



UNIVERSITY OF GJAKOVA
"FEHMI AGANI"

Sr. ISMAIL QEMALI, Nn 50 000 GJAKOVA, Republic of Kosovo
Phone: 038 200 20 831

Senate of University of Gjakova "Fehmi Agani" based on article 187-197 of UGJFA Statutetë, on meeting held on date 08.05.2020 approved:

**MANUAL ON EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE,
QUALITY AND CURRICULA**

Gjakova 2020

CONTENT

1. Assasment standars.....	8
2. Goals of professor and curricula evaluation	8
3. Evaluation of academic staff performance	8
4. Period of evaluation of academic staff performance	9
5. Evaluation processes.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
6. Evaluation proces throught printed questionare	11
7. Evaluation proces throught questionare and electronic reports.....	12
8. Organization of evaluation proces through reports	12
9. Publication of Evaluation results.....	13
10. Subsequent measures	14
a) Evaluation report.....	14
b) Performance review meetings for internal evaluation	14
c) Recrutment o f n e w academic staff.....	14
d) Promoting academic staff	15
e) Advancment of academic staff	15
f) Repetition of poor performance	15
g) Measures against academic staff with poor performance	16
11. Academic staff complaint.....	16
12. Guidelines Review in 2022	Error! Bookmark not defined.

1. Evaluation Standards

This document specifies the rules set by the mission, policies and strategies of the University of Gjakova "Fehmi Agani", which derive in a special way from the Statute of UGJFA. This document is fully in accordance with the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG, 2015) and the Regulation on Quality Assurance and Evaluation at the University of Gjakova "Fehmi Agani".

UGJFA performs the evaluation of curricula (subjects) and staff performance in a standardized and transparent manner. These guidelines clearly regulate the collection and use of data obtained during the evaluation of academic staff and teaching subjects. They apply to all academic staff (including lecturers and teaching assistants) regardless of their academic vocation or position.

The evaluation of professors and study subjects by students has an important role in the group of measures for quality assurance, as an integral part of the construction of the quality assurance system within the University.

In particular, evaluation results help teachers and their own academic unit to continually improve. In cases where academic staff do not have the skills or will to improve, the university will impose measures / sanctions. eg assignment of other tasks / activities..

2. Goals of professor and curriculum evaluation

The evaluation of professors aims to improve the teaching activities at the University, in particular by providing:

- Instrument for collecting information on the effectiveness of academic staff teaching (feedback) and
- Instrument for collecting information for work planning for: deans, vice deans for teaching, study programs and university management.

Course evaluations are an important part of creating a comprehensive quality assurance culture. Student responses to the quality of a subject and a professor give teachers valuable information on how students perceive both the teacher and his teaching.

The data obtained from the evaluations are intended to help teachers improve their practices, further developing the content of their courses where necessary.

3. Academic staff performance evaluation

3.1. Performance evaluation of regular and engaged academic staff of the university is realized twice a year, respectively at the end of each semester.

3.2. The evaluation of the performance of the academic staff is based on the results of the questionnaires and the reports attached to this guide.

3.3. Criteria for performance evaluation are presented in the table below.

Evaluation criterion	Percentage
Evaluation by students	25%

Intercollegiate evaluation	15%
Evaluation by dean	15%
Scientific publications and conference participation in conferences	25%
Contribution to university and contribution to community	20%
Total:	100%

4. Period of academic staff performance

4.1. Evaluation and monitoring of compliance with standards and of programs based on the instruments set out in the Quality Assurance Regulation, and in this guide is carried out periodically twice a year;

4.2. The general evaluation, determined by the provisions of this guide, is made at the end of each semester.

Interested parties	Responsibilities
Rector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures that the quality assurance system is an integral part of management at UGJFA. Contributes to finding solutions for teachers who exhibit low performance repeatedly. Takes leadership when students report a violation of the law.
Vice –rector for Academic Affairs and Quality Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responsible for the quality system (Management duties, reporting, etc.). Initiate review of guidelines in 2022. Co-chairs meetings to review internal performance.
Senate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approves and revises regulations, guidelines, questionnaires and other quality assurance instruments. Approves and reviews quality assurance measures.
Central Commission for Quality assurance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviews questionnaires, approves guidelines, initiates quality initiation, policies, strategies and quality improvement plan regarding evaluation results.
Quality Assurance Office (QAO)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Carries out evaluations, processes data, monitors and publishes results. Compiles reports related to evaluation results according to the requirements of senior management. Coordinates activities with students and academic staff in relation to informing, collecting and publishing evaluation results. Reports to the Vice- rector for Academic Affairs and Quality Improvement.

