

**INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE UNIT  
(NJSBC)**

**INTERNAL QUALITY ASSESSMENT RESULTS REPORT  
MADE BY STUDENTS  
FIRST SEMESTER**

**I**

Academic year  
2022-2023

**Tirana, March 2023**

## **1. Internal Quality Assurance Unit at Western Balkans University**

Quality assurance is the main objective of the Western Balkans University (WBU), defined in the institution's vision and mission for a transformative impact on society through continuous innovation in the field of education, scientific research, creativity and entrepreneurship, investing in the preparation of the future professionals prepared for the international labor market, to be an internationally recognized university in the field of scientific research and innovation, with the main goal of continuous improvement of a better life.

The periodic evaluation of the results of the quality of education, research, human resources, finance, infrastructure, public relations, international relations, social and cultural activities, works within the framework of quality development and improvement activities, is a comprehensive, systematic and regular, which institutionalizes the culture of quality at Western Balkans University.

The process of carrying out the questionnaires and drawing up the report on its findings is in accordance with the following legal and by-laws as follows:

- Law No. 80/2015, dated 22.07.2015, "On higher education and scientific research in higher education institutions in the Republic of Albania", Articles 46, 103, 104 and 106,
- Quality Code in Higher Education, approved by- The council of Minister Decision-VKM no. 824, dated on 24.12.2021, "On the approval of the Quality Code of Higher Education",
- European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in Higher Education,
- Statute of Western Balkans University (Articles 37 and 38),
- Basic Regulation of "Western Balkans" University (Article 15),
- Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ASCAL) manual for the internal quality system.

## **2. Composition of the Internal Quality Assurance Unit (IQAU-NJSBC) for the academic year 2022-2023, the methodology of the development of the questionnaire process and data processing.**

The Internal Quality Assurance Unit consists of 5 (five) members, of which 3 (three) are representatives of the academic staff of the main units, one for each faculty, 1 (one) representative of the Student Council and 1 (one) expert external. The President and Members of the unit are approved by the Academic Senate on the proposal of the rector.

Composition of NJSBC for the academic year 2022-2023

<b>No.</b>	<b>Name, Surname</b>	<b>Function</b>	<b>Representation</b>
------------	----------------------	-----------------	-----------------------

1	Mirela Cela	Head	Faculty of Technical Medical Sciences
2	Elizabeth Susaj	Member	Faculty of Economics, Technology and Innovation
3	Eda Cela	Member	Faculty of Dental Medicine
4	Ramadan Chipuri	Member	External expert
5	Franci Brahollari	Member	Student Representative

During the first semester of the 2022-2023 academic year, institutional questionnaires were organized and well-structured as part of the evaluation of the quality and performance of the academic staff in the teaching process. The process of evaluating the teaching quality of the academic staff consists of 4 components:

- Evaluation by students,
- Peer Review,
- Self-esteem,
- Evaluation by managers (direct superior or department manager).

At the end of each academic semester, receiving the opinions of students on each study program as a whole, special subject, lecturer or on a specific problem through special questionnaires, we believe that it directly affects the quality assurance in this institution. The data obtained from the questionnaires, after processing, will be widely used in support of the process as a whole, during which the leaders of the institution evaluate the academic performance of each lecturer at the end of the academic year and take the relevant measures for improvement.

The content of the questionnaire is standard and is organized into **16 questions**, measurable and evaluable, according to **an evaluation scale from 1** (minimum evaluation) **to 5** (maximum evaluation). Also, in a separate section of the questionnaire, students have the opportunity to make comments about the problems they think about the subject and/or the relevant lecturer.

The questionnaires were filled out physically and during the presentation the students were asked to be as objective as possible in their answers. The completion of the questionnaire was done confidentially and anonymously and was carried out in the period 12-23 December 2022 for Bachelor programs and in the period 6-17 March 2023 for Master of Science programs.

A total of **710 questionnaires were completed**, in **3 faculties**, for **10 study programs**, of which **7 Bachelor study programs**, **1 Integrated Master study program** and **2 Master of Science study programs**. Specifically:

- **242 questionnaires** were completed by students of the Faculty of Economics, Technology and Innovation (FETI), of which **197 questionnaires** were for **3 Bachelor study programs** (59 questionnaires were completed by students of the Biotechnology program, 97 questionnaires were completed by students of the Biomedical Engineering program, and 41 questionnaires were completed by students of the Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence program), and **45 questionnaires** were completed by students of the Master of Science in Hospital Management program

- **225 questionnaires** were completed for 1 (one) Integrated Master's study program in Dentistry,
- **243 questionnaires** were completed by the students of the Faculty of Medical and Technical Sciences (FSMT) , of which **223 questionnaires** for 4 Bachelor study programs (94 questionnaires were completed by students of the Nursing program, 44 questionnaires were completed by students of the Laboratory Technician program, 57 questionnaires were completed by students of the Imaging Technician program, and 28 questionnaires were completed by students of the Physiotherapy program) , and **20 questionnaires** for a Master of Science in Nursing study program.

