



**“UKSHIN HOTI” UNIVERSITY PRIZREN
UNIVERSITETI “UKSHIN HOTI” PRIZREN**

Rruga e Shkronjave str No. 1, 20000
Prizren, Republic of Kosovo;
Tel:+381 (0) 29- 232 140;
Homepage: www.uni-prizren.com

**GUIDELINES
for the evaluation of academic staff, course evaluation, and the use of
evaluation results at the "Ukshin Hoti" University Prizren**

Prizren, January 2020



Content

1. Purpose of the guidelines	3
2. Scope of the guide	3
3. Evaluation of academic staff performance	3
4. Evaluation period	3
5. Carriers of the evaluation process	4
6. The evaluation process through printed questionnaires	6
7. Evaluation process through questionnaires and electronic reports	7
8. Organizing the evaluation process through reports	7
9. Validity of evaluation results	7
10. Processing, publishing and using evaluation results	7
11. Implementation of performance outcomes in the recruitment and re-election process...	8
12. Support and professional development of academic staff.....	8
13. Promotion of high performing academic staff	9
14. Measures against poorly performing academic staff.....	9
15. Annexes, revision and entry into force of the Guide.....	10
Appendices: Questionnaires and reports	11
A.1. Questionnaire for subject and teacher evaluation.....	13
A.2. Inter-collegiate evaluation questionnaire	15
A.3. Assessment Report by the Dean.....	17
A.4. Report of scientific publications and conference attendance	19
A.5. Report of contribution to university and contribution to society	21



1. Purpose of the guidelines

The purpose of the Guidelines for the Evaluation of Academic Staff, Course Evaluation, and the Use of Evaluation Results (hereinafter referred to as the Guidelines) is to set out the criteria and procedures for the evaluation of academic staff and study subjects, in order to provide data that will be used for planning at all levels of "Ukshin Hoti" University in Prizren (hereinafter referred to as the University), with the aim of ensuring quality in the teaching and learning process according to European standards ESLG.

2. Scope of the guide

- 2.1. The guide is based on the Regulation on quality assurance.
- 2.2. The provisions of this Guide apply to all regular and engaged academic staff of the University.

3. Evaluation of academic staff performance

- 3.1. The evaluation of the performance of the regular and engaged academic staff of the University is conducted twice a year, respectively at the end of each semester.
- 3.2. The evaluation of academic staff performance is based on the results of the questionnaires and reports attached to this guide.
- 3.3. The criteria for performance evaluation are presented in the table below.

Evaluation Criterion	Percentage
Evaluation by students	20%
Inter-collegial evaluation	20%
Evaluation by the Dean	20%
Scientific publications and participation in conferences	20%
Contribution to the University and contribution to society	20%
Total:	100%

4. Academic Staff Performance Evaluation Period

- 4.1. Evaluation and monitoring of compliance with standards and programs based on the instruments set out in the Quality Assurance Regulation, and this guideline is periodically carried out twice a year.
- 4.2. The overall assessment, determined by the provisions of this guide, is made at the end of each semester.



5. Carriers of the evaluation process

Bodies responsible for quality assurance	Role and responsibilities
Rector	Ensures that the quality assurance and evaluation system at the University is being implemented and takes executive action in this regard.
Vice-Rector for Teaching, Student Affairs and Scientific Research	Reviews the Deans' reports, conducts interviews with the Deans on the teaching and learning process at the faculty. Achieving the objectives by statute helps the Rector to achieve the objectives. Coordinates with the Rector to implement the recommendations of the Central Commission for Quality Assurance for teacher evaluation.
Vice-Rector for Quality Improvement	Performs the duties of the principal responsible for quality assurance set out in the Quality Assurance Guide. Undertakes quality assurance policy initiatives. Assists the Rector in setting quality assurance priorities and executing quality assurance policies.
Senate	Adopts and reviews regulations, guidelines, questionnaires and other quality assurance instruments. Adopts and reviews quality assurance measures.
Office for Quality Assurance	Coordinates and manages activities with all stakeholders involved in the quality assurance and evaluation process.
Central Commission for Quality Assurance	Analyzes survey results and reports with recommendations to organs.
Quality Assurance Committee at the faculty level	Organizes the evaluation process of the academic staff. Drafts the evaluation and quality assurance report at the faculty level.
Office for Academic Affairs	Supports the Office of Quality Assurance in preparing the final evaluation report for teachers and for the operational evaluation tasks of teachers, courses and workgroup programs. Assists the Vice-Rector for Teaching, Student Affairs and Research to implement recommendations for academic issues.
Deans	Ensure the preparation of the annual report, for the evaluation of the academic staff, including the attendance of the academic staff, the research work,



