

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE REVIEW COMMISSION FOR ASSESSMENT OF FULFILMENT OF STANDARDS ON SELF-EVALUATION AND QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS AND STUDY PROGRAMMES

According to article 25 of the Law on Higher education (Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia 88/17, 27/18 and 73/18) the higher education institution conducts the procedure of self-evaluation and quality assessment of its study programmes, teaching process and working conditions. Self-evaluation is conducted in the manner and according to the procedure established by the general act adopted by the higher education institution, in accordance with the act on standards for self-evaluation and quality assessment of the higher education institutions and study programmes. Self-evaluation procedure also includes an assessment by students.

Higher education institution conducts the process of the self-evaluation in the fourth year since the accreditation of the higher education institutions, i.e. study programmes for the period of the previous three years and it publishes the report on the procedure and results of self-evaluation, as well as other relevant data for evaluation of quality on the institution's website and delivers them to the National Entity for Accreditation.

Documentation to be submitted by the institution, as well as the review report, are based on the following documents:

1. Regulations on Standards for Self-evaluation and Quality Assessment of Higher Education Institutions
2. Regulations on Standards and Procedure for External Quality Assessment of Higher Education Institutions
3. Instruction for Preparation of Documentation for the Report on Procedures and Results of Self-Evaluation of Higher Education Institutions.
4. Standards for Self-evaluation and Quality Assessment of Higher Education Institutions and Study Programmes

The enlisted documents are available at the website www.nat.rs

Members of the Review Commission are acquainted with the National Entity for Accreditation and Quality Assurance in Higher Education of Serbia Code of Ethics and they conduct review in accordance with the Code and the according documents.

Review Commission, depending on the object of review, follows the standards, instructions and documentation submitted by the institution, upon which it makes the REVIEW REPORT.

It is mandatory for the Review Commission to make the report both in the electronic and paper form. Review Commission is obliged to submit the review report in both forms before the deadline enlisted in the review contract.

Members of the Review Commission receive:

1. documentation in electronic form,
2. Regulations on Standards for Self-evaluation and Quality Assessment of Higher Education Institutions
3. Regulations on Standards and Procedure for External Quality Assessment of Higher Education Institutions
4. Instruction for Preparation of Documentation for the Report on Procedure and Results of Self-Evaluation of Higher Education Institutions
5. Standards for Self-evaluation and Quality Assessment of Higher Education Institutions and Study Programmes – with attachments and tables.
6. Regulation on the list of professional, academic and scientific titles
7. Regulation on scientific, art or applied areas within educational-scientific/educational-artistic fields.

Review Commission analyses each standard relevant for the self-evaluation and quality assessment of the

higher education institutions and study programmes.

It is determined in the instructions that the institution proves the fulfilment of standards by an according description, as well as attachments and tables in which according data which document the fulfilment of given standard are depicted. The institution can prove fulfilment of a standard in a different way as well, or by additional attachments and tables that are not enlisted in the Instructions on Preparation of Documentation for the Accreditation.

Reviewers follow the Instructions for the Review Commission, which are organised in the same manner as the Instructions for Preparation of Documentation for Self-evaluation and Quality Assessment of the Higher Education Institutions and Study Programmes.

Instructions for review are given in textual descriptions along with each standard, whereby reviewers can open the according files related to the tables and attachments submitted by the institution in its documentation.

After the insight in the submitted documentation, Review Commission analyses the fulfilment of each individual standard.

Review Commission prepares a preliminary report on the review form based on the previous analysis and assesses:

- whether self-evaluation is conducted in accordance to the Standards on Self-evaluation and Quality Assessment of Higher Education Institutions;
- which standards are, during the self-evaluation and quality assesment, fulfilled entirely, which ones partially, and which ones have not been fulfilled;
- which areas of the higher education institution functioning are satisfactory quality-wise, which are partially satisfactory and which are dissatisfactory.
- which standards have been, during the accreditation of the institution, fulfilled entirely, which ones partialy, and which ones have not been fulfilled.
- whether the institution acted in accordance with the recommendations from the previous decision on accreditation and the report on external quality assessment

Review Commission for accreditation of higher education institution, establishes additional facts relevant for the making of the decision on the request for accreditation via direct insight into the work of the higher education institution, while the information on its arrival to the higher education institution is to be provided by the coordinator 15 days prior to the planned visit at the latest.

During the visit, the higher education institution is obliged to provide the Review Commission for accreditation of higher education institution with all the requested data, free access and insight into the teaching process as well as management process, insight into the useful space, encounter with teachers, students, non-teaching staff, self-evaluation commission, alumni organisation, as well as everything else relevant for the process of accreditation.

After the insight into the submitted documentation and the direct insight into the work of the institution, Review Commission analyses and assesses the fulfilment of each individual standard and gives a numerical grade on the scale from 5 to 10 as well as a descriptive grade, comments and recommendations which are incorporated in the review report.

Review Commission delivers the review report to the coordinator. The coordinator delivers the report to the higher education institution that can give, within 15 days from the delivery of the report, potential remarks regarding facts enlisted in the report.

After the expiration of the 15-day deadline, Review Commission makes the final report, in Serbian, and an abstract in English, based on the report and the accepted remarks of the higher education institution and submits it to the subcommissions for consideration.

Based on the final report of the Review Commission for the accreditation of the higher education institution, subcommission adopts a proposal of the Decision on Accreditation of the Higher Education Institution and delivers it to the Commission for Accreditation within 30 days from the day of the delivery of the final report of the Review Commission for accreditation of the higher education institution.

The final report is to be delivered along with the proposal of the Decision on Accreditation of the Higher Education Institution.

At its first session after the reception of the proposal of the Decision on Accreditation, the Commission takes the delivered proposal into consideration, requests additional clarifications of the Review

Commission if necessary, after which it renders the decision on accreditation.

Technical instruction for the Review Commission is organised so that in:

- part one, the depicted item is: Standard
- part two: Description of the institution of the given standard according to the Instructions for Application of Standards as well as the Instructions for Application of Standards,
- part three: Record: Attachments and Tables
- part four: Instructions for Review Commission for Fulfilment of Standards Assessment.

Instruction for Review Commission for assessment of standard fulfilment:
REPORT ON SELF-EVALUATION - INTRODUCTION
<p>Review Commission states whether the higher education institution delivered all the documentation requested and whether it provided all the attachments requested by an insight into the Report.</p> <p>Review Commission states whether the higher education institution delivered all the documentation requested and whether it provided all the attachments requested.</p> <p>Review Commission is obliged to state which documents were submitted by the institution along with the Report, referring to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• name, seat, responsible person (rector, dean, director);• act of establishment and the issued working licences;• study programmes:<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. which were accredited in the previous period with the date of accreditation, for which accreditation is not requested (cancelled study programmes),2. study programmes currently in force accredited in the previous period with the date of accreditation, for which accreditation is not requested3. which were accredited in the previous period, for which accreditation is requested (in case the name of the study programme has changed, a remark is needed),4. new study programmes for which accreditation is requested,5. duration, total number of accredited students by each study programme (number of students enrolled for the first time, times the number of years of the duration of studies), number of points, educational-scientific or educational-artistic field, IMT studies for each study programme• report on self-evaluation; <p>Total number of students at a study programme is calculated as a number of students enrolled in the first year multiplied with the number of years of the duration of the study programme. Total number of students in the higher education institution is calculated as a total number of students at all study programmes.</p> <p>Review Commission checks whether the data provided in the Report are identical to the rest of the documentation submitted by the institution.</p> <p>Review Commission checks whether the higher education institution fulfills all the legal conditions.</p> <p>Review Commission states whether the higher education institution has a working licence, as well as licence for the performance of all study programmes which are currently performed at the higher education institution.</p> <p>Review Commission states and inserts as a comment specifics of the relation between study programmes on different degrees of studies (e.g., if there are study programmes at a certain degree of studies and not at other degrees of studies and which study programmes are those, etc).</p> <p>Review Commission states whether the higher education institution is being accredited for the first time and states this separately so that the Commission for Accreditation and Quality Assurance would keep in mind other segments of accreditation (study programmes,...).</p> <p>Review Commission inserts these data as well as the educational-scientific or educational-artistic fields in which the institution performs the accredited study programmes in the report.</p> <p>In the Report, which includes basic data on the higher education institution, teaching staff, students, classes of active teaching, space, library and informatics resources, Review Commission makes a</p>

comparison with the data provided along the respective standards and with facts established during the visit to the institution, and it inserts its comment in its report. Data on the higher education institution in which the study programme is performed as well as the names of study programmes which are included in the Report, are inserted by the Review Commission into the review report within the appropriate fields. In case that the aforementioned is not in accordance with the law and the decisions of the National council, Review Commission inserts that in a part of the report.

Review Commission analyses weaknesses and strengths (SWOT analysis) including:

- (Strength; Weaknesses; Opportunities; Threats).

Based on the quantifications of weaknesses and strengths (+++ of high importance; ++ of medium importance; + of little importance; 0 of no importance).

Standard 1: Quality Assurance Strategy

The institution of the higher education determines the quality assurance strategy, which is available to the public

Instructions for preparing documentation for self-evaluation:

Description (The quality assurance policy should reflect the mission and values of the relevant institution, and be closely related to the relevant plans and activities of the higher education institution in terms of strategic management. The institution analyzes and assesses the current situation with regard to previously defined goals, requirements and expectations. The date is given when the management body of a institution of higher education has adopted a quality assurance strategy and it is proven that this document is available to the public. The institution encloses an action plan for the implementation of the strategy, as well as documentation on its adoption. The institution clearly sets out measurable objectives in terms of controlling implementation of the action plan for different activities and levels of quality assurance within a higher education institution. The procedures should include the ability to analyze and elaborate the essence of the mission and plans, as well as appropriate resources to support the implementation of objectives in the long run. The institution should document that on the basis of the previous results of self-evaluation and the results of the survey obtained at a certain time interval, it is continuously working on updating and improving the action plans).

Within this standard, the SWOT analysis methodology analyzes and evaluates quantitatively each point of the guidance of this standard.