The disposal and processing of their data is done manually. For the questionnaires, a database in EXCEL format was created for measurable questions and a categorized database for open questions. The processing of quantitative data is reflected in graphic form, separately for each faculty.

## Conclusions

The first semester of the 2022-2023 academic year is also the first work semester of Western Balkans University. From the results of the evaluations of the students of the University for the lecturers and the teaching process, carried out anonymously through physical questionnaires, it was found that the academic staff of the Western Balkans University has had a relatively good commitment and dedication in the smooth running of the teaching process.

- At the institutional level, only 4.71% of the academic staff were evaluated with less than 3 points, 7.06% of them were evaluated with 3.00-3.50 points and 16.47% were evaluated with 3.51-4.00 points, while the majority, 71.76% of academic staff was evaluated above 4.01 points, of which, 27.06% was evaluated with 4.01-4.5 points and 44.71% received the maximum evaluation with 4.51-5 points.
- At the faculty level, we can say that in the Faculty of Economy, Technology and Innovation (FETI), the academic staff had a slightly higher positive evaluation compared to the other two faculties.
- In the Faculty of Economics, Technology and Innovation, 80.77% of the academic staff was evaluated with 4.51-5 points, while in the other two faculties this number is lower. Specifically, in the Faculty of Dental Medicine, only 20% of the academic staff was evaluated with 4.51-5 points and in the Faculty of Technical Medical Sciences, only 30.61% of the academic staff was evaluated with 4.51-5 points.
- 19.23% of the academic staff of FETI, 30% of the academic staff of FMD and 30.61% of the academic staff of FSMT were evaluated with 4.01-4.5 points.
- 40% of the academic staff of FMD and 20.41% of the academic staff of FSMT were evaluated with 3.51-4.00 points.
- were evaluated with 3.01-3.50 points .
- The lowest evaluation value was obtained at the Faculty of Technical Medical Sciences, where 8.16% of the academic staff was evaluated with less than 3 points.

- **FORM OF THE EVALUATION OF LECTURER BY THE STUDENTS**

-

<b>Subject:</b> _____
<b>Program:</b> _____
<b>Faculty:</b> _____
<b>Lecturer:</b> _____
<b>Academic year:</b> _____

-

- Please rate your course teacher by circling one of the numbers 1 to 5, where 1 = minimum rating and 5 = maximum rating, based on the following aspects:

-

	Overall performance	Evaluation				
Nr.	Questions	1	2	3	4	5
1	At the beginning of the semester, does the lecturer explained in a comprehensible way the purpose of the subject and what is expected of the student?	1	2	3	4	5
2	The lecturer is prepared for the lesson	1	2	3	4	5
3	The lecturer regularly participates in the lesson and uses the time effectively	1	2	3	4	5
4	The lecturer is successful in establishing the dominance of the class during the lesson	1	2	3	4	5
5	The lecturer's explanation is clear and understandable	1	2	3	4	5
6	The lecturer stimulates interest in the subject	1	2	3	4	5
7	The subject serves for our professional formation	1	2	3	4	5
8	The lecturer uses examples to make the subject as easy and understandable as possible	1	2	3	4	5
9	The lecturer conducts tests, assigns tasks and essays in such a way that you learn them as well as possible	1	2	3	4	5
10	The teaching material used for the subject (lectures, exercises, seminars, assignments) is clear, sufficient and useful	1	2	3	4	5
11	Course assignments are interesting and stimulating	1	2	3	4	5
12	The lecturer encourages you to ask questions and answers them fully	1	2	3	4	5
13	The lecturer is ready to help students when they have needs even outside of class	1	2	3	4	5
14	The criteria for placing grades are clear and known to students	1	2	3	4	5

15	The lecturer is equal in evaluation for all students	1	2	3	4	5
16	The ethics of the lecturer's communication with the students	1	2	3	4	5

- 
- **What do you want to convey in addition to the questions above? Make other comments, if any, about the teacher's evaluation.**
- 

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

- 
-