advises that networking with work fields should be improved.

National and international cooperation to start up student mobility should also be improved

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.

The Panel thinks that the staff members are very motivated and enthusiastic, supported by direct management.

Good relation between students and staff is evident from discussions and site visit.

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 of and on the consideration of the following:

The panel thinks that assessment and testing is in accordance with study program syllabi. The planned student activities for each subject are given in the framework of its program. Each of the planned activities carried a certain number of points. Each student is informed in advance with the ways and methods of assessment of each proposed activity and with the number of points that can get in each activity being assessed. So, The Panel thinks that there are good and clear procedures about assessment and testing.

Recommendations for improvement:

- Testing the practical skills should be important. It would be good to have 50 % of the mark for theory and other 50 % for practical skills because a job of Class Teaching is based on the practical work.

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 of and on the consideration of the following:

The content and concept of practice classes is defined in the course syllabi and is consistent with the theoretical concept of the course, as well as its learning outcomes. Practice classes are conducted in primary school in accordance with a defined curriculum, course syllabus and goals set.

Recommendations for improvement:

- More practical training even from the beginning of the studies, not only in the final years.

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 of and on the consideration of the following:

Admission procedures, including conditions of enrollment, are defined by the Statute of the University. Admissions policy and the number of students to enroll in degree programs is defined in accordance with the University capacity (human and spatial).

Based on the available information, the panel was able to determine that good and motivated students are selected.

Enrollment of students is conducted in accordance with the Decision on the criteria and standards for determining the order of candidates for admission in the first year of the first cycle of studies at faculties of the University of Zenica. The Panel thinks that procedures are clear, transparent and known.

Recommendations for improvement:

The panel advises that more statistical indicators regarding students and admission of the students should be monitored.

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:

The Faculty has implemented a survey in which students can assess the quality of teaching. Nevertheless, the definition of the students' participation in the educational process improvement is not clear.

At the same time there is no sufficient information on how results of the survey and students views are used for the programme enhancement. Students are not in position to observe any real actions to adopt their requests regarding teaching process and teachers attitudes. Panel find out that students doesn't have enough opportunity to give their opinion which is very important.

There is no established protocol to review the programmes with the participation of students.

Recommendations for improvement:

- Students should be accepted as important partners of the faculty, especially using their feedback for the further development of education. With this the mentality of anxiousness might be changed to self responsible engagement in all matters of student affairs
- There should be a support from the faculty management for a better organization of the students and the involvement of the students in all decisions concerned with student affairs should be improved

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 of and on the consideration of the following:

The panel shows understanding that unfortunately, neither at the federal nor the state level, are there any pre-requisites for mobility, although there is no language barrier, and there are no networks of related faculties that would enable student and academic staff mobility, however, this is an issue related to the political decision making.

Students are not enough informed about possibilities for mobility so they don't complain about this. They should know more about mobility, for example about Erasmus Mundus and tell to the Faculty they need this type of education even for a brief time (1 semester to spend in some foreign University).

Recommendations for improvement:

- International mobility of students should be supported e.g. through a special mentoring and information of very good students

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 of and on the consideration of the following:

The panel noticed that traditional system of coaching students through consultations exists at the study program.

The students have an excellent access to their teachers. The panel observes that there are some problems with visiting professors and their availability.

Recommendations for improvement:

Teacher should also work with students in the order to inform them about opportunities of mobility and acquiring the knowledge in some other places not only in their Faculty. If students are "afraid" of claiming their problems, maybe they can tell them to their teachers so they can be mediators in communication between students and management team.

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:

Students are not enough informed about Bologna process and which is more important about possibilities for mobility. The Faculty offered the information about Bologna in the site, so the problem are student which are not enough active to find out what opportunities they have.

Recommendations for improvement:

The truth is that students are passive and not enough aware of importance of being informed about things related to them, but Faculty could try to inform them in other way. The promotion of information could be done in some other way, they could insist more in informing the students.

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 makes a positive consideration and puts forward that the study programme has the potential to remedy these shortcomings.

Criterion 5. Means and Facilities

Indicator 5.1 Material Aspects

Assessment criteria:

Housing and facilities are adequate to realize the programme. Teaching tolls 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 of and on the consideration of the following:

After a faculty tour the panel holds the opinion that facilities are adequate and satisfactory. A lot of new equipment is in operation.

The panel puts forward advantages of the integrated university regarding usage of facilities and equipment.

Recommendations for improvement:

The panel advises better transparency in financial issues.

The panel also recommends that Library can be optimized.

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.

Facilities are in relatively good condition, well equipped and clean.

