

EDUCATIONAL QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Physical education and sports

An evaluation of the quality of the bachelor's programme
Physical education and sports at Pedagogical faculty
University of Bihać

[/draft May2012]

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 Physical education and sports at Pedagogical faculty University of Bihać** 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.

1. The Assessment Panel

1.1 Composition

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

The panel assigned to evaluate the **bachelor's programme Physical education and sports at Pedagogical faculty University of Bihać** includes the following members:

Chairman: Prof.dr Hans Günther Sonntag, Emer. Dean of the Medical Faculty in Heidelberg

Expert 1: Prof.dr Senad Turkovic, Vice - dean for International Relations and Quality Management

Student member: Edita Miftari, Student of first degree studies, University of Sarajevo

The assessment of **bachelor's programme Physical education and sports at Pedagogical faculty University of Bihać** was accompanied and supported by Mirela Radic, associate at HEA. She was appointed as secretary of this assessment.

1.2 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.

1.3 Working Method

The assessment of **Bachelor's programme Physical Education and Sports at Pedagogical Faculty University of Bihać** 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 discuss 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.

1.4 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 Physical education and sports

Pedagogical Faculty was founded in 1998 as higher education institution within the University of Bihać. However, this educational institution dates back to 1993, when Teacher-training college for education of primary-school teachers was founded by the decision of the Presidency of the Republic B&H. By decision of Cantonal Assembly of 9th July 1998, Teacher-training college was transformed into Pedagogical Faculty, which educates teachers in the fields of Bosnian language and literature, German language and literature, English language and literature, Mathematics and Physics, Primary School Education, Preschool education, and Physical Education and Sports.

Department of Physical Education and Sports has been an integral part of Pedagogical Faculty from 1998. There are 188 students enrolled (45 absolvents) at the Department in the current academic year, which makes approximately one tenth of the entire number of students at the Faculty (1702) from the first study cycle. Also, there are 11 students enrolled in the second cycle (this is the first generation of II cycle students). The third cycle has not been organized yet, but two doctoral dissertation proposals have been registered, within the old system of study.

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: GOOD

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination 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 is needed for academic and research competences as basis for second and third cycle.

Recommendations for improvement:

Students should be educated in a very early phase of the study course about the scientific background of the objectives and about the possibilities how to get informed and become competent to use these information in the further study programme.

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: GOOD

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 the region but more international dimension is needed. Collaboration with labour market (work field) is the weak point and more activities have to be addressed in this direction.

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:

Taking into account the critical economic situation of B&H the education and the graduation criteria should refer to an international accepted level so that graduates will be able to get a professional chance outside of B&H.

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

Based on the opinions of:

Indicator 1.1, level and orientation: **GOOD**

Indicator 1.2, domain specific demands: **GOOD**.

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

[This criterion is unanimously marked: **SATISFACTORY**]

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: GOOD

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:

- Strategic approach to programme development and more frequently revision needed according to more appropriate learning outcomes description and international standards.
- Promotion for an active participation of the academic staff and students in discussions and debates on curriculum development.

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: GOOD

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:

- **Lack of the feedback from the institutions about quality of students should be pointed as one of the main strategic points in the future institution development.**
- **Subjects should become obligatory in the undergraduate study.**

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: SATISFACTORY

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

Standard coherence in medical education, preclinical subjects followed by clinical subject could be recognized. Introduction of clinical practice in the first two years is a very important step in curriculum reform and should be followed by adequate use of laboratory equipment (Laboratory for clinical skills). There is no vertical harmonization and coherence in structure of elective subjects. Clinical practice could not be elective course.

Recommendations for improvement:

- **Introduce more practical courses from early beginning of the course**
- **Adaption of the education to the requirements of professions after graduation**

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: GOOD

ECTS is introduced as very important instrument for curriculum development, and students have to fulfill all obligations and pass exam to collect 60 ECTS points for one academic year (standard)
 Total time of studying is in accordance with standards
 There is no data for master study and doctoral study.

Recommendations for improvement:

- **Due to students' lack of motivation it is recommended to introduce elective courses in particular in the field of sports and sport medicine.**
- **For the definition of the workload it should be recognized that according to the deficiency of several facilities (swimming pool etc.) lectures have to take place outside of Bihac**

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: SATISFACTORY

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

There is good intention for introduction of new teaching methodologies and alignment of the didactic method with the objectives.