Based on the SWOT analysis, the proposal of measures and activities for quality improvement is stated, as well as evidence that the proposal was adopted by the management bodies of the higher education institution

Proposal for measures and activities for improving the quality of the standard 1:

Instructions for implementing the standard 1:

1.1 Quality Assurance Strategy contains:

- the commitment of the higher education institution to continuously and systematically work to improve the quality of its programmes;
- measures for quality assurance;
- quality assurance entities (professional bodies, students, non-teaching staff) and their rights and obligations in that process;
- Quality assurance areas (study programmes, teaching, research, student evaluation, textbooks and literature, resources, non-teaching support, management process);
- commitment to building an organizational quality culture;
- the connection between educational, scientific, artistic and professional activities.

1.2 The Quality Assurance Strategy is adopted by the managing body of a higher education institution at the proposal of the managing authority.

1.3 In designing the strategy, the higher education institution also includes the appropriate social entities.

1.4 Higher education institution announces a quality assurance strategy and promotes it, both in the institution itself and in the public.

The higher education institution periodically reviews and improves the quality assurance strategy.
Record
Attachment 1.1. Quality Assurance Strategy Attachment 1.2. Measures and quality assurance entities Attachment 1.3. Action plan for the implementation of the strategy and the decision on its adoption (if any).
Instructions for the Review Commission for Compliance Assessment:
<p>The Review Commission assesses whether the basic tasks of a higher education institution, a quality assurance strategy and measures and quality assurance entities are determined by the governing bodies and also whether they are publicly announced, as well as other requirements of the standard.</p> <p>The Review Commission assesses whether the Quality Assurance Strategy is based on three documents: Quality Strategy, Quality Rules and Regulations on Self-Evaluation and Quality Control.</p> <p>The Review Commission assesses whether the strategy, as a general development document in the field of quality assurance, defines the mission, vision, goals, determinations and principles of the institutional quality assurance and improvement system, as well as whether the areas, entities and measures for quality assurance were identified.</p> <p>The Review Commission shall include in the report whether the higher education institution has attached the action plan for the implementation of the strategy, as well as the documentation on its adoption. The action plan for the appropriate period should be the result of the self-evaluation analyzes and the results of the surveys from the previous periods.</p> <p>The Review Commission shall determine whether the higher education institution has attached the publication and whether the data contained in the Self-Evaluation Report have been posted on the institution's website. The Review Commission shall include in the report whether the higher education institution has attached the action plan for the implementation of the strategy, as well as the documentation on its adoption. The Review Commission assesses whether the higher education institution has resources to support the implementation of goals in the longer period of time.</p> <p>In addition to the assessment of the standards, the Review Commission provides explanations of the assessment regarding the fulfilment of this standard, based on the appendices in the Report, the facts established during the visit and the documents provided by the institution at the request of the Review Commission before / during / after the visit. In case aforementioned is not in accordance with the legislature and decisions adopted by the National Council, the Review Commission shall enter into the report part.</p> <p>The Review Commission provides explanations concerning the fulfilment of this standard, analyzes the weak and strong points of this standard and makes suggestions for improving this standard</p> <p>The text should contain at least 300 words.</p>
Standard 2: Ways and procedures for quality assurance
The higher education institution determines the methods and procedures for ensuring the quality of their work, which are available to the public.
Instructions for preparing documentation for self-evaluation:
<p>Description (The institution lists the document that sets quality standards and defines competencies of certain entities in the system of quality assurance measures, as well as the procedures for ensuring the quality of work of the higher education institution.)</p> <p>Within the framework of this standard, the SWOT analysis method analyzes the institution and quantitatively evaluates some of the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – standards for improving the quality of the institution; – standards for improving the quality of study programmes; – quality assurance procedures.

Proposal measures and activities for improving the quality of the standard 2.
<p>Instructions for implementing Standard 2:</p> <p>2.1 The methods and procedures for quality assurance shall be determined separately for each quality assurance area and shall be regulated in a detailed manner by the operators in the quality assurance system of that institution.</p> <p>2.2 Ways and procedures for quality assurance are made by the professional body of the higher education institution on the proposal of the commission for quality assurance.</p> <p>2.3 The higher education institution is obliged to make the manners and procedures for quality assurance available to teachers, students and the public.</p> <p>2.4 The higher education institution periodically reviews and improves the methods and procedures for quality assurance.</p>
Record
<p>Attachment 2.1. Adopted document - Standards and procedures for securing and improving the quality of a higher education institution</p> <p>Attachment 2.2. The adopted work plan and procedures for monitoring and improving the quality of the higher education institution within the quality standards</p> <p>Attachment 2.3. Adopted annual reports on the work of the established body (commissions, committees, centers) for internal quality assurance of higher education institution</p>
Instructions for the Review Commission for Compliance Assessment:
<p>The Review Commission shall determine whether the higher education institution has submitted the documentation and any attachments required by this standard. The Review Commission checks whether the institution has standards and procedures for ensuring and improving the quality of the higher education institution, as well as the adopted work plan and procedures for monitoring and improving the quality of the higher education institution, and assesses whether the planning is based on systematic and continuous data collection and their expert analysis as and whether the planning documents are available to the public.</p> <p>The Review Commission determines whether the institution conducts control by comparing the planned and achieved objectives. It analyzes and compares the results of Review Commission with its results in the previous period and the results of similar higher education institutions in the country and the world. It also checks whether a higher education institutions is compiling a report that is accessible to the public, analyzes whether the report marks the elements that document the entire activity of the institution. The Review Commission comments on the report whether the Plan of Work covers all activities of all organizational units that are defined by the general act of the higher education institution.</p> <p>In addition to the assessment of the fulfilment of the standards, the Review Commission provides explanations of the assessments related to the fulfilment of this standard, based on attachments with the Report, the facts established during the visit and the documents provided by the institution upon request of the Review Commission before / during / after the visit. In the event that this is not harmonized with the legislature and decisions of the National Council, the Review Commission shall enter into the report part.</p> <p>The Review Commission provides explanations relating to the fulfilment of this standard, analyzes weak and strong points in quality assurance measures and procedures, and proposes measures for improvement.</p> <p>The text should contain at least 300 words.</p>

Standard 3: Quality Assurance System
The higher education institution develops the organizational structure for quality assurance ..
Instructions for preparing documentation for self-evaluation:
<p>Description (Higher education institution provides evidence that it has and applies a quality assurance system and provides a critical overview of objectives, adequate formulation of processes and activities related to quality, as well as deciding in a transparent manner. The higher education institution describes</p>

the method of regular collection and evaluation of data related to quality. It describes in detail the way in which the reports on the implementation of the strategy and on the analysis of quality assurance standards have been adopted. It is realistically assessed to what extent the results of the survey are incorporated into measures which are undertaken for quality improvement.

Higher education institution documents that the decision-making processes, competencies and responsibilities of the governing bodies, the management bodies, the competencies of professional bodies, teachers and associates, as well as the competencies of students, are clearly defined, communicated and implemented. The institution should show that the organizational structure and procedure of the quality assurance system ensure that teachers and students are involved in the decision-making process related to the study programme).

In scope of this standard, with the SWOT analysis method, the institution analyzes and quantitatively evaluates some of the following elements:

- existence and competence of a special body for the improvement of quality;
- competencies of the management body in the quality assurance system;
- competencies of the executive body;
- competencies of professional bodies;
- competencies of teachers and associates;
- competencies of students;
- organization and functioning of the quality assurance system;
- adoption of corrective and preventive measures based on the analysis of the assessment of the fulfilment of quality assurance standards.

Proposal for measures and activities for improvement of the quality of the standard 3:

Instructions for the application of standard 3:

3.1 The higher education institution determines the tasks of teachers, associates, students, professional bodies, departments and the commission for quality assurance in the adoption and implementation of the strategy, methods and procedures for quality assurance.

3.2 Higher education institution ensures, by special measures, participation of students in the adoption and implementation of the strategy, methods, procedures and culture of the quality assurance.

3.3 The higher education institution establishes a quality assurance commission (committee) among teachers, associates, non-teaching staff and students.

Record

Attachment 3.1. Formally established body (commission, committee) with specific responsibility for internal quality assurance in a higher education institution (excerpt from the Statute) and job description (up to 100 words).

Attachment 3.2. List of all surveys

Attachment 3.3 Document on the analysis of the results of the survey and on the adoption of corrective and preventive measures.

Instructions for the Review Commission for standard compliance assessment:

The Review Commission determines whether the higher education institution has submitted the documentation and all the attachments requested. Based on the descriptions and given data, the Review Commission assesses whether there is a statutory organizational structure, that is, formally established body (commission, committee, center) with concrete responsibility for internal quality assurance in a higher education institution. In addition to the declaration of compliance, the Review Commission provides explanations regarding the manner of regular collection and evaluation of data related to quality.

The Review Commission analyzes whether the Regulations on self-evaluation and quality control ensures student participation in the adoption and implementation of the strategy, standards, procedures

and culture of quality assurance.

The Review Commission analyzes the results of the survey and assesses the extent to which the results of self-evaluation are incorporated into measures taken to improve quality.

The Review Commission should assess to what extent it is ensured that teachers and students are involved in the decision-making process related to the study programme.

In addition to the assessment of compliance with the standard, the Review Commission provides an explanation of the declaration regarding the fulfilment of this standard, based on the attachments from the report, the facts established during the visit and the documents provided by the institution upon request of the Review Commission before / during / after the visit. In case that this is not harmonized with the law and decisions of the National Council, the Review Commission shall note that in the report.

The Review Commission provides explanations regarding the fulfilment of this standard, analyzes the weak and strong points of the organizational structure for quality assurance of the higher education institution and presents suggestions for improvement of this standard.

The text should contain at least 300 words

Standard 4: Quality of the study programme

The quality of the study programme is ensured through the monitoring and checking of its goals, structure, students workload, as well as through modernization of content and continuous collection of information on the quality of programmes from the appropriate social institutions.

Instructions for preparing documentation for self-evaluation:

Description (The institution lists all study programmes of all levels it has accredited, as well as the number of students for which each study programme is approved. Also, it inserts decisions on accreditation.