Panel don't have a clear view about financial means

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 of and on the consideration of the following:

Based on the available information, the panel was able to determine that the QA policy is defined on institution (central) level, and motivated QA coordinator (manager) exists at the central and the faculty level. QA system is well structured and very good implemented. The panel puts forward good cooperation between several levels in quality system, and a lot of measurements and results regarding improvements of the QA system.

Recommendations for improvement:

- The importance of student's voice should be more considered. The QA is referred to the organization of the Faculty in order to offer better education to their students and it is obvious that students are an important part so their opinion should be unavoidably.
- The transparency of the evaluation results and the certainly can be improved. It is recommended to establish a small board (Dean, Vice Dean, assistant teacher, student) which will be offered all evaluation results and which according to transparent regulation will analyze and decide about consequences

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 of and on the consideration of the following:

Based on the available documents that the panel inspected and looked into, the panel conclude that SWOT analysis is created and adopted at the study program level, and it is a part of SER.

Faculty has intentions to improve thing that are not functioning well. However, they should do more things and they should dedicate themselves more in order to solve the problems in the near future.

Measures for improvements are systematically planned and monitored

Recommendations for improvement:

- Even though SWOT analysis exists, operational and action plans the panel is missing. The panel strongly recommends that study program management create operational and/or action plans for improvements with agreed time-frame and person in charge, etc. for plans implementation.
- The results of evaluation after every year should be analyzed and there should be a stronger intention to solve problems the Faculty has. The Faculty also should demand the financial autonomy which can be the key for solving a lot of problems

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 of and on the consideration of the following:

After discussions with all discussion groups and examining of the documentation, the panel thinks that all stakeholders are involved.

Recommendations for improvement:

- Students should be taken more seriously and should be motivated to participate in making decisions.
- The panel advises that training in quality management is needed for built-up of quality culture.

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: opinion 6.3,

According to the panel the quality structure is example of good practice. A lot of motivated people are involved in the QA board. QA board is composed of all relevant stakeholders involved.

The panel thinks that there are a lot of measures for improvement, but concrete action plans are still missing.

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 of and on the consideration of the following:

During the interview with alumni and the work field representatives the panel deduced that they are satisfied with realized level

Based on the available documents and diploma thesis that the panel inspected and looked into, the panel established that there is fine quality of the diploma thesis.

Recommendations for improvement:

- The panel recommends that practical training of students should be considered.
- Even though the panel understands that mobility of students and academic staff at the University of Zenica has not yet been organized at a satisfactory level, it is not possible to implement mobility within B&H due to the lack of political will, the panel strongly recommend that internationalization must be stimulated.

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:

- The educational output is very good. In conversation with students we find that students are satisfied with the education they acquire in this faculty. The students strongly believe that they would be competent in their field after obtaining a degree.
- It would be a good thing to provide students more practical work in order to have students that are not only good in theory but also in practical work.

Recommendations for improvement:

- Find more time for organization of the practical work even if this mean less time for theory lessons. The practical work is more important.

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.

SER was created professionally. In writing down SER participated a lot of persons from different field of faculty (study program) life. Students play respectable role in meetings and they gave huge contribution in work of the SER working group and finally writing down SER.

Team for writing down SER was working in accordance to adopted criteria and indicators.

SER was discussed and adopted at study program level and also faculty level bodies.

The global opinion of the assessment panel for the quality of the Bachelor is positive, especially taking into consideration the Bosnian National standards. Thus, at this level all the criteria could be considered as satisfactory.

The Panel strongly recommend that study program also has certain areas to improve, as mention in this report. The Panel suggests that study program and faculty management should create plans operative (action) plans for improvement aspects we suggested.

Because of the all what is mention in this report, the **Panel gives positive opinion for accreditation of this study program.**

Based on the opinions of:

Criterion 1, educational objectives and learning outcomes: Satisfactory

Criterion 2, curriculum: Satisfactory

Criterion 3, staff: Satisfactory

Criterion 4, students: Satisfactory

Criterion 5, means and facilities: Satisfactory

Criterion 6, internal quality control: Satisfactory

Criterion 7, results achieved: Satisfactory

The assessment panel holds the opinion that there is a satisfactory generic quality present in the study programme.

Overview of the Opinions¹

	Indicator Score	Criterion Score
Criterion 1: Educational Objectives and Learning Outcomes		S
Indicator 1.1 Level and Orientation	S	
Indicator 1.2 Domain Specific demands	S	
Criterion 2: Curriculum		S
Indicator 2.1 Correspondence between Objectives and the Content of the Programme	S	
Indicator 2.2 Demands Professional and Academic Alignment	S	
Indicator 2.3 Coherence Programme	S	
Indicator 2.4 Workload	G	
Indicator 2.5 Coherence of the Organization of the Learning Process and Contents	S	
Indicator 2.6 Master's Thesis	S	
Criterion 3: Staff		S
Indicator 3.1 Quality of Staff	G	
Indicator 3.2 Demands Professional/Academic Alignment	S	
Indicator 3.3 Quantity of Staff	S	
Criterion 4: Students		S
Indicator 4.1 Assessment and Testing	G	
Indicator 4.2 Practical training	S	
Indicator 4.3 Condition of Admission	G	

¹ If the table mentions only one opinion, this opinion is valid for all specializations, locations and variants that are mentioned in relation to the concerning study programme. If the opinion on one or more specialisations/locations/variants differs, all the opinions are mentioned in the table.