Recommendations for improvement:

- **Activities for the introduction of new teaching methods and didactic methods should be supported and realized by the whole teaching staff**

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: SATISFACTORY

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

Since the second cycle of education still is in the development the master thesis has not been intensively assessed by the panel, but the panel considers the involvement of some students of the Faculty in research tasks to be a good strategy.

Opinion on Criterion 2, Curriculum: SATISFACTORY

Based on the opinions of:

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

Indicator 2.2, demands professional and academic alignment: **GOOD**

Indicator 2.3, coherence programme: **SATISFACTORY**

Indicator 2.4, workload: **GOOD**

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

Indicator 2.6, master's thesis: **SATISFACTORY**

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

[This criterion is unanimously marked: **SATISFACTORY**]

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: SATISFACTORY

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

For B&H conditions, academic staff is well prepared to teach the core of the proposed programme. They are motivated and they have a good knowledge of the local needs for the profession.

The main problem is the lack of the own teaching staff but this problem is recognized and there is important trend to increase number of own human resources.

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:

- **Strongly recommendations to raise the level of professionalisation in terms of pedagogy.**
- **Internationalisation through research collaboration and stays in other European countries will help the international dimension and more visible research outcomes from the staff.**
- Due to financial restrictions regarding the recruitment of permanent staff, it is highly recommended to urge the USK Government as well as the Bihać University to provide financial assistance
- 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: SATISFACTORY

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:

- **It is highly recommended to pay more attention to research in interdisciplinary field together with medical faculties, management and schools**
- **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: UNSATISFACTORY

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

Number of new employees (assistant) has drastically increased in the last ten years and this is good basis for increase of the number of own staff.
 There is still dependency on visiting professors.
 Structure academic vs. non-academic staff is not good. There is a lack of academic staff, especially senior ones (full and associate professors) and future perspectives for young staff. It was not possible to understand total academic staff workload (including their obligations regarding teaching at other courses, research and management activities). The research is weak and lacks international visibility as a result.

Recommendations for improvement:

- **Appropriate measures to ensure the retention of its own staff**
- **Students should be motivated to pursue academic career to address the very low rate of continuation of studies, therefore organisation of third cycle studies is recommended**
- **The number of academic staff has to be increased at senior level**
- **The young staff (assistants) has to be recruited and formed, stimulating international exposure to research, assistants and doctoral students should be have more time for research**

- **The clear review of total staff workload has to be prepared**

Opinion on Criterion 3, Staff: SATISFACTORY

Based on the opinions of:

Indicator 3.1, quality of staff: **SATISFACTORY**

Indicator 3.2, demands professional/academic alignment: **SATISFACTORY**

Indicator 3.3, quantity of staff: **UNSATISFACTORY**

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

[This criterion is unanimously marked: **SATISFACTORY**]

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: GOOD

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

Weaknesses of the system of examination are recognized in SER.
Serious changes are needed in assurance of quality in examination process.

Recommendations for improvement:

- **More transparency of evaluation is needed.**

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: SATISFACTORY

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

Institution has 7 spaces for practical work with equipment and this is good basis for quality practical training however they are located in a far distance to the campus and the building of the faculty.

There are still obstacles in usage of Catalogue of the skills in education and assessment in practical training and there is need for obligatory introduction through legal documentation (Regulation on evaluation, etc.).

Recommendations for improvement:

- **The efforts of the faculty and especially of the dean to reconstruct the buildings on the campus and with this to establish better facilities especially for the practical training should be supported by the government**

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: GOOD

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

Well defined internal procedures for admission.
There is no preparatory programme before admission.

Recommendations for improvement:

- **Since education and graduation criteria in B&H secondary schools are different the admission criteria just on the basis of grades in teaching objectives should be improved.**

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: SATISFACTORY

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

All the problems are identified in SER and there are constant attempts by faculty to engage students.
There are needs for strategic engagement and obligations for students through legal documentations.

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.

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

Recommendations for improvement:

- **It is recommended to substantially increase students' involvement in the decision-making and functioning of the faculty, e.g. through feedback**
- **There is inadequate motivation on the part of students to organise themselves as an active partner in the faculty and this needs to be improved**
- **Each year of study should have a student representative to ensure better communication**

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: SATISFACTORY

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

ECTS as basis for student exchange exist.

There is a good interest from the student's part for exchange programmes but more efficient support from the Faculty management is necessary.

More bilateral and multilateral agreements needed as basis for exchange of students and teaching staff.

Recommendations for improvement:

- **International mobility should be bolstered**

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: GOOD

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

The students have an excellent access to their teachers. The coaching system seems well organised but it does not cope completely with the success rates for some modules. The panel observes that there are some problems with visiting professors and their availability. The importance of adequate coaching of students is recognized. The Council of the Faculty of medicine reintroduced the mentorship in the academic 2011/12 year.