Deans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyze evaluation data and write the evaluation report for the respective academic unit. • • Decide on the announcement of 10% of the best evaluation results on the website • • Conduct interviews with teachers and agree on improvement plans (if scores are below 3.0) • • Distribute the evaluation report among the teachers of the respective faculty, • • Co-chair of meetings during the review of the performance of the internal evaluation,
Univeristy Commision for studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examines long evaluation results during the process of election, re-election and advancement.
Vice-deans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the Dean in fulfilling their duties.
Quality assuranace commission at the faculty level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • . Organizes the evaluation process of academic staff. • Drafts the evaluation and quality assurance report at the faculty level
Members of the academic staff teachers (academics)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsibility for quality (Academic assignment) • • Inform students about the use of evaluation results. • • They undergo evaluation, make their own evaluation, make intercollegial evaluation, make observation in the classroom for similar subjects. Perform academic tasks, inform students about the evaluation process. Participate in trainings. Draft the annual self-evaluation report at the end of December on research, conference attendance, contribution to the University and contribution to society, and submit it to the Dean, and to the Quality Assurance Commission at the faculty level for evaluation and inclusion in the summary report.
Students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consult on the research process • Complete the questionnaires
Students/Graduates (alumni)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actively incorporate in the quality assurance process, completing teacher evaluation questionnaires, subject / course, study program, infrastructure and student services. • They are part of the commissions for quality assurance at the level of the University and the faculty.

5. EVALUATION PROCESSES

UGJFA conducts evaluations, processes data, monitors results and compiles reports related to evaluation results according to management requirements. Students complete the questionnaires at the end of each semester.

The courses and all teachers responsible for the respective subjects are currently evaluated at UGJFA.

6. Evaluation process through printed questionnaires

The evaluation process through questionnaires for teacher evaluation, subject and study program is carried out according to the following specified procedures:

- 6.1. The questionnaire is completed by students in the last weeks of each semester;
- 6.2. The coordinator / chairperson of the quality assurance commission at the faculty level informs the teacher in advance about the implementation of the questionnaire;
- 6.3. During the time of completion of the questionnaire by the students, the teacher should not be present in the classroom or amphitheater;
- 6.4. Completion of questionnaires by students is anonymous and confidential;
- 6.5. Immediately after completing the questionnaires, the coordinator / chairperson or one of the members fills in the record in the presence of the teacher and the same is signed by the teacher;
- 6.6. Completed questionnaires and record are put in the envelope;
- 6.7. The envelope is closed in the presence of the teacher, and is stamped and signed by the coordinator / chairperson or one of the members of the Quality Assurance Commission at the faculty level and is also signed by the evaluated academic staff;
- 6.8. Closed envelopes with the questionnaire and records are sent in real time (immediately) in the Office for Quality Assurance;
- 6.9. After the evaluation through the questionnaire, the Quality Assurance Commission at the faculty level, in cooperation with the Office Coordinator for Quality Assurance, holds the meeting in which the evaluation envelopes are opened, as well as the results of the questionnaires are entered, processed and tabulated;
- 6:10. After processing and tabulating the data, the Commission for quality assurance at the faculty level, compiles the records of the evaluation results which are signed by the members of the commission, and submits the same physical copy to the Office for quality assurance, and sends an electronic copy to the official e-mail of the Chairman of the Central Commission for Quality Assurance and the Coordinator of the Office for Quality Assurance;
- 6:11. The members of the Quality Assurance Commission at the faculty level are obliged to maintain the confidentiality of the evaluation results until the moment of their publication;
- 6:12. Any attempt to deviate, manipulate or falsify the evaluation process is punishable and sanctioned under the relevant legislation and regulations in force.