	<p>publications, participation in conferences, contributions to the University and society. Performs the evaluation of professors for regular lectures, exams and consultations, participation in committees, and the Faculty Council. Compile the periodic and annual report of the faculty. Analyze evaluation data and take care of implementation of recommendations. Conduct interviews with teachers about the teaching process.</p>
University Study Committee	<p>Reviews the evaluation results during the selection, re-election and promotion process.</p>
Lecturers	<p>They are subject to assessment, self-assessment and inter-collegiate assessment, classroom observation of similar or related subjects. Perform academic assignments, inform students of the assessment process. Attend training. Draft annual self-assessment report at the end of December for scientific research, conference attendance, University contribution and community contribution and submit it to the Dean and Faculty Quality Assurance Committee for evaluation and inclusion in the summary report.</p>
Students / Graduates (alumni)	<p>They are actively involved in the quality assurance process by completing teacher evaluation questionnaires for courses/ subjects, study programs, infrastructure and student services. They are part of the quality assurance committees at the University and faculty level.</p>



6. The evaluation process through printed questionnaires

The evaluation process through the questionnaires for evaluation of the teachers, subjects and study programs is carried out according to the following specified procedures:

- 6.1. The questionnaire is completed by students in the final weeks of each semester;
- 6.2. The coordinator / chair of the quality assurance committee at the faculty level informs the teacher in advance of the implementation of the questionnaire;
- 6.3. The teacher should not be present in the classroom or in the amphitheater while students complete the questionnaire;
- 6.4. Completion of the questionnaires by the students is anonymous and confidential;
- 6.5. Immediately after completing the questionnaires, the coordinator / chairperson or one of the members of the Quality Assurance Committee fills out the minutes in the presence of the teacher and the same is signed by the teacher;
- 6.6. Completed questionnaires and minutes are put in envelopes;
- 6.7. The envelope is sealed in the presence of the teacher, and sealed and signed by the coordinator / chair or one of the members of the Quality Assurance Committee at the faculty level and also signed by the evaluated academic staff;
- 6.8. The envelopes sealed with the questionnaire and the record are sent in real time (immediately) to the Quality Assurance Office;
- 6.9. Upon completion of the evaluation through the questionnaire, the Quality Assurance Committee at the faculty level, in co-operation with the Coordinator of the Quality Assurance Office, holds the meeting at which the evaluation envelopes are opened, and the results of the questionnaires are entered, processed and tabulated;
- 6.10. After processing and tabulating the data, the Quality Assurance Committee at the faculty level compiles the minutes of the evaluation results, which is signed by the members of the committee, and submits the same in a physical form to the Quality Assurance Office, and an electronic copy sends it to the official e-mail of the Head of the Central Commission for Quality Assurance and the Coordinator of the Office for Quality Assurance;
- 6.11. The members of the Faculty Quality Assurance Committee are obliged to maintain the confidentiality of the evaluation results until their publication;
- 6.12. Any attempt to misrepresent, manipulate or falsify the evaluation process is punishable and sanctioned under applicable laws and regulations.



7. Evaluation process through questionnaires and electronic reports

7.1. The University, in accordance with all-inclusive opportunities and analysis, is committed to conducting the evaluation through questionnaires and evaluation reports electronically, using the resources of the University Management System (UMS).

7.2. Questionnaires and electronic assessment reports are managed and controlled by the Quality Assurance Office.

8. Organizing the evaluation process through reports

8.1. The Dean's Evaluation Report (Appendix A.3.) Is conducted by the Dean on the basis of factual evidence and objective judgment regarding:

8.1.1. Regular attendance of academic staff (10%)

8.1.2. Regular examinations and consultations of academic staff (5%); and

8.1.3. Ethical behavior with students and colleagues of the academic staff (5%).

8.2. The inter-collegial report (Appendix A.2.) is conducted by regular academic staff of the faculty and evaluates colleagues performance related to:

