|  |
| --- |
| Internal Quality Report Form – Pilot programmes PT&SCHE |

**Institution details and certification**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Institution name and country** | | | | | |  | |
| Belgrade Metropolitan University | | | | | | Serbia | |
| **Number of sites at which delivery takes place** | | | | | | **2** | |
| Please give details of the sites (Postal address of each site; size; activity level) | | | | | | | |
| The university is situated in the centre of Belgrade  Address: Tadeuša Košćuška 63, 11000 Belgrade, Serbia  and in the centre of Niš Address: Bulevar Svetog Cara Konstantina 80A, 18000 Niš, Serbia | | | | | | | |
| **Standards Verifier** | | | | | |  | |
| Žan Dapčevič | | | | | |  | |
| **Date of sampling** | | **Duration** | | | | **Method** | |
| 7 May 2018 | | 8.5 hours | | | | Visit and Distance Evaluation | |
| **Name and email address of person who has authority and responsibility for the management and delivery of PT&SCHE programs** | | | | | | **Role in the organisation** | |
| Prof. Dr. Dragan Domazet (dragan.domazet@metropolitan.ac.rs) | | | | | | Rector | |
| **Name of people to whom feedback was presented** | | | | | | **Role in the organisation** | |
| Prof. Dr. Dragan Domazet  Miroslava Raspopović Milić | | | | | | Rector  Dean FIT | |
| **Programme title** | **Programme number** | | **Language of delivery and assessment** | **Number of students at institution** | **Mode of delivery** | | **Release / NYFS / Block** | |
| SCHE Java Programmer | N/A | | Serbian | 10 | Blended | | Release | |
| PT Information Systems | N/A | | Serbian | 17 | Blended | | Release | |

\*NYFS denotes Not Yet Fully Sampled

\*\*NYFS only for length of time of first cohort

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date form completed and submitted** | 15 March 2019 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Summary of essential actions** | **By date** |
| There are no essential actions raised in this report. |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Areas of good practice** |
| Identify any areas of particularly good practice **not mentioned** in other sections of this report |
| University has provided all essential material for high quality internal quality monitoring and control. Internal verification methods are beyond expected with the pilot project. Design of the pilot programmes are in line with international IT industry occupational standards, ensuring the credibility of the programme for students’ success on a job market not only in Serbia but globally.  University has developed state-of-the art active learning management system that ensures active participation of students for each learning outcome. Such student engagement counts for guided learning hours required by the programme. |

|  |
| --- |
| **General comments** |
| Mention any points you wish to make that are not otherwise covered in the report, including:   * comments on administration * communication with the centre * access to material needed to carry out standards verification * issues arising during your visit that have affected your report |
| The programmes are administrated from university’s city premises where record are maintained in both physical folders with other versions held electronically.  The university, and particularly prof. Dragan Domazet, Rector, their Dead of FIT, Ms Katarina Cvetkovic assistant to the Rector and Mr Stefan Jovanovic, teaching assistant, has always supported the standard verification visit of its pilot programs by responding positively to all requests for information during, prior and after the visit.  During the visit administration has prepared all required access to materials and to the online platform developed via the project and needed to carry out this standard verification. |