Recommendations for improvement:

- **It is recommended to put more efforts into the mentorship system in the faculty especially with the aim to motivate more students to enter the academic career**

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: SATISFACTORY

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

The fact that student are not well informed is recognized in SER and more collaboration between management team and students is needed.

Recommendations for improvement

- **It is recommended to establish a board at the faculty with members of all faculty groups including students which is concerned with aspects of information and support of international exchange measures**

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

Based on the opinions of:

Indicator 4.1, assessment and testing: **GOOD**

Indicator 4.2, practical training: **SATISFACTORY**

Indicator 4.3, condition of admission: **GOOD**

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

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

Indicator 4.6, coaching of students: **GOOD**

Indicator 4.7 information, consultation and complaining system: **SATISFACTORY**

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

[This criterion is unanimously marked: **SATISFACTORY**]

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: SATISFACTORY

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

According to the SER Faculty has its own building and well-developed structure that will be additionally supplemented with the modern equipment for research (during 2012). Faculty also possesses modern equipment and computer facilities for regular realization of teaching process.

Financial incomes does not ensure the stability and future development and have to be improved. There is a total financial dependence on the government. Looking for the possibilities to insure more own funds. Development of library, increasing the number of books are necessary.

Accelerate the plan to build up balloon and sports hall, because it is the basis of department like this. It is believed that the 1.35 million KM worth Centre for Kinesiological studies should not take precedence over the sports halls, especially at sports department which does not have any sports hall at all.

Recommendations for improvement:

- **It is recommended to support the plans of the dean for the necessary reconstruction and the establishment of new facilities which are necessary for an adequate education**

Opinion on Criterion 5, Means and Facilities: SATISFACTORY

Based on the opinions of:

Indicator 5.1, material aspects: **SATISFACTORY**

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

[This criterion is unanimously marked: **SATISFACTORY**]

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: GOOD

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

Structure necessary for quality control exist at the university and with this a permanently monitoring of teaching process

Formal usage of the results of evaluation process: no usage for the improvement of the teaching process.

There is a QA Office at the level of University only, and students are not well-informed about its purpose, despite the faculty's efforts to make such information constantly available.

Recommendations for improvement:

- **To establish internal quality structure in a process to periodically review the teaching plan**
- **To develop procedure to measure achievements and to follow graduates in the labor market**
- **To establish monitoring system**

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: SATISFACTORY

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

Previous self-assessment has been taken into consideration and has been used in improvement of many aspects of educational process.

Some weakpoints from the former assessment in educational process were recognized but no improvement action in the study programme.

There are needs for strategic approach, periodically systematic students evaluation with well defined aims and planned usage of the results in order to improve teaching process.

Recommendations for improvement:

- **Set the conditions for a fluid information exchange inside the Faculty and between the Faculty and the central office of the University.**
- **Include the students as partners into this process since their feed back is essential for the evaluation and development measures**

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: SATISFACTORY

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

There is good progress in the internal quality assurance. The Committee and Office for Quality are formed and the coordinator for quality at the University level is introduced.

Through Teaching Council there is solid involvement of teaching staff in decision-making process but evaluations have to be done in systematic way. Greater part of teaching process has to be evaluated.

Involvement of students is listed as one of the weakest point in SER and need strategic plan from management staff.

This criterion is not processed in the SER. It is only mentioned through another criterion.

Recommendations for improvement:

- **Better connection with alumni and stakeholders is necessary**
- **Develop the follow-up system and the template of annual report about the quality results.**
- **Identification of what information about the most relevant outcomes of the programme is needed for different stakeholders.**

Opinion on Criterion 6, Internal Quality Control: SATISFACTORY

Based on the opinions of:

Indicator 6.1, evaluation results: **GOOD**

Indicator 6.2, measures for improvement: **SATISFACTORY**

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

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

[This criterion is unanimously marked: **SATISFACTORY**]

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: SATISFACTORY

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

There is a substantial improvement at Faculty, and great changes aimed to the development of teaching process have been made.

There is also few points where forces from all management and staff have to be pointed in the future period that will be listed in general remarks

Recommendations for improvement:

- **See recommendations mentioned in the above criteria**

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: SATISFACTORY

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

Pass rates are pretty low at the preclinic years of study and need detailed analysis. Average study time is 8.17 years and also need analysis and reconsideration.