7. Evaluation process through questionnaires and electronic reports

7.1. The University, in accordance with the possibilities and comprehensive analysis, is committed that the evaluation through questionnaires and evaluation reports is carried out in electronic form, using the resources of the University Management System (SMU).

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

8. Organization of evaluation process through reports

8.1. The inter-collegial report is conducted by the regular academic staff of the faculty and evaluates the performance of colleagues, regarding:

8.1.1. Collaborative cooperation of academic staff;

8.1.2. Collaborative communication;

8.1.3. Interpersonal relationships; and

8.1.4. Collegial ethical behavior.

8.2. The dean's evaluation report is carried out by the dean based on factual evidence and objective judgment, regarding:

8.2.1. Regular attendance of academic staff (10%);

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

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

8.3. The report of scientific publications and participation in conferences (Appendix.) Is carried out by the quality committee at the faculty level based on factual evidence related to:

8.3.1. Publication of at least 1 (one) scientific paper on the platforms according to MEST Administrative Instruction no. 01/2018 on the principles of recognition of international platforms and peer-reviewed journals (Web of Science, Scopus, EBSCO, World Cat, DOAJ) (15%); and

8.3.2. Participation or publications in at least 1 (one) conference, congress and workshop (5%).

8.4. The report of the contribution to the University and the contribution to the society is realized by the quality committee at the faculty level based on the factual evidence, related to:

8.4.1. Active contribution to at least 1 (one) commission, working group or group of University experts (10%);

8.4.2. Active participation in at least 1 (one) community activities (volunteer work, workshop, expertise, etc.) (5%).

9. Publication of evaluation results

Results will be available for:

- 9.1. Each teacher evaluated who receives his / her results electronically from the QAO.
- 9.2. Students receive information about the evaluation through oral reports from the Dean and teachers, citing reactions from previous student groups and subsequent improvements. QAO reminds teachers of the need to present oral reports to students.
- 9.3. It is very important for students to collaborate and experience that evaluation leads to continuous quality improvement.
- 9.4. The Deans and the Vice-Deans receive all the results for their faculty.
- 9.5. The Rector and the Vice-Rectors receive all the results for the University.
- 9.6. The results of the evaluation of the teacher's performance are also sent to the Commission for Studies of the University, which takes into account these results in the case of election, re-selection or advancement of the academic staff;
- 9.7. 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 certain decision-making in accordance with the relevant Statute and Regulation;
- 9.8. After processing the results and accepting the recommendations from the Central Commission for Quality Assurance, a joint meeting is organized with the participation of the leading structures of the University (Rector, Vice Rectors, Coordinator of the Office for Quality Assurance, Head of the Office for Academic Affairs, Deans of academic units, in order to implement quality assurance measures, in accordance with the Statute and relevant regulations.

A standard e-mail clause with evaluation data should make it clear that evaluation results are sensitive data and should therefore be treated confidentially.

If less than 30% of students or less than five students have completed the questionnaire, the results should only go to the teacher (due to lack of validity).

To help interpret the evaluation results, QAO provides the model for each question for all faculty subjects 10% of the best evaluation results are made available to the general public through the University website. 10% of the best results are defined as 10% of the subjects of each faculty with the best average results during the overall evaluation (ie Questions: "How do you evaluate the teacher in general, As a result, it is possible that a person is represented more than once at the top 10%.).

10. Subsequent measures

Not only the evaluation process, but the adequate use of the evaluation results will lead to quality improvement. Subsequent (follow-up) measures refer to either the single teacher or the faculty, if necessary.

a) Evaluation report

Each year each faculty prepares an evaluation report. In this report, the faculty analyzes the results of the evaluation of subjects and teachers, provides information on quality assurance measures and lists plans to improve quality.

The Academic Affairs Vice-rector provides a reporting model of approximately two to three pages, without narrative parts, aiming at improvement / follow-up measures),

The report does not contain personalized data (exception: public data as 10% of the best rating) and should be sent to all faculty members.

b) Performance review meetings for internal evaluation

After receiving the Evaluation Report, the Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs and Quality Improvement and the deans of the respective faculties meet in a special meeting to review the performance of the internal evaluation performance, Performance Evaluation:

Evaluation	Grade
• Poor	1.00 -1.99
• Not good	2.00 - 2.99
• Avarage	3.00 - 3.99
• Exelent	4.00 - 5.00

The goal of UGJFA is that within the first three years in 80% of subjects and teachers to have excellent performance.