Indicator 4.4 Student Involvement in the Improvement of the Teaching/Learning Processes	S	
Indicator 4.5 Measures for promoting Mobility, Including the Mutual recognition of Credits	U	
Indicator 4.6 Coaching of Students	S	
Indicator 4.7 Information, Consultation and Complaining System	S	
Criterion 5: Means and Facilities		S
Indicator 5.1 Material Aspects	S	
Criterion 6: Internal Quality Control		S
Indicator 6.1 Evaluation Results	S	
Indicator 6.2 Measures for Improvement	S	
Indicator 6.3 Involving Co-workers, Students, Alumni and the Professional Field	S	
Criterion 7: Results Achieved		S
Indicator 7.1 Realized Level	S	
Indicator 7.2 Educational Output	S	

Appendices

I Site visit schedule – 12 April – 13 April 2012

Pedagogical faculty University of Zenica

Date 11.04.2012	Arrival to Zenica	
Around 16.00	Meeting of external assessment team	
Evening	Dinner	

12.04.2012		
09:00-09:30	Study program	Meeting with self assessment team: Prof. dr. Ćatić, Chair for Pedagogical Sciences; Doc. dr. Skelić, Head of Department of the Study Program "Razredna nastava"; V. prof. dr. Kukić, Dean; Doc. dr. Burgić, Vice-Dean; Ass. Beganović; Ass. Čaro; Paša Jašarević, Head of Library; Ass. Mr. Ćurković, QA Manager.
09:30-10:00	Study program	Meeting management: V. prof. dr. Kukić Doc. dr. Burgić Velida Mahovkić, Legal Advisor
10:00-10:30	Study program	Meeting academic staff: Doc. dr. Alić Doc. dr. Madjarević Dr. Ćatić
10:30-11:00	Study program	Coffee break
11:00-11:30	Study program	Meeting academic staff: Doc. dr. Meškić V. prof. dr. Bajramović
11:30-12:15	Study program	Meeting students representatives of first and second year: Amir Zukić, Ana Vrdoljak, Buljubašić Merima, Anita Gelić i Sabiha Joldić
12:15-13:00	Study program	Meeting students representatives of third and final years: Ermina Ščulić, Alisa Ćatić, Anja Polić, Haris

		Nuhagić, Talić Emina, Helena Šantić
13:00-14:00	Study program	Lunch break
14:00-15:00	Study program	<u>Meeting administration, student service, and international office:</u> Velida Mahovkić, Legal Advisor Aida Alić, Head of Student Service Semra Cica Mahovkić, Student Service Ass. Mr. Ćurković, QA Manager; Doc. dr. Muris Bajramović, member of QA Board and Head of Department for Bosnian Language; Sn. ass. Prasko, member of QA Board and ECTS Coordinator; Ass. Subašić, member of QA Board and Web Master; Tanja Muratović, student member of QA Board; Rabija Bešo, student member of QA Board.
15:00-16:00	Study program	<u>Faculty tour:</u> V. prof. dr. Kukić, Dean Doc. dr. Dženan Skelić, Head of the Department of the Study Program Ahmet Šabić, administration
16:00-17:00	Study program	<u>Meeting alumni and representatives of workfield</u> Vanesa Delalić , alumni; Alisa Ibraković, alumni, student of master program and representative of workfield: Agency for Pre- and Primary School Education, Sarajevo; Ana Marić and Edin Hadžikadunić, Institute for Pedagogical Sciences Zenica
17:00	Study program	Meeting of external assessment team
20:00	Study program	Dinner
13.04.2012		
07:30		Breakfast
08:30-12.00	Study program	Informal program-discussion with students, staff, additional meetings and documents and etc.
12:00-12:30	Study program	<u>Meeting with Self assessment team:</u> Doc. dr. Skelić, Head of Department of the Study Program“Razredna nastava”; V. prof. dr. Kukić, Dean; Doc. dr. Burgić, Vice-Dean; Ass. Beganović; Ass. Čaro; Paša Jašarević, Head of Library; Ass. Mr. Ćurković, QA Manager.

12:30-13:30	Lunch	
13:30-15:30	Study program	Meeting of external assessment team
15:30-16:30	Study program	Report to dean, vice deans, staff and others
17:00	Departure	