Recommendations for improvement:

- **Taking into account the recommendations of the above criteria and to try to find ways to increase the pass rates, and to reduce the study time**

Opinion on Criterion 7, Results Achieved: SATISFACTORY

Based on the opinions of:

Indicator 7.1, realized level: **SATISFACTORY**

Indicator 7.2, educational output: **ATISFACTORY**

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

[This criterion is unanimously marked: **SATISFACTORY**]

Global Opinion

Based on the opinions of:

Criterion 1, educational objectives and learning outcomes: Partially compliance,

Criterion 2, curriculum: Substantially compliance,

Criterion 3, staff: Substantially compliance,

Criterion 4, students: Substantially compliance,

Criterion 5, means and facilities: Substantially compliance,

Criterion 6, internal quality control: Substantially compliance,

Criterion 7, results achieved: Substantially compliance,

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

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

However, there are certain aspects that need to be addressed through the strategic plan to cover issues of research, financing, cooperation with alumni and industry etc. There is a strong need to reduce the number of visiting professors that is surely reason for the low level of communication between students and teaching staff, especially in the process of supervision and organization of examination. Another important issued to be addressed is the low level of students involvement and motivation and this should be reflected in the strategic vision.

More internationalization of study process is necessary: more international projects, agreements etc
 One of the weakest points is the research process. New equipment is good basis but it has to be followed by strategic plan of education and usage in undergraduate and postgraduate study programme.

Overview of the Opinions¹

	Indicator Score	Criterion Score
Criterion 1: Educational Objectives and Learning Outcomes		S
Indicator 1.1 Level and Orientation	G	
Indicator 1.2 Domain Specific demands	G	
Criterion 2: Curriculum		S
Indicator 2.1 Correspondence between Objectives and the Content of the Programme	G	
Indicator 2.2 Demands Professional and Academic Alignment	G	
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	S	
Indicator 3.2 Demands Professional/Academic Alignment	S	
Indicator 3.3 Quantity of Staff	U	
Criterion 4: Students		S
Indicator 4.1 Assessment and Testing	G	
Indicator 4.2 Practical training	S	

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 4.3 Condition of Admission	G	
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	S	
Indicator 4.6 Coaching of Students	G	
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	G	
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

Curriculum vitae of the members of the assessment panel

HANS-G. SONNTAG, MD PhD

Retired Director of the Institute of Hygiene and Medical Microbiology, University of Heidelberg, Germany.

Hans Günther Sonntag studied medicine at the universities in Gießen and Kiel, Germany. He received a doctorate at the University of Kiel in 1966 and habilitated there in 1974 for immunology, in 1976 for Medical Microbiology. He was appointed Director of the Institute for Hygiene and Medical Microbiology of the University of Heidelberg in 1980 where he stayed until he took the emeritus status in 2004.

Professor Sonntag covers a broad area of subjects by his expertise. His research focuses are the immunology for organ transplantations, mycobacteria, anaerobic bacteria, the epidemiology of infectious diseases like the virus hepatitis, meningitis or typhus. He is particularly active in the field of hospital- and drinking water hygiene as well as environmental toxics.

The internationally highly acknowledged expert documented his knowledge in more than 350 publications, as editor of educational books and received numerous national and international honours. Not only is he now "Doctor honoris causa" but also Senator of the University of Budapest, Hungary. He was acting Dean of the Medical Faculty University of Heidelberg from 1981 – 1987 and from 1994 to 2004.

I Site visit schedule – 15 March – 17 March 2012

Physical education and sports at Pedagogical faculty University of Bihać

Date 15.03.2012		
Afternoon	Trip to Bihac	Dinner

16.03.2012		
7:30-9:30	Meeting of external team	
09:30-10:00	Study program	Meeting with self assessment team
10:00-10:30	Study program	Meeting management
10:30-11:00	Study program	Meeting academic staff
11:00-11:30	Study program	Coffee break

11:30-12:00	Study program	Meeting academic staff
12:00-12:45	Study program	Meeting students representatives of first and second year
12:45-13:30	Study program	Meeting students representatives of third and fourth years
13:30-14:00	Study program	Meeting administration
14:00-15:00	Study program	Lunch break
15:00-15:30	Study program	Meeting student service
15:30-16:00	Study program	Meeting representatives of international and/or QA office
16:00-17:00	Study program	Faculty tour
17:00-17:30	Study program	Meeting alumni and representatives of work field
17:30	Study program	Meeting of external assessment team
20:00	Study program	Dinner
17.03.2011		
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	Meeting with Self assessment team
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	