1. Higher education institution describes the mechanisms for monitoring the quality of study programmes (eg the formal legal procedure for approving programmes, procedures for monitoring the success of the programme and established responsibility for their improvement, as well as regular and periodic evaluation of the programme).
2. The higher education institution describes the outcomes of education within the accredited study programmes which it conducts, based on learning outcomes.
3. The institution records that it has ensured that learning outcomes are based on descriptors of qualifications of a particular cycle of education in a given scientific or artistic area and the relevant European Qualifications Framework, including the requirements of international and national professional associations..
4. The higher education institution describes the way in which it has established a balance between teaching methods, learning outcomes and assessment criteria; describes student-oriented teaching methods and a grading system based on measuring learning outcomes. The higher education institution documents and describes how the learning outcomes define the content of the curriculum and its organization, teaching methods and strategies, proposed courses and procedures for knowledge testing and assessment.
5. The institution encloses the object mapping table as an aid to gain insight into how the programme learning outcomes are covered within the compulsory subjects defined by the programme.
6. Assessments of students' achievements in achieving the intended learning outcomes are to be disclosed. The higher education institution describes the strategy and the methods used to check the achievement of learning outcomes for each study programme. The institution assesses the

extent to which the results achieved coincide with the planned learning outcomes.

7. In a concrete case of one subject or module of an accredited study programme in each scientific or artistic field, the institution describes all the learning activities needed to achieve the expected learning outcomes (time spent on activities directly administered by the teaching staff, the time spent in independent work, compulsory professional practice, the time required for preparation for the knowledge test and the time covered by the knowledge test itself), through the share of these activities in the total ECTS value for the given subject / module.
8. The higher education institution records that the assessment of the student's workload necessary to achieve the specified learning outcomes (ECTS) is subject to regular checks, by monitoring and collecting feedback from students.
9. The institution describes the method of exact measurement, not the assessment of student workload for each ECTS score, by which it documents that the allocation of points to parts of the programme is based on the workload of students necessary to achieve learning outcomes in a formal sense. The institution encloses, in case it is in a possession of such data, the results of the survey obtained from students in the process of regular monitoring of the load. Also, the higher education institution provides an overview of the measures and activities it has undertaken to reduce the failure rate on the exams and to harmonize the workload of students with the values of ECTS points.
10. The higher education institution shows that the improvement and continuous modernization of the existing study programmes is based on the development of science or art and the new requirements placed before the given educational profile.
11. Evidence is provided that teachers and students are familiar with the defined requirements that graduate thesis (thesis) should be fulfilled, especially in terms of academic methodology, formal aspects, practical orientation and assessment criteria.
12. Higher education institutions should document how it remains in contact with its graduates. The relevance of the labor market programme (local, state, international) and the achievements of graduates in later professional development are being assessed.)

Within this standard, the SWOT analysis method analyzes institutions and quantitatively evaluates some of the following elements:

- the objectives of the study programme and its alignment with the learning outcomes;
- Learning-oriented methods of learning outcomes;
- a grading system based on measuring learning outcomes;
- the ECTS load compatibility with the learning activities necessary to achieve the expected learning outcomes;
- mutually consistent learning outcomes and expected competencies based on descriptors of qualifications of a particular education cycle;
- the ability to functionally integrate knowledge and skills;
- procedures for monitoring the quality of study programmes;
- feedback from the practice of graduates and their competencies;

- Continuous modernization of study programmes;
- the availability of information on graduate work and professional practice;
- the availability of information on study programmes and learning outcomes.

Proposal for measures and activities for improving the quality of the standard 4:

Instructions for the Application of Standard 4:

4.1 The higher education institution regularly and systematically checks and, if necessary, re-determines the following:

- the objectives of the study programme and their compliance with the goals of the higher education institution;
- the structure and content of the study programme in relation to general education, scientific and professional-applicative and theoretical and methodological disciplines;
- students workload measured by the number of ECTS points;
- the outcomes and expertise that students receive when they finish their studies and the possibilities of employment and further education.

4.2. The higher education institution has established procedures for the approval, monitoring and control of the study programme.

4.3. The higher education institution regularly obtains feedback from employers, representatives of the National Employment Service and other relevant organizations on the quality of studies and its study programmes.

4.4 The higher education institution provides students with participation in the evaluation and quality assurance of study programmes.

4.5 The higher education institution ensures continuous modernization of curriculum contents and their comparability with the curricula of relevant foreign higher education institutions.

4.6 The curriculum of the study programme encourages students to create a creative way of thinking, a deductive way of research, and the application of these knowledge and skills for practical purposes.

4.7 The conditions and procedures necessary for completing studies and obtaining a degree of a certain level of education are defined and available to the public, in particular in electronic form, and are in line with the objectives, content and scope of accredited study programmes.

Record

Table 4.1. List of all study programmes accredited at the higher education institution since 2011 with the total number of enrolled students in all years of studying in the current and previous 2 academic years

Table 4.2. Number and percentage of graduated students (compared to the number of enrolled students) in the previous 3 academic years within the accredited study programmes. These data are calculated by dividing the total number of students who graduated in the school year (until September 30) by the number of students enrolled in the first year of study in the same school year. The data should be shown separately for each level of study.

Table 4.3. Average duration of studies in the previous 3 academic years. This data is obtained by the average duration of study for students who graduated by the end of the school year (until 30 September). The data should be shown separately for each level of study.

Attachment 4.1. Analysis of the results of the survey on the opinions of graduates about the quality of the study programme and the achieved learning outcomes.

Attachment 4.2. Analysis of the results of the survey on the satisfaction of employers with the acquired qualifications of graduates.

Instructions for the Review Commission for Compliance Assessment:

The Review Commission shall determine whether the higher education institution has submitted the

documentation and all attachments requested, as well as all tabular data relating to this standard.

The Review Commission analyzes the objectives and outcomes of the compulsory and elective subjects of each study programme individually and determines whether the objectives of the study programmes are in line with the learning outcomes.

Based on the contributions provided by the institution, the reviewer describes how the learning outcomes define the content of the curriculum and its organization, teaching methods and strategies, proposed courses and procedures for knowledge assessment and assessment.

By analyzing learning outcomes for programmes of different structures, the reviewer assesses whether the learning outcomes for a particular study programme describe essential knowledge, skills and attitudes that a student is expected to demonstrate. As part of this assessment, the reviewer uses the results of the survey to give an insight into the opinion of graduates about the quality of the study programme and the achieved learning outcomes, as well as the opinion of employers about the acquired qualifications of graduates.

Based on the description of the qualifications and outcomes of the study programmes presented in the table, the Review Commission assesses whether students obtain qualifications that correspond to the completion of a certain level of study and whether the qualification descriptions correspond to the levels of the studies.

The Review Commission underlines if there are any data on the rate of drop-out students from further studies and this is analyzed separately. The Review Commission specifically shows the percentage of graduated students in relation to the number of enrolled students.

The Review Commission should explain if the higher education institution has documented that the assessment of the student's workload necessary for achieving specified learning outcomes (ECTSs) is subject to regular checks, and whether the higher education institution successfully harmonises the ECTS students workload with the learning activities needed in order to achieve the expected learning outcomes. Also, if the data is present, the reviewer describes the proposal of measures and activities undertaken by the higher education institution to reduce the failure rate in the exams and to harmonize the student workload with the values of ECTS points.

The Review Commission assesses whether students gain qualifications that correspond to the completion of a particular degree of study and whether qualification descriptions are appropriate to the degree of study, based on the attachments in the Report, the facts identified during the visit and the documents provided by the institution at the request of the Review Commission before / after the visit.

Note: The Review Commission specifically analyzes the standard in the case of self-evaluation of a higher education institution; self-evaluation of an accredited study programme; a new study programme submitted for accreditation. In the event that it is not harmonized with the legislature and decisions of the National Council, the Review Commission shall enter into the report part.

The Review Commission provides explanations regarding the fulfilment of this standard, analyzes weak points and highlights and proposes measures and activities for improving the quality of this standard.

The text should contain at least 600 words.

Standard 5: Quality of the teaching process

The quality of the teaching process is ensured through the interactivity of teaching, introducing examples in teaching, professional work of teachers and associates, passing and adhering to work plans per subjects, as well as monitoring the quality of teaching and taking the necessary measures in case when it is established that the quality of teaching is not at the appropriate level.

Instructions for preparing documentation for self-evaluation:

Description (Higher education institution documents that the content of the curriculum as well as the teaching methods for its application correspond to achieving the goals of the appropriate study programmes and learning outcomes.)

1. The institution analyzes, on the example of one study programme, that the proportion of different types of subjects (lectures, seminars, practices, projects, etc.) carried out by teachers and associates engaged in the study programme is balanced with respect to learning outcomes.

2. The institution documents, within the annual report on the work of the body responsible for internal quality assurance, or otherwise, to encourage the acquisition of active competences of teachers typical for higher education institutions, as well as the acquisition of professional competencies.

3. The higher education institution shall document the procedure for ensuring the availability and realization of the work plan on the subjects, as well as the regularity of the teaching schedule. The adopted procedures and measures taken by the institution in the event of non-compliance with this standard are described.)

Under this standard, the SWOT analysis method analyzes institutions and quantitatively evaluates some of the following elements:

2. the competence of teachers and associates;
3. the availability of information on terms and plans for the realization of teaching;
4. interactive participation of students in the teaching process;
5. availability of data on study programmes, curriculum and schedule;
6. selection of methods of teaching and learning that achieve learning outcomes;
7. systematic monitoring of teaching quality and corrective measures.

Proposal measures and activities for improving the quality of the standard 5:

Instructions for the application of standard 5:

5.1 The plan and schedule of classes (lectures and exercises) are in accordance with the needs and abilities of students, they are known before the beginning of the semester and are consistently implemented.

5.2 Teaching at higher education institutions is interactive, necessarily includes examples from practice, encourages students to think and be creative, independence in work and the application of acquired knowledge.