This meeting will be held every year, participants in this meeting will be: Vice Rector for Academic Affairs and Quality Improvement, Deans, Vice Deans, Quality Assurance Coordinators and Director of QAO .

c) Recruitment of new academic staff

Experienced candidates in previous teaching at UGJFA are required to submit performance evaluation results from HEI during the application process for their election or re-election to UGJFA. Also, teachers / assistants who are newly applying for UGJFA engagement should be considered on the basis of prior evaluation.

During the recruitment process of the new academic staff, the re-selection and advancement of the academic staff at the University , the University will take into account and evaluate the results of the performance of the academic staff by the Study Commission.

d) Promoting academic staff

The results of professor evaluation are part of all promotion procedures (promotion to a higher academic degree, promotion to a retained position, etc.). The relevant regulation for the promotion of academic staff will specify the minimum level of evaluation required for promotion to a certain degree. QAO offers the results of the evaluation of the last year in the respective commissions.

The University will promote staff after evidence of high performance in teaching, scientific publications, inter-collegial reports and contribution to the University and the community. .

Each year, the faculty councils will propose the promotion of their academic staff by forwarding it with a report which includes the evaluation results and high performance;

The University Senate will decide on the forms of promotion and support of academic staff who have shown high performance;

If the promotion of academic staff will have financial implications, the decision to allocate the budget is taken by the Steering Council of the University.

e) Advancement of academic staff

Evaluation results are an essential part of all evaluation interviews. Employees and their supervisors may agree on remedial measures such as pedagogical training or peer counseling.

- The university will provide training programs for new academic staff (new professors and assistants) in the first two years of work in order to support them;
- Participation in the training of academic staff is mandatory;
- The University will also provide training support programs for regular academic staff, depending on performance outcomes.

f) Repetition of poor performance

If teachers belong to the group of those with lower scores than the average twice in two years, the Vice-Rector for Academic Issue and Quality Improvement invites them to an evaluation interview and proposes improvement measures, ie additional training to improve teaching. If the teacher does not fulfill this agreement, or if his / her performance does not improve; The Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs and Quality Improvement initiates his / her meeting with the Rector. Possible measures after the meeting are:

- Notice in writing from the Dean of the relevant academic unit.
- In case of disregard for the remark, the submission of the measure to the Ethics Commission,
- Depending on the type of remark, it will be initiated for payroll deductions
- Other measures in accordance with the regulation on disciplinary measures and procedures against academic staff and the Code of Ethics.

g) Measures against academic staff with poor performance

Poor teacher performance is considered the result of evaluation when academic staff is evaluated with an overall score below 50% (fifty percent) of subject and teacher evaluation, inter-collegial evaluation, dean evaluation, evaluation of scientific publications, contribution to the University and society.

In case of poor performance (1.00-2.99), the following measures are initiated against the academic staff:

1. In case of poor evaluation for the first time, verbal remarks are issued by the Dean of the Faculty;
2. In case of repetition of poor performance for the second time in a row, a written remark is issued by the Dean of the Faculty and the undertaking of other measures is announced;
3. In case of repetition of poor performance for the third time, the measure is imposed
 - a. Failure to allow fees and surcharges for one semester;
 - b. Academic non-funding for one year;
 - c. Appearance to the Ethics Council;
 - d. Other measures in accordance with the Statute and Regulations of the University.
4. In case of continuous repetition of poor performance, the measure of non-continuation of the contract with the University is imposed.

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

11. Academic staff complaint

Complaints and remarks of academic staff regarding the results of the evaluation can be addressed in writing to the Vice Rector for Quality.

12. Review of guidelines in 2022

This guide should be re-evaluated in 2022, after the first two years of its implementation. Also review the questionnaire / s.

This guide remains valid until new decisions are made.

Senate chairman

Prof.Ass. Dr. Artan Nimani