8.2.1. Collegiate cooperation of academic staff;

8.2.2. Collegiate communication;

8.2.3. Interpersonal relationships; and

8.2.4. Ethical collegial behavior.

9. Validity of evaluation results

9.1. Student assessment data are considered valid in the case of over 30% (thirty percent) student participation;

9.2. In the case of under 30% (thirty percent) student ratings the results will not be published and do not represent a sufficient basis for inclusion in the overall teacher evaluation percentage;

10. Processing, publishing and using evaluation results

10.1. The final results of the performance appraisal are processed by the Quality Assurance Office, with the support of the Academic Affairs Office;

10.2. The Quality Assurance Office sends the results of the performance appraisal individually to the academic staff undergoing the evaluation;

10.3. The results of the performance evaluation are published in the form of a semester and annual summary report, after the evaluation process is completed;



10.4. The summary report of the academic staff's evaluation of the academic unit is sent to the Rector, the Dean of the Faculty and the Central Commission for Quality Assurance;

10.5. The performance appraisal results are confidential for each assessed teacher;

10.6. The results of the teacher performance appraisal are also sent to the University Studies Commission, which takes into consideration these results upon the selection, re-election or promotion of academic staff.;

10.7. The Central Commission for Quality Assurance, after reviewing and analyzing the results of the overall evaluation, makes recommendations to the management and decision-making bodies for taking measures to improve the situation or for decision-making in accordance with the respective Statute and Regulation;

10.8. Following the elaboration of the results and the acceptance of recommendations by the Central Commission for Quality Assurance, a joint meeting is organized with the participation of the leading structures of the University (Rector, Vice-Rector, Coordinator of the Office for Quality Assurance, Head of Academic Affairs Office, Deans of Academic Units) for the purpose of implementing quality assurance measures, in accordance with the Statute and respective regulations

Implementation of performance outcomes in the recruitment and re-election process

10.9. During the process of recruiting new academic staff, re-election and promotion of academic staff at the University, the results of academic staff performance will be taken into consideration and evaluated by the Study Committee;

10.10. In the case of re-election or promotion of the academic staff at the University, the result of the evaluation of the academic staff shall be taken into account in accordance with the respective Statute and regulations, respectively the Regulation on the selection and promotion of academic staff and the Regulation on external associates.

11. Support and professional development of academic staff

11.1. The University will provide training programs for new academic staff (new professors and assistants) in the first two years of their work in order to support them;

11.2. Participation in training of academic staff is mandatory;

11.3. The university will also provide supportive training programs for full-time academic staff, depending on performance results.



12. Promotion of high performing academic staff

12.1. The University will promote staff following evidence of high performance in teaching, scholarly publications, inter-collegial reports and contributions to the University and the community.

12.2. Faculty Boards will propose, each year, the promotion of their academic staff, followed by a report including assessment results and high performance;

12.3. University Senate shall decide on forms of promotion and support for academic staff who have shown high performance;

12.4. If the promotion of academic staff will have financial implications, the decision on budget allocation is taken by the University Governing Council.

13. Measures against poorly performing academic staff

13.1. Poor teacher performance is considered the result of evaluation when academic staff are rated below 50% (fifteen percent) overall by subject and teacher evaluation, inter-collegial evaluation, dean's evaluation, evaluation of scientific publications, contribution to the University and society.

13.2. In case of poor performance, the following measures are initiated against the academic staff:

13.2.1. In case of poor evaluation for the first time, verbal remarks are issued by the Dean of the Faculty;

13.2.2. In case of repeated poor performance for the second time in a row, a written warning is issued by the Dean of the Faculty and other measures are announced;

13.2.3. In the event of a repeated poor performance for the third time, the following measures shall be imposed;

13.2.3.1. Not allowing wages and overtime for one semester;

13.2.3.2. Academic non-promotion for one year;

13.2.3.3. Appearing in front of the Ethics Council;

13.2.3.4. Other measures in accordance with the Statute and Regulations of the University.

13.2.4. In case of continuous repetition of poor performance, the measure of non-continuation of contract at the University is pronounced.



13.3. All of these measures will be included in the Regulation on the selection, re-election and promotion of University academic staff, and in the Regulation on disciplinary measures against University academic staff.

14. Appendices, revision and entry into force of the Guidelines

14.1. Appendices to this guide are questionnaires and performance evaluation reports.

14.2. The guide, questionnaires and reports will be reviewed annually by the University Senate.

14.3. The Guide enters into force upon approval by the University Senate.

Chairman of the Senate

Prof. Asoc. Dr. Ismet Temaj