5.3 The higher education institution ensures that on every subject, before the beginning of the semester, the work plan is adopted and made available to students, which includes:

- basic information about the subject: title, year, number of ECTS credits, conditions;
- goals of the subject;
- the content and structure of the subject;
- curriculum and teaching schedule (lectures and exercises);
- method of evaluation on the subject;
- textbooks, that is, compulsory and supplementary literature;
- information about teachers and associates of the subject

5.4 The higher education institution systematically monitors the implementation of the curriculum, as well as the work plans for individual subjects, assesses the quality of teaching and takes corrective measures for its improvement. The institution warns teachers who do not adhere to the curriculum on the subject or do not achieve the appropriate quality of teaching to improve and provide them with the necessary training.

Record

Attachment 5.1. Analysis of the results of the student survey on the quality of the teaching process.

Attachment 5.2. Procedures and processes that ensure respect for the curriculum and schedule.

Attachment 5.3. Proof of activities undertaken to encourage acquiring active competencies of teachers and associates.

Instructions for the Review Commission for compliance assessment:

The Review Commission shall determine whether the higher education institution has provided all the documentation and all the attachments requested. Based on the documentation and attached surveys, the Review Commission determines whether teaching at higher education institutions is interactive, whether it obligatory involves involvement of cases from practice and encourages students to think and be creative, independence in the work and application of acquired knowledge.

Based on curriculum contents and teaching methods for its realization, the reviewer specifically analyzes the extent to which a balance is established between different types of activities (lectures, seminars, practices, projects, portfolio, essay, etc.) and learning outcomes. The Review Commission specifically analyzes the relationship between learning outcomes, teaching strategies, student activities, and test

methods (exam at the end of the subject, tests with multiple answers, essay, practical check, fieldwork, clinical check-ups, presentations, projects) and evaluates the adequacy of method choices of teaching and learning to achieve the learning outcomes.

The Review Commission determines whether the teaching methods and assessment methods are listed in the work plan of each individual subject and whether they are relevant to the content of the subject. In case that this is not harmonized with the law and decisions of the National Council, the Review Commission shall enter this into the report.

The Review Commission determines whether the quality of the teaching process is checked by student surveys according to the Regulations on Student Evaluation of Pedagogical Work of Teachers and Associates.

In addition to the assessment of compliance with the standard, the Review Commission provides an explanation of the appraisal regarding the fulfilment of this standard on the basis of the attachments along with the request for accreditation, the facts that were determined during the visit and the documents provided by the institution upon request of the Review Commission before / during / after the visit.

Note: The Review Commission specifically analyzes the standard in the case of self-evaluation of a higher education institution; self-evaluation of an accredited study programme.

The Review Commission provides explanations regarding the fulfilment of this standard, analyzes weak and strong points and proposes measures and activities for improving the quality of this standard.

Text should contain at least 400 words.

Standard 6: Quality of scientific, artistic and professional work

The higher education institution continuously works on stimulating, providing conditions, monitoring and checking the results of scientific research, artistic and professional work and their inclusion in the teaching process.

Instruction for preparing documentation for self-evaluation:

Description

1. The higher education institution analyzes the structure and resources for the realization and organization of basic, developmental and applied researches, artistic and professional work and shows that the existing structures for the realization and organization of scientific research, artistic and professional work correspond to the norms.
2. The institution should document that the determination of research strategies and goals is in line with the institution's strategic orientation and national strategy.
3. The institution lists the projects financed by the Ministry of Education and Science, the Ministry of Culture or funded by international organizations, whose teachers are permanently employed in a higher education institution.
4. The institution also encloses a list of projects that provide transfer of technology to relevant industries and business communities, as well as non-profit organizations.
5. The institution lists the individual engagement of teachers and associates within scientific research projects funded by the Ministry of Education and Science.
6. The higher education institution provides evidence that the integration of research methods and research results into academic and doctoral study programmes is ensured.
7. The higher education institution should document support to teachers and associates to increase the number and quality of publications in renowned journals with SCI indexation. A system for financial support for young researchers from the surplus of own incomes of a higher education institution is documented.
8. The institution shows by example that the criteria for scientific research, arts and professional work are consistently applied for the election to the position of teacher and that they are in accordance with the recommendations of the National Council for Higher Education.
9. The institution records that the selection and appointment of teachers and mentors in the study programmes of doctoral studies has been carried out in accordance with the current standards for

accreditation of study programmes of doctoral studies within the educational-scientific and educational-artistic fields.

10. The institution analyzes and compares its criteria defining the choice of teachers and the selection of mentors on doctoral studies with the conditions of other higher education institutions from the appropriate scientific or artistic field.

11. Higher education institution should provide evidence of intensive international cooperation.

Under this standard, the SWOT analysis method analyzes institutions and quantitatively evaluates some of the following elements:

- the harmonization of educational, scientific, artistic and professional work, the permanence of scientific research and international cooperation;
- monitoring and evaluating the quality of scientific and research work of teachers and associates;
- harmonization of contents of scientific research artistic and professional work with the strategic determination of the country and the European goals;
- active inclusion of research results in the teaching process;
- encouraging teachers and associates to publish research results;
- publishing activity;
- care for scientific research.

Proposal of measures and activities for improving the quality of the standard 6:

Instructions for the application of standard 6:

6.1 The higher education institution achieves in its work the unity of educational, scientific, artistic and professional (competent) work.

6.2 The higher education institution permanently devises, prepares and realizes scientific research, artistic, professional and other types of programmes, as well as national and international scientific projects.

6.3 The higher education institution systematically monitors and assesses the scope and quality of the research work of teachers and associates.

6.4 The content and results of the scientific, research, artistic and professional activities of the higher education institution are in accordance with the strategic goal of the institution itself, as well as with the national and European goals and standards of higher education.

6.5 Knowledge to which higher education institution comes through the implementation of certain scientific, research, artistic and professional activities are actively involved in the existing teaching process.

6.6 The higher education institution encourages its employees to actively engage in scientific, research, artistic and professional work and publish the results of their work as often as possible.

6.7 The higher education institution performs the publishing activity in accordance with its capabilities.

Table 6.1. The name of current scientific-research/art projects, whose managers are teachers permanently employed at the higher education institution.

Table 6.2. List of teachers and associates employed in higher education institutions, participants in current domestic and international projects.

Table 6.3. A summary overview of scientific and artistic results in the institution in the previous calendar year according to the criteria of the Ministry and classification of artistic-research results.

Table 6.4. List of SCI/SSCI-indexed papers by years for the previous three-year period. (Specify references with a serial number).

Table 6.5. List of defended doctoral dissertations and art projects (name of candidate, name of mentor, title of dissertation and year of defense, published results) in higher education institution in the previous three school years.

Table 6.6. A list of professional and artistic projects currently being implemented at the institution, whose managers are teachers permanently employed at the higher education institution.

Table 6.7. List of mentors according to currently valid standards regarding the fulfilment of conditions for mentors within the educational-scientific or educational-artistic field, as well as the ratio of the

number of mentors in relation to the total number of teachers at the higher education institution.

Attachment 6.1. List of awards and acknowledgments of teachers, associates and students for the achieved results in scientific and artistic research work.

Attachment 6.2. Relation of teachers and associates involved in projects in relation to the total number of teachers and associates at the higher education institution.

Attachment 6.3. The ratio of the number of SCI indexed papers in relation to the total number of teachers and associates at the higher education institution.

Instructions for the Review Commission for compliance assessment:

The Review Commission shall determine whether the higher education institution has submitted the documentation, all the attachments requested, as well as all the tabular data relating to this standard.

Based on the data presented in the tables, description and appendices, the Review Commission assesses whether the institution prepares and carries out scientific and artistic, professional, national and international projects.

The Review Commission is in compliance with the goals of the higher education institution and with the national and European goals and standards of higher education and research. It is especially assessed whether the knowledge to which higher education institution comes by carrying out scientific and artistic work is included in the teaching process. On the basis of the data on scientific research or artistic work, the reviewer assesses whether the institution encourages and provides conditions for teaching staff to actively engage in scientific research, artistic and professional work and whether it publishes the results of this work.

The Review Commission shall explain the evaluation of scientific research and/or artistic work and comment on the results achieved.

In addition to the descriptive assessment of compliance with the standard, the Review Commission provides an explanation of the assessment regarding the fulfilment of this standard. The reviewer determines how much and what kind of projects the institution implements in each of the fields and areas within which the higher education institution conducts doctoral academic studies.

The Review Commission determines whether the higher education institution has attached the list of the most significant published results for the previous calendar year (systematized according to the designation of the relevant Ministry) and comments on the results.

Based on the number and list of SCI-indexed papers per year for the previous three-year period, the number of published publications per teacher and associate, as well as the number of participants in projects in relation to the total number of teachers and associates, the reviewer evaluates the trend of development and sustainability of scientific, artistic and professional research work. It also assesses to what extent the scientific research activity is sufficiently affirmative for the national and international recognition of the institution, that is, the permanence of scientific research and international cooperation.

The reviewer should pay special attention to the competence analysis of the mentor on the basis of publications and a review in the journals. Based on Attachment to Table 6.5, the reviewer analyzes published publications showing the results of doctoral dissertations for all candidates who have completed their doctoral studies at a higher education institution in the previous three school years.

The Review Commission checks whether scientific research work, as one of the highest priorities of a higher education institution, is covered by the action plan of the institution and whether the higher education institution has defined its own policy in the field of scientific research that would enable strong support for young researchers and promote the international mobility of researchers. In case that this is not harmonized with the law and decisions of the National Council, the Review Commission shall enter this into the report.

The Review Commission analyzes the quality of personnel for scientific research activity and whether the institution foresaw their permanent improvement. Also, does the institution have young staff and a Young Research Development Programme.

In addition to the assessment of compliance with the standard, the Review Commission provides an explanation of the appraisal regarding the fulfilment of this standard on the basis of the attachments

along with the request for accreditation, the facts that were determined during the visit and the documents provided by the institution upon request of the Review Commission before / during / after the visit.

Note: The Review Commission specifically analyzes the standard in the case of self-evaluation of a higher education institution; self-evaluation of an accredited study programme.

The Review Commission provides explanations regarding the fulfilment of this standard, analyzes weak and strong points and proposes measures and activities for improving the quality of this standard.

Text should contain at least 400 words.

Standard 7: The quality of the teachers and associates

The quality of teachers and associates shall be provided by careful planning and the election on the basis of public procedure, by creating the conditions for permanent perfecting and development of the teachers and associate and by verification of quality of their instruction work.