**Detailed comments**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **University management systems** | | |
| 1.1 Senior management are allocating appropriate time and resources to support programme delivery/review | | Y |
| 1.2 Systems are in place to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of all qualification delivery and assessment staff and to make changes when required | | Y |
| 1.1 The university allocates the recommended GLH for the delivery of each unit. Appropriate study resources for classroom work and computing facilities are available at the unviersity’s city centre site both in Belgrade and Niš. Internship / Work-based learning facilities are arranged through partner IT employers and research organisations to meet the demands of the units delivered.  1.2 Monitoring and evaluation systems include a student questionnaires for every unit plus ‘end of year’ feedback for each unit.  Assessor feedback is given through an annual questionnaire and Academic Staff Meetings held multiple times per year.  Joint staff meetings, across programme sectors, are held annually with afternoon sessions allocated to individual sector team discussions.  Serbian regulations require Quality Committees to monitor the performance of all education qualifications where representation from the teaching team and students is mandatory.  University has a well-developed internal verification system that allows cross-programme learning outcome comparisons as well it ensures the credibility of learning outcomes mapping – achieved vs. planned. | | |
| **Essential action required?** | NO | |
| **Essential action** - any actions here need to be copied into the Summary box on page 1 | **By date** | |
| No essential actions are required. |  | |
| **Recommendation** | **By date** | |
|  |  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. **Published documentation is in place and being used for:** | |
| 2.1 Internal verification | Y |
| 2.2 Assessment – also to cover the ongoing programme review | Y |
| 2.3 Learner recruitment, registration and certification | Y |
| 2.4 Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) including exemptions | Y |
| 2.5 Special considerations and reasonable adjustments | Y |
| 2.6 Equal opportunities | Y |
| 2.7 Learner Plagiarism; staff malpractice and/or maladministration | Y |
| 2.8 Appeals (published and available to all learners) | Y |
| 2.9 Complaints | Y |
| 2.10 Safeguarding of Learners | Y |
| 2.11 Risk assessment and Health and Safety (including public liability cover) | Y |
| 2.12 Conflict of interest | Y |
| 2.13 Learner support (to include individual development needs) | Y |
| 2.14 Distance Learning policy requirements have been embedded into the centres policies (if applicable) | Y |
| 2.15 University Contingency and Adverse Effects (see the guidance document for full details of what constitutes as Adverse Effect) - to include withdrawal of Centre Approval Status and Protection of the Learner Interest in the case of such a withdrawal | Y |
| 2.1 to 2.15 All policies and procedures are stored in the ‘University Policies and Procedures’ document which is also maintained in electronic form. These include college wide policies and procedures as well as those specific to pilot programs.  Students are provided with an appropriate range of policies and procedures in the Student Handbook, which is also available online. | |
| **Essential action required?** | NO |
| **Essential action** - any actions here need to be copied into the Summary box on page 1 | **By date** |
|  |  |
| **Recommendation** | **By date** |
|  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Registration and student/learner support** | | |
| **3.1** There are systems in place to ensure the accurate and timely registration and certification of identified students/learners in accordance with national published policies and timelines | | Y |
| **3.2** The university is recruiting with integrity | Y | |
| **3.3** The university is identifying and providing the specialist support that some students/learners need e.g. equipment adaptation | Y | |
| **3.4** The university recognises students’/learners’ previous achievements to enable credit transfers and exemptions where applicable | Y | |
| **3.5** The university has provided a student/learner handbook which contains accurate information about the university, the qualification; unit certification; any special equipment that they have to buy and progression | Y | |
| **3.6** A university produced, accurate programme specification (see guidance document) for each Higher Education programme has been produced | Y | |
| 3.1 Effective systems for the registration of students is in place at the centre.  3.2 The centre recruits students with the necessary entry qualifications who are predominantly employed mature students.  3.3 There a no students needing specialist support currently registered on the pilot programmes.  3.4 RPL has been efficiently organised for the pilot programmes by mapping existing programmes to pilot programmes units at assessment criterion level.  An example of this process was sampled during the visit – see the Assessment Sampling section of this report.  3.5 A student handbook is made available online for all pilot programme students (a copy was made available to the Standard Verifier).  3.6 A copy of the Programme Specification was sent to the Standard Verifier as an email attachment prior to visit. | | |
| **Essential action required?** | NO | |
| **Essential action** - any actions here need to be copied into the Summary box on page 1 | **By date** | |
|  |  | |
| **Recommendation** | **By date** | |
|  |  | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Programme delivery** | | |
| **4.1 Human resources** | |  |
| 4.1.1 The university employs, updates, trains and supports a sufficient number of appropriately qualified staff to ensure appropriate management, delivery, assessment and internal verification. | | Y |
| 4.1.2 Trainers/Assessors/Internal Verifiers hold the relevant qualifications to deliver units/programs as stated by either the programme specification or the standards setting body | | Y |
| **4.2 Physical resources** | |  |
| 4.2.1 The university has essential and sufficient equipment, facilities and resources as stated within qualification specifications. (e.g. IT equipment/materials/library). Resources are regularly reviewed, maintained and replaced as required | | Y |
| 4.2.2 The university ensures that learners have full access to required equipment, facilities and resources | | Y |
| 4.2.3 The centre has a healthy and safe working environment for learners undertaking the programme(s) | | Y |
| **4.3 Delivery** | |  |
| 4.3.1 Delivery methods are appropriate for a pilot implementations. | | Y |
| 4.3.2 Are there distance learners? | | Y |
| 4.3.3 Distance learners identities are safely confirmed? | | Y |
| 4.3.4 The work of distance learners can be accurately attributed to individual learners | | Y |
| Summarise the views expressed by learners, including favourable comments and any concerns raised | |  |
| 4.1 Teaching staff are employed on a full-time and part-time basis and drawn from local employers and research establishments. Academic qualifications at MSc or PhD are required for all teaching staff in Serbia. CPD is compulsory and reviewed on a 5 year cycle but recorded annually for both engineering and pedagogical development. Staff CVs were viewed during this visit.  Specific training sessions for the teaching team regarding the requirements for delivering pilot programmes have been delivered internally by college staff. The university has also taken advantage of PTSHCE online guidelines for pilot implementation. Further training sessions are being planned to continue improvements in Assessor feedback, assignment design and assessment standards.  4.2 The university has organised appropriate partnership arrangements with local IT employers and research facilities to carry out internship activities required by the pilot programme units. University staff are used to provide the official assessment of these practical activities along with industry supervisors.  Classroom and IT facilities are provided for students at the city university site in Belgrade and Niš.  4.3 Appropriate delivery methods are provided through the Belgrade and Niš centre site and partner employers and research establishments. Healthy and safe environments are provided at all sites use to deliver programme activities.  All lectures are stored electronically giving students open access to review lectures through LMS. Additionally on-line tutorials, from the in-house developed learning tool, to enhance student tuition throughout their programme where relevant modules are available.  There are blended learning students registered on these pilot programmes. Such method ensures that learners identities are safely confirmed as part of the assessment takes place in a monitored environment at the university.  The work of blended learners can be accurately attributed to individual learners through the in-house developed online learning tool.  Sufficient guided learning hours are assigned to the distance part of pilot programme delivery as the online learning tool enables active student participation in tasks.  Discussions with students were held in the afternoon where their views confirmed their satisfaction with their course of study. Assessors were seen as knowledgeable, helpful and experienced in the applications of IT. No negative concerns were raised. | | |
| **Essential action required?** | No | |
| **Essential action** - any actions here need to be copied into the Summary box on page 1 | **By date** | |
|  |  | |
| **Recommendation** | **By date** | |
|  |  | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Assessment** | | | |
| **5.1** A range of appropriate assessment methods is used | | Y | |
| **5.2** The university has taken reasonable steps to ensure that opportunities for plagiarism are removed | Y | |
| **5.3** Learners have signed a declaration confirming that their work is their own | Y | |
| **5.4** The assessment tools are fit for purpose i.e. have an appropriate professional context