The instruction for preparing self-evaluation documentation

Description The higher education institution shall show it has provided that the instruction is performed by qualified and competent teaching staff. The institution shall execute regular evaluation of its policy and procedure concerning employment and the election of teaching staff. Surveillance and evaluation of the quality and competence of the teaching staff. This shall particularly refer to the procedures of the election, appointment, judging, development and promotion of the staff. The institution shall submit the documentation supporting this requests. The institution shall document that it possesses the programme of staff-development and that it has provided adequate means for that purpose. The professional development of the staff is achieved by organization of the seminars „the education of the educators” type. The institution shall document whether it has the plan of development of human resources for academic, technical and administrative staff, as well as provided pre-conditions and opportunities for continuous education. The communication between academic staff and relevant professional associations shall be supported. The institution documents that it has defined criteria for the election of teaching staff

Within the framework of this standard, by the method of SWOT analysis, the institution shall analyze and quantitatively judge some of the following elements:

- The publicity of procedure and conditions for the election of teachers and associates.
- The conformity of the election procedure with the proposal of criteria given by the National Council for Higher Education
- Systematical surveillance and encouragement of pedagogical activities of teachers and associates
- Long-term policy of selection of teaching and research youth group.
- the ensuring of permanent education and perfecting;
- повезаност образовног рада са истраживањем на пројекту и радом у привреди; The connection of educational work to the research on the project and the work in economy;
- the evaluation of pedagogical capacities;
- the evaluation of research capacities;
- The acceptance of the students’ opinion on pedagogic work of teachers and associates.

The proposal of measures and activities for the improvement of standard 7:

The instructions for the application of standard 7:

7.1 The procedure and terms for the election of teachers and associates shall be established in advance, they are open to public and available to the assessment of professional and broader public. The procedure and terms shall be the subject of periodical evaluation and perfecting.

7.2 . When electing teachers and associates for positions, the higher education institution shall obey the prescribed procedures and terms with which it rates scientific, respectively artistic and pedagogic activity of the teachers and associates.

- 7.3 The higher education institution shall systematically survey, rate and encourage scientific and pedagogic activity of teachers and associates.
- 7.4 The higher education institution carries out long term policy of good quality selection of young staff and their further progress, as well as various form of perfectioning.
- 7.5 The higher education institution shall provide permanent perfectioning to teachers and associates with study stays, specializations and participation on scientific, artistic and professional conferences.
- 7.6 When electing and promoting teaching and scientific, artistic and professional staff, the higher education institution shall particularly evaluate the connection of the work in education with the education in work on the projects in other fields of economy and society.
- 7.7 When electing and promoting teaching and scientific, artistic and professional staff, the higher education institution shall particularly evaluate pedagogical capacities of teachers and associates.

Evidence

Table 7.1. The overview of the number of teachers by positions and the status of teachers in the higher education institution (full working hours or part-time working hours employment, engagement on the basis of contract)

Table 7.2. The overview of the number of teachers by positions and the status of teachers in the higher education institution (full working hours or part-time working hours employment, engagement on the basis of contract)

Attachment 7.1. Regulations on the election of teachers and associates

Attachment 7.2. The ratio of total number of the students (the number of the students approved by the accreditation multiplied by the number of years of duration of study programme) and the number of employed teachers on the level of the institution.

Intruction for the Review Commission for the rate for fulfilment of the standard

The Review Commission constates whether the higher education institution delivered complete documentation, all the attachementes and all the table data requested by this standard. The Review Commission shall give its commentary regarding the regulations on the election of teachers and it shall comment its conformity with the recommendations of the National Council for higher education.

The Review Commission shall constate the aggregate number engaged at higher education institution, the number of teachers engaged with full working hours, the number of teachers engaged with part-time working hours, as well as whether the terms of the law regarding the dates of election and the age of the teachers. The review commission thence constates the number of employed teachers in relation to the aggregate number of students and the age structure of the teachers. The Review Commission shall judge pyramidal age profile and compare it with the ideal one (broad base with narrow top, which would increase the number of active researchers).

The Review Commission shall constate whether the institution applies the Regulations on the minimal terms for the election of teachers adopted by the NCHE.

Based on the attached data, the reviewer shall determine whether the number of the associates meets the necessities of the realization of the study programme. As to the realization of study programmes in applied studies, excluding the field of arts, the Review Commission shall determine whether at least 50% of the teachers hold Ph.D title.

The Review Commission shall analyze the data available at the higher education institution's website (the book of the teachers) regarding the competences of the teachers in a specific field i.e. area and the reviewer shall generally judge on the general competence of the teachers, taking into consideration their references and the subjects they teach.

The Review Commission shall comment the students' evaluation of pedagogic and research capacities of the teachers and associates, taking into consideration the results of the SWOT analysis.

The Review Commission constates the ratio between the aggregate number of students (the number of the students approved in the accreditation multiplied by the numbers of years of duration of the study programme) and the number of employed teachers on the level of the institution. In case that the

aforementioned is not in conformity with the law and the decisions of the National Council, the Review Commission marks it in the part of the report.

In addition to rating fulfilment of standards, the Review Commission provides motivation of rate in terms of fulfilment of this standard, based on the attachementes to the report, and of the facts determined during its visit and the documents provided by the institution at request of the Review Commission before/ in the course of/after the visit.

Annotation: The Review Commission shall particularly analyze the standard if the self-evaluation of the higher education institution is concerned; self-evaluation of the accredited study programme.

The Review Commission provides motivation referring to the Review Commission provides motivations referring to the fulfilment of the standard, analyzes weak and strong points and proposes the measures and activities for the improvement of the standard.

The text should contain 500 words minimum

Standard 8: The quality of the students

The quality of the students is provided by the selection of students in public fashion prescribed in advance, by grading the students during instruction, by permanent surveillance and verification of results of grading and success of the students and by taking appropriate measures in case of omissions.

Instruction for the preparation of self-evaluation documentation

Description (Higher education institution shall describe the application of general institutional strategy with regard on the procedures of acceptance and the recognition of education and shall show whether it respects the equality and equal rights of the students by all basis. The higher education institution shows whether the procedures of the acceptance and grading of the students are clearly defined, publicly announced and whether they are ceaselessly and consistently applied in the entire institution. The higher education institution shall particularly document and describe whether the methods of grading are conceived in order to estimate the outcome of studying in an appropriate fashion. The institution documents whether everybody is acquainted with the procedures of grading in a clear and undoubted fashion, as well as are there mechanisms for the estimation and control of grading procedure. The infrastructure for students (recreational space, club, students services, library, consultations and other) meet the requests applied for higher education institutions. The participation of students in the estimation of conditions and organization of study programmes shall be documented. The higher education institution shall show that the student evaluations of the quality of study programme are performed systematically and that the results of the evaluation are used within the framework of the measures for the improvement of quality of instruction. The relation between teacher and student shall provide the achievement of the goals of education.

The adopted procedures and measures that the institution shall introduce in case of excessively low results of students by subjects, programmes, years of students, as well as in marked irregularities in grading.

Within the framework of this standard, by the method of SWOT analysis, the institution shall analyze and quantitatively judge some of the following elements:

- The procedure of acceptance of students
- equality and equal rights of the students, including students with special needs
- The work on planning and development of the student's carrier
- The availability of the information on students
- The availability on the procedures and criteria of grading
- The analysis and criteria of grading by subjects, programmes and years, with corrective measures
- The conformity of the methods of grading with the outcome of the study programme
- objectivity of the teachers and their acting by principles in the process of grading
- The surveillance of the results of the students by subjects, programmes and years of studies,

<p>with corrective measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The organization of students and participation in decision-making <p>The proposal of measures and activities for the improvement of the quality of the standard 8:</p>
<p>The instructions for the application of standard 9:</p> <p>8.1 The higher education institution shall provide to students all relevant information and data in connection to their studies.</p> <p>8.2 When selecting students for enrolment, the higher education institution shall evaluate the results shown at the entrance examination, respectively the test of inclinations and skills, in accordance with the law.</p> <p>8.3 Equality and equal rights of the students on all basis (race, skin color, sexual orientation, ethnic, national or social origin, language, religion, political or other views, the status obtained by birth, sensory or motorical handicap and financial situation)</p> <p>8.4 The higher education institution develops the obligation of instruction-attending and it shall inform the students on that obligation in advance.</p> <p>8.5 The students are graded on the bases of the criteria, rules and procedures published in advance.</p> <p>8.6 The higher education shall systematically analyze, rate and improve the methods and criteria of student-grading by subjects and particularly whether the method of student-grading is conformed to the subject, whether the students' work during instruction is surveyed and graded, what is the ratio between the grades of students' work during the instruction and on the final exam in the overall grade and whether the students' capacity of applying knowledge.</p> <p>8.7 The methods of student-grading and the knowledge they have acquired in the course of instruction and scientific process shall be in conformity with the goals, contents and volume of the accreditation of the study programmes.</p> <p>8.8 The higher education institution provides correct and professional behavior of the teachers when grading the students (objectivity, ethical behavior and correct relation towards the student)</p> <p>8.9. The higher education institution shall systematically survey and check the grades of the students by subjects and takes appropriate measures in case of irregularities in grade-distribution (too many high or low grades, uneven distribution of grades) in long time period.</p> <p>8.10 The higher education institution shall systematically survey and check the results of the students by subjects, programmes and years of study and takes corrective measures in case of excessively low results and other grading irregularities.</p> <p>8.11 The higher education institution provides to students adequate form of the organization, activity and participation in decision-making, in accordance with the law.</p>
<p>Evidence</p> <p>Table 8.1. The overview of the students by degrees, study programmes and the years of studies on the current academic year.</p> <p>Table 8.2. The rate of success of the students. The datum shall be calculated for the students who obtained the degree in previous academic year (up to 30 September) and completed the studies within the term of prescribed duration of the study programme.</p> <p>Table 8.3. The number of students who are enrolled on current academic year in relation to the obtained ECTS credits (60), (37-60) (less than 37) for all study programmes by the years of studies.</p> <p>Attachment 8.1. Regulations on the procedure of the acceptance of students</p> <p>Attachment 8.2. Regulations on grading</p> <p>Attachment 8.3. The procedures and corrective measures in case of non-fulfilling and deviance from the adopted procedures of grading</p>
<p>Instruction for the Review Commission for the rate for fulfilment of standards</p> <p>The review constates whether the higher education institution has delivered all documentation, all attachementes, as well as the tabulary data requested by this standard. Based on the attachementes, the reviewer shall determine whether the regulations on the procedure for the acceptance of the students are precised: the criteria for determination of candidate-ranking, the procedure of enrolment contest, the fashion of filing an appeal on the established ranking and the term within the appeal shall be filed, the terms of enrolment, and the fashion of candidate-ranking.</p>

The Review Commission has the obligation to write the number of students (the number of students on the first year of studies multiplied by the years of duration of study programme) for every study programme for which the institution has obtained accreditation, as well as the aggregate number of the students of the higher education institution in its report, by using the data that the institution attached to this standard.

The Review Commission shall judge whether the number of students enrolled by the higher education institution is in conformity with personnel, spacial and technical capacities and it is cited in the work license issued by the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Serbia.

Based on the description of the standard and the attached data, as well as the results of the SWOT analysis, the reviewer checks whether the institution ceaselessly and systematically surveys the results of the students by subjects, programmes and years of studies and whether it takes measures of support in case of unsatisfactory success of the students.

The Review Commission shall analyze the data on the average duration of studies for each of the study programmes. It shall also analyze student polls on the judgment of the teachers' objectivity and acting by principles when grading, as well as the proposal of measures and activities providing the conformity of the grading method with the outcome of the study programme.

The Review Commission shall check on the appropriate professional, academic, i.e. scientific title and constates on its accordance with the law. In case that aforementioned is not in accordance with the law and the decisions of the National Council, the Review Commission shall mark it in the part of the report.

In addition to rating fulfilment of standards, the Review Commission provides motivation of rate in terms of fulfilment of this standard, based on the attachementes to the report, and of the facts determined during its visit and the documents provided by the institution at request of the Review Commission before/ in the course of/after the visit.

Annotation: The Review Commission shall particularly analyze the standard if the self-evaluation of the higher education institution is concerned; self-evaluation of the accredited study programme.

The Review Commission provides motivation referring to the Review Commission provides motivations referring to the fulfilment of the standard, analyzes weak and strong points and proposes the measures and activities for the improvement of the standard.

The text should contain 400 words minimum

Standard 9: The quality of the textbooks, literature, library and information resources

The quality of the textbooks, literature and information resources shall be provided by introducing and execution of the adequate general acts.

The instruction for preparing the documentation for self-evaluation

Description (The higher education institution shall analyze the quality of the textbooks, literature, library and information support. It shall particularly analyze the documents and measures by which publishing activity, teaching and other literature are defined, the documents and measures by which the minimum of standards of the quality of textbooks is defined, and the documents and measures by which the obligation of verifying the quality of textbook is prescribed. The higher education institution shall document that it performs regular periodical evaluation of the quality of textbooks, library and information resources. In case of necessary improvements of this standard, the institution attachementes the planm of measures in order to meet prescribed requests. The higher education institution shall describe library fund and adequate equipment in the field of information technologies contributing to the quality of instruction.

Within the framework of this standard, by the method of SWOT analysis, the institution shall analyze and quantitatively judge some of the following elements:

- the existence of general act on textbook and acting according to it;
- The coverage of subjects by textbooks and means of study
- Structure and volume of library fund
- the existence of information resources (computers, software, Internet, digital form of journals)

- The number of employees in the library and other relevant offices and their professional qualifications;
- The adequacy of working conditions (space, working hours)

The proposal of measures and activities for the improvement of the quality of the standard 9

The instructions for the application of standard 9:

- 9.1 The higher education institution shall provide to students textbooks and other literature necessary for completion of study matter in necessary quantity and on time.
- 9.2 The instruction of every subject is covered by the adequate textbooks and other means of study which are familiar and published in advance.
- 9.3 The higher education institution shall introduce general act on textbooks. In accordance with the general act, the institution systematically surveys the quality of the textbooks and other means of study from the aspect of the quality of the contents (modernity, correctness), structure (examples, questions, resume), style and volume (the conformity with the number of ECTS credits); the textbooks and other means of study not meeting the standard shall be enhanced or withdrawn and replaced by the textbooks of better quality.
- 9.4 The higher education institution shall provide to students the library equipped with the necessary number of library units, as well as the working equipment.
- 9.5 The higher education institution shall systematically survey and improve the structure of the library fund.
- 9.6 The higher education institution provides to students necessary information resources for the completion of study matter: the necessary number of computers of adequate quality, other information equipment, the access to the Internet and other communication equipment.
- 9.7 The number of employees in library and auxiliary services, as well as the type and level of their professional education are in conformity with national and European standards for providing this type of services.
- 9.8 The competence and motivation of the personnel for support in the library, reading room and computer center shall be continuously surveyed, judged and improved.
- 9.9 The students are systematically acquainted with the form of work in library and computer center.
- 9.10 The rooms intended for accommodation of library fund, archival and digital material and especially student reading rooms, are placed in an adequate part of the building in order to provide students, teaching and non-teaching staff and other users appropriate working conditions. The use of library and the access to its complete fund are secured for at least 12 hours daily.

Evidence

Table 9.1. Number and type of library units in higher education institution

Table 9.2. The list of information resources

Attachment 9.1 General act on textbooks

Attachment 9.2. The list of textbooks and monographs authored by the teachers employed at the higher education institution (with ordinal numbers)

Attachment 9.3. The ratio between the number of the textbooks and monographs (altogether) authored by the teachers employed at the institution with the number of the teachers.

Instruction for the Review Commission for the rate for fulfilment of standards

The review shall state whether the higher education institution has delivered all documentation, all attachments, as well as the tabular data requested by this standard

The Review Commission has the obligation to analyze all the data referring to information resources and information support, on the basis of which the fulfilment of the standard is judged.

Based on the data provided in the tables and attachments, as well as on the basis of the attached SWOT analysis, the Review Commission shall check and determine whether the higher institution supplied with the literature which provides support to the process of instruction and scientific-research and artistic work, whether the library possesses minimally 1000 library units from the field of instruction, taking into consideration educational-scientific respectively educational-artistic fields in which the institution realizes its study programmes. On the basis of data analysis, the Review Commission shall determine whether the higher education institution provides the coverage of the subjects with appropriate textbook

literature.

The Review Commission cites the number of computers in computer libraries available to the students in its report by giving the commentary whether the number of computers is in conformity with the number of students of the higher education institution.

In addition to rating fulfilment of standards, the Review Commission provides motivation of rate in terms of fulfilment of this standard, based on the attachments to the report and of the facts determined during its visit and the documents provided by the institution at request of the Review Commission before/ in the course of/after the visit. The Review Commission provides motivations referring to the fulfilment of the standard, analyzes weak and strong points and proposes the measures and activities for the improvement of the standard.

Annotation: The Review Commission shall particularly analyze the standard if the self-evaluation of the higher education institution is concerned; self-evaluation of the accredited study programme; of a new programme for which the accreditation is requested

The text should contain 300 words minimum.

Standard 10: The quality of managing the higher education institution and the quality of non-teaching support

The quality of managing the higher education institution and the quality of non-teaching support shall be ensured by determining the competence and responsibility of managing organ and units for non-teaching support and permanent following and check of its work.

Instruction for the preparation of documents for the self-evaluation:

Description(The higher degree institution analyzes the general acts by which are regulated basic competencies, process and manner of work of managing organs, Students' parliament and professional services. The structure of organizational units of the higher education institution is shown and observed, as well as the activity of professional services through which non-teaching support is achieved. The higher education institution documents that it performs a regular and periodical evaluation of the estimation of the quality of work of managing organs and the work of professional services and that, if necessary, brings the proposal of measures for improving the quality of their work).

Within this standard by SWOT method of analysis the institution analyzes and estimates quantitatively some of the following elements:

- definition of competence of managing organ, business organ and professional organ;
- definition of the organizational structure;
- observing and evaluating the quality of managing the institution, with measures for improvement;
- observing and evaluating the quality of work of professional services and non-teaching staff, with measures for improvement;
- definition and availability of conditions for improvement of non-teaching staff;
- availability of the relevant information about the work professional services and managing organs;
- permanent improvement and education of non-teaching staff.

The proposal of measures and activities for improvement of the quality of standard 10:

Instructions for application of standard 10:

10.1 Managing organs and business organs, its competences and responsibilities in organization and management of the higher education institution are set by the general act of the higher education institution in accordance with the law.

10.2 Structure, organizational units and its scope of activities, as well as its coordination and control are set by the general act of the higher education institution, in accordance with the law.

10.3 The higher education institution systematically observes and evaluates the organization and management of the higher education institution and undertakes measures for its improvement.

- 10.4 The higher education institution systematically observes and evaluates the work of managing and non-teaching staff and undertakes measures for improvement of the quality of its work; especially follows and evaluates their approach to the students and motivation in the work with students.
- 10.5 Condition and process of establishing the labor relationship and progression of non-teaching staff shall be determined by the publicly available general act of the higher education institution.
- 10.6 The work and activity of managing and non-teaching staff are available for the evaluation of teachers, non-teaching staff, students and interested subjects.
- 10.7 The higher education institution provides the number and the quality of the non-teaching staff in accordance with the standards envisaged for accreditation.
- 10.8 The institution provides for managing and non-teaching staff permanent professional education and improvement.

Record

Table 10.1. The number of full-time or part-time employed non-teaching staff in the higher education institution within matching organizational units

Attachment 10.1. Schematic organizational structure of the higher education institution

Attachment 10.2. Analysis of the results of a survey of students on the assessment of the quality of the work of managing organs and professional services.

Instruction for the Review Commission for the evaluation of the fulfilment of standard:

The Review Commission concludes whether the higher education institution delivered documentation, all attachments, as well as tabular data which refer to this standard. The Review Commission determines whether there is a sufficient number of qualified persons for conducting library job and information system related jobs.

The Review Commission is in obligation to analyze all the data related to non-teaching staff, and refer to the fulfilment of standard. Besides, the reviewer checks whether there is sufficient number of qualified persons to perform secretary jobs and jobs of student service.

The Review Commission determines, by analysis of data, whether processes of deciding, competencies and responsibility are clearly defined, announced and implemented. The Review Commission on the basis of the attachment and the statute of the higher education institution estimates whether the organizational structure and procedures ensure the involvement of teachers and students in the processes of deciding upon study programmes. In the case that the mentioned requirements are not in compliance with the law and decisions of NAT, the Review Commission notes it in the part of the report.

The Review Commission, apart from the estimation of the fulfilment of standards, gives an explanation of estimations related to the fulfilment of this standard, on the basis of the attachment with the Report, facts determined during the visit and documents which the institution provided at the request of the Review Commission before/during/after the visit. The Review Commission provides explanations which refer to the fulfilment of this standard, analyzes weak and strong points of measures and procedures for ensuring the quality, and gives the proposal of measures for improving this standard.

Note:

The Review Commission especially analyzes this standard in the case of self-evaluation of the higher education institution; self-evaluation of the accredited study programme; a new study programme submitted for accreditation.

Text should consist of at least 300 words.

Standard 11: Quality of space and equipment Quality of space and equipment is assured through its adequate extent and structure.
Instruction for preparation of documentatio for self-assessment:
<p>Description (The higher institution shows that it has at disposal infrastructure necessary for implementation of aims toward strategic plans. Size, availability and quality of space and equipment correspond to standards obligatory for the higher education institutions).</p> <p>Within this standard the institution analyzes and quantitatively evaluates some of the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • compliance of spacial capacities with the total number of students; • adequacy of technical, laboratorian and other equipment; • compliance of equipment capacities with the number of students; • computer rooms. <p>Proposal of measures and activities for improving the quality of sstandard 11:</p>
<p>Instructions for application of standard 11:</p> <p>11.1 The higher education institution has adequate spacial capacities: classrooms, offices, library, reading room and similar resources for quality realization of its activity.</p> <p>11.2 The higher education institution possesses adequate and contemporary technical, laboratorian and other specific equipment which assures quilaty in realization of teaching at all types and levels of studies.</p> <p>11.3 The higher education institution continuously monitors and adjusts it spacial capacities and equipment with the needs of teaching process and the number of students.</p> <p>11.4 The higher education institutuion provides all employed persons and students undistrubed access to the various types of information in electronic form and informational technologies, in order to use those information for scientific purposes.</p> <p>11.5 The higher education institution possesses at least on eroom equipped with contemporary tehcnical and other devices which enable students and staff to work on computers and to use services of the computer centre (coping, printing, scanning, burning to CDs and DVDs).</p>
Record
<p>Table 11.1. Total quadrature (property of the higher education institution and rented space) with quadrature of objects (amfitheaters, classrooms, laboratories, organizational units, services)</p> <p>Table 11.2. List of equipment owned by the higher education institution which is used in teaching process and scientific work.</p> <p>Table 11.3. Teaching-scientific and other proffesional bases.</p>
Instruction of the Review Commission for assessment of fulfilment of this standard:
<p>The Review Commission concludes whether the higher education institution delivered documentation, all attachments, as well as tabelar data which refer to this standard. Review Commission comments data provided in tables and in its report gives a comment in reference to the Proveo f ownership, contracts on use or rent of space.</p> <p>The Review Commission determines whether, on the basis of data provided in tables and attachments, the higher education institution provides space for realization of teaching in relation to the entire number of students. Minimal necessary number is counted when the entire bruto quadrature (K) is divided with the total number of students (C) and that relation should be higher than 2m^2 per student in all cases except in the field of art, where the minimal required space per student estimates 5m^2 neto.</p> <p>Review Commission on the basis of attached list of rooms and number of available places determines whether the space is in compliance with needs of education procees of a particular education-scientific, respectively education-artistic field, whether there is adequate working space for teachers and associates as well as whether in the amphitheater, classroom and laboratory, there is a place for each student.</p>

Review Commission is in obligation to determine, on the basis of attachments, whether the space is ownership of the higher education institution, whether it is given for use or it is rented for at least 5 years. The reviewer is in obligation to add this information in the Report. If the institution uses a number of objects on various locations, the Review Commission is in obligation to stipulate it in its Report.

On the basis of data provided in tables and attachment the reviewer assesses whether the institution assures the necessary technical equipment for contemporary realization of teaching in accordance with the needs of study programme. The Review Commission concludes whether the higher education institution provides the space for the work of students' parliament. In the case of that the mentioned requirements are not in compliance with the Law and decisions of the National Council, the Review Commission states that fact in a part of the Report.

The Review Commission, apart from the assessment on the fulfilment of standards gives an explanation of evaluations related to the fulfilment of this standard, on the basis of attachment to the Report, facts determined during the visit and documents which the institution provided at the request of the Review Commission before/during/after the visit. The Review Commission provides explanations which refer to the fulfilment of this standard, analyzes weak and strong points of measures and procedures for ensuring the quality, and gives the proposal of measures for improving this standard.

Note:

The Review Commission especially analyzes this standard in the case of self-evaluation of the higher education institution; self-evaluation of the accredited study programme; a new study programme submitted for accreditation.

Text should consist of at least 300 words.

Standard 12: Financing

The quality of financing the higher education institution is ensured through the quality of sources of financing, financial planning and transparency in the use of financial resources, which leads to the long term financial stability.

Instruction for preparation of documentation for self-assessment:

Description (The higher education institution describes sources of financing and implementation of the budget. It attaches evidence that the processes of financing are clearly defined and transparently documented. The higher education institution comments its own sources of financing, as well as contribution of finances from these sources. The institution especially describes the way of financing the research and teaching. The institution has the middle term plan for financing of its own activities. Within that plan, budgeted and real expenses of each study programme and the entire institution are periodically structured and documented. The institution analyzes possible deviations and documents corresponding measures to improve this standard.

Within this standard the institution analyzes and quantitatively assesses some of the following elements, by use of SWOT method:

- sources of financing;
- long term security of financial resources for teaching, scientific research, artistic and professional work;
- financial planning and deciding;
- public ways of use of financial resources.

The proposal of measures and activities for improvement of standard 12:

Instructions for application of standard 12:

12.1 The higher education institution has long term secured financial resources necessary for the

<p>realization of teaching process, scientific research projects, artistic and professional activities.</p> <p>12.2 Sources of financing of the higher education institution are determined in accordance with the Law.</p> <p>12.3 The higher education institution analyzes and plans the schedule and the purpose of financial resources in order to assure the long term financial stability and liquidity.</p> <p>12.4 The higher education institution assures the public and transparency of its sources of financing and the ways of use of financial resources through the Report on business and through the yearly billing which is adopted by the Council.</p>
Record
<p>Attachment 12.1. Financial plan</p> <p>Attachment 12.2. Financial report for the past calendar year.</p>
Instruction for the Review Commission for the assessment of the fulfilment of standard:
<p>The Review Commission concludes whether the higher education institution submitted all documents and attachments required by this standard. The Review Commission concludes whether the institution submitted the financial report for the past school year. By analyzing attachments submitted as a proof of fulfilment of this standard, assesses whether sources of financing of the higher education institution sufficient to provide the quality realization of teaching at study programmes.</p> <p>On the basis of inspection of the financial plan, the reviewer assesses whether processes of financing and implementation of budget are clearly defined and transparently documented, as well as whether there is long term security of financial resources for teaching, scientific, artistic and professional work, and also whether the higher education institution ensures the long term financial stability and liquidity.</p> <p>The Review Commission, apart from the assessment on the fulfilment of standards gives an explanation of evaluations related to the fulfilment of this standard, on the basis of attachment to the Report, facts determined during the visit and documents which the institution provided at the request of the Review Commission before/during/after the visit. The Review Commission provides explanations which refer to the fulfilment of this standard, analyzes weak and strong points of measures and procedures for ensuring the quality, and gives the proposal of measures for improving this standard.</p> <p>Note:</p> <p>The Review Commission especially analyzes this standard in the case of self-evaluation of the higher education institution; self-evaluation of the accredited study programme; a new study programme submitted for accreditation.</p> <p>Text should consist of at least 300 words.</p>

Standard 13: Students' role in the self-evaluation and quality check process
Higher education institutions provide an important role for students in the process of quality assurance, through the work of student organizations and student representatives in the bodies of higher education institutions, as well as through interviewing students about the quality of higher education institutions.
Instructions for preparing documentation for self-evaluation:
<p>Description (Higher Education Institution shall describe the ways in which students are involved in quality assessment and quality improvement processes and shall substantiate its assertions with the relevant documentation and adopted reports.) The institution shall in particular analyze the procedures and corrective measures in the case of non-compliance with standards in the areas that are being checked during the self-evaluation process, which could be assessed by students.)</p> <p>Within this standard, by way of SWOT analysis, the institution shall analyze and quantitatively</p>

evaluate some of the following elements:

- students' participation in quality assurance bodies;
- students' participation in self-evaluation;
- students' evaluation of the institution, study programmes, classes.

Proposal of measures and activities for improving the quality of the standard 13:**Guidelines for the application of standard 13:**

13.1 Student representatives are members of the commission for quality assurance of a higher education institution.

13.2 Students shall, in an appropriate way, give their opinion on the strategy, standards, procedures and documents that shall ensure the quality of the higher education institution, including the results of self-evaluation and quality assessment of the higher education institution.

13.3 A mandatory element of self-evaluation of a higher education institution is a survey with the help of which students' attitudes and opinions on issues from all areas that are being checked in the process of self-evaluation shall be examined. The higher education institution is obliged to organize and conduct the survey and make its results available to the public and it shall include them in the overall self-evaluation and quality assessment.

13.4 Students are actively involved in the processes of permanent creating, development and evaluation of study programmes within the curriculum and development of assessment methods.

Record keeping

Attachment 13.1 Documentation confirming students' participation in self-evaluation and quality assurance.

Compliance assessment instructions for the Review Commission:

The Review Commission shall determine whether the higher education institution has submitted the documentation and all the attachments required by this standard. The Review Commission shall analyze whether students have an active role in the adoption and implementation of the quality assurance strategy of a higher education institution, and in particular whether the assessment of the quality of the teaching process is determined in accordance with the student surveys. The Review Commission shall determine whether the students' participation and activities in the quality assurance of the institution, study programmes and classes can be considered a process based on an open, honest and constructive critique in order to make an improvement. In the event that this is not in accordance with the law and decisions of the National Council, the Review Commission shall indicate this in its report.

In addition to the assessment of the standards' compliance, the Review Commission provides justification of the assessments related to the fulfilment of this standard, based on the attachments to the Report, the facts established during the visit and the documents provided by the institution upon request of the Review Commission before/during/after the visit. The Review Commission shall provide the justification regarding the fulfilment of this standard. It shall analyze weak and strong points of quality assurance measures and procedures, and it shall propose measures to improve this standard.

Note: The Review Commission shall separately analyze the standard if it concerns the self-evaluation of a higher education institution; self-evaluation of an accredited study programme; a new study programme submitted for accreditation.

The text shall consist of at least 300 words.

Standard 14: Systematic monitoring and periodic quality control

The higher education institution continuously and systematically collects the necessary information on quality assurance and performs periodic checks in all areas of quality assurance.

Instructions for preparing documentation for self-evaluation:

Description (Higher education institution describes the basic working principles in the process of systematic monitoring and periodic quality control. It needs to substantiate the extent to which the principles have been adhered to in accordance with the strategic commitment of the institution. The higher education institution shall analyze the existing infrastructure for systematic monitoring and quality assurance. It shall name the forms of cooperation and ways of information exchange with other

higher education institutions which achieve good results in student education and research. When it comes to working within the framework of systematic monitoring and periodic quality control, the higher education institution shall underline the public-participation principle.)

Within this standard, by way of SWOT analysis, the institution shall analyze and quantitatively evaluate some of the following elements:

- continuity in the realization of the process of securing and improving the quality;
- existence of infrastructure for systematic monitoring and quality assurance;
- regular feedback on the quality of acquired competencies of graduate students;
- harmonization with the quality improvement strategies of other prestigious higher education institutions in the country and abroad;
- periodical collection of the data concerning the quality;
- public accessibility of the results of the quality assessment.

Proposal of measures and activities for improving the quality of the standard 14:

Guidelines for the application of standard 14:

14.1 The higher education institution shall ensure the implementation of established standards and procedures for quality assessment and performing of all the tasks which present the duties of the entities that are involved in the process of quality assurance of the institution.

14.2 The higher education institution provides conditions and infrastructure for regular and systematic collection and processing of data that are necessary for quality assessment in all areas subject to self evaluation.

14.3 The higher education institution provides regular feedback from employers, representatives of the National Employment Service, its former students and other relevant organizations on the competencies of graduate students.

14.4 The higher education institution provides the data necessary for making the comparison with foreign higher education institutions in terms of quality.

14.5 The higher education institution performs periodic self-evaluation and quality level controls during which it reviews the implementation of the established quality assurance strategies and procedures, as well as achieving of the desired quality standards. The periodical self-evaluation shall include the results of the student surveys. Self-evaluation must be carried out at least once every three years.

14.6 The higher education institution shall familiarize its teachers and associates, through its departments and professional bodies, as well as students and student organizations with the results of the self-evaluation process. The same applies to the Accreditation and quality control commission and to the public.

Record keeping

Attachment 14.1 Information published at the higher education institution website with regard to the activities that provide systematic monitoring and periodic quality control in order to maintain and improve the quality of work of the higher education institution.

Compliance assessment instructions for the Review Commission:

The Review Commission shall determine whether the higher education institution has submitted documentation and all the attachments required by this standard.

The Review Commission checks whether the management body of a higher education institution has adopted a quality assurance strategy and whether this document is available to the public. The Review Commission shall assess strategic planning of higher education institutions and the resources necessary for achieving those goals. The Review Commission shall provide a descriptive assessment when evaluating the commitment of a higher education institution to establish and maintain the required level of quality.

The Review Commission shall establish whether a higher education institution systematically collects and processes data required for quality assessment in all areas subject to self-evaluation. It shall specifically comment on whether the institution provides regular feedback from employers, representatives of the National Employment Service, its former students and other relevant organizations, on the competencies of graduate students. The Review Commission analyzes and

evaluates public accessibility of the quality assessment results. In the event that this is not in accordance with the law and decisions of the National Council, the Review Commission shall indicate this in its report.

In addition to the assessment of the standards' compliance, the Review Commission provides justification of the assessments related to the fulfilment of this standard, based on the attachments to the Report, the facts that it established during the visit and the documents provided by the institution upon request of the Review Commission before/during/after the visit. The Review Commission shall provide the justification regarding the fulfilment of this standard. It shall analyze weak and strong points of quality assurance measures and procedures, and it shall propose measures to improve this standard.

Note: The Review Commission shall separately analyze the standard if it concerns the self-evaluation of a higher education institution; self-evaluation of an accredited study programme; a new study programme submitted for accreditation.

The text shall consist of at least 300 words.

Standard 15. Quality of doctoral studies

The quality of doctoral studies is ensured through the improvement of scientific research work, that is, through artistic research work, modernization of the study programmes' contents at the level of doctoral studies and regular monitoring and checking of their goals, through achieving scientific and artistic skills of the PhD students and mastering of specific academic and practical skills necessary for the future development of their careers.

Instructions for preparing documentation for self-evaluation:

Description (Within this standard, by way of SWOT analysis, the institution shall analyze and quantitatively evaluate each point from the guidelines set forth in this standard):

Proposal of measures and activities for improving the quality of the standard 15:

Guidelines for the application of standard 15:

- 15.1 Higher education institution self-assesses accredited study programmes of doctoral studies, that is, a doctoral school which a higher education institution realize independently or together with another higher education or scientific-research institution from the country or abroad.
- 15.2 The doctoral school shall be developed in accordance with the Guidelines for the establishment of doctoral schools adopted by the National Council for Higher Education.
- 15.3 The higher education institution assesses itself its readiness for conducting of the doctoral studies on the basis of indicators related to the scientific research, that is, artistic research, taking into account:
 - a. the number of doctoral dissertations, that is, doctoral art projects defended at the higher education institution in the areas in which it performs doctoral studies, taking into account the proportion between the number of doctoral dissertations, that is, doctoral art projects and the number of graduates and the number of teachers;
 - b. the proportion of the number of teachers and the number of teachers who are involved in scientific research or artistic research projects;
 - c. the quality of scientific and research work of teachers engaged in doctoral studies according to the conditions defined by the standards for accreditation;
 - d. established cooperation with scientific and research institutions in the country and in the world;
- 15.4 The higher education institution monitors, analyzes and improves the achievement of scientific, that is, artistic abilities and academic and specific practical skills of its students, by evaluating:
 - a. scientific research, that is, artistic research results and the ability of graduate students to deliver results at scientific conferences and to publish them in scientific journals with a review, to present them to the public, to acquire patents or realize innovations through recognized new technical and technological solutions;
 - b. contribution to the development of scientific discipline through participation in domestic or international scientific research projects;
 - c. development of skills and capability of application of the acquired knowledge in the appropriate

<p>field;</p> <p>d. respecting the principles of the Code of Ethics and good scientific practice;</p> <p>15.5 The higher education institution monitors, analyzes and improves the student enrollment policy for doctoral studies by evaluating:</p> <p>a. social needs and needs of the development of science, art, education and culture;</p> <p>b. its material and scientific research, that is, artistic research resources, and the availability of modern research equipment and laboratory space intended for students of doctoral studies.</p> <p>15.6 The higher education institution continuously monitors and analyzes the progress of its students taking into account the progress made in acquiring of knowledge and skills necessary for the further career development, and the progress made in the field of research, and to this end, it improves and develops the mentoring system serving as a support offered to the students of doctoral studies.</p> <p>15.6 The higher education institution monitors, critically evaluates and continuously encourages the scientific, that is, artistic progress of its teachers, especially the mentors, in an effort to improve the proportion of the number of potential mentors to the number of PhD students in order to create a more favorable research, that is, artistic environment for their students.</p> <p>15.6 The institution deposits doctoral dissertations, that is, doctoral art projects in a unique repository which is permanently accessible to the public. The institution provides public availability of reports on the acceptance of a dissertation, that is, an art project and published scientific and artistic research results that the candidate has accomplished.</p>
Record keeping
<p>Table 15.1. List of all accredited study programmes of doctoral studies,</p> <p>Table 15.2. List of organizational units that deal with harmonization of the quality of all doctoral studies at a higher education institution (Doctoral Studies' Council, Doctoral school ...)</p> <p>Table 15.3. List of members of the organizational units for the quality of doctoral studies of the higher education institution</p>
<p>Attachment 15.1 Regulations of doctoral studies</p> <p>Attachment 15.2 Excerpt from the Statute which govern doctoral studies</p> <p>Attachment 15.3 Regulations on the work of doctoral schools</p> <p>Attachment 15.4 Regulations on the selection of mentors</p> <p>Attachment 15.5 The procedure of drafting and defending the doctoral dissertation or the doctoral art project</p>
Compliance assessment instructions for the Review Commission:
<p>The Review Commission shall determine whether the higher education institution has submitted the documentation and all attachments required by this standard. The Review Commission shall review the quality of all study programmes of doctoral studies at the institution. In the event that this is not harmonized with the law and decisions of the National Council, the Review Commission shall indicate this in its report.</p> <p>In addition to the assessment of the standards' compliance, the Review Commission provides justification of the assessments related to the fulfilment of this standard, based on the attachments to the Report, the facts that it established during its visit and the documents provided by the institution upon a request of the Review Commission before/during/after the visit. The Review Commission shall provide the justification regarding the fulfilment of this standard. It shall analyze weak and strong points of quality assurance measures and procedures, and it shall propose measures to improve this standard.</p> <p>Note: The Review Commission shall separately analyze the standard if it concerns the self-evaluation of a higher education institution; self-evaluation of an accredited study programme at the level of doctoral studies; a new study programme at the level of doctoral studies submitted for accreditation.</p> <p>The text shall consist of at least 300 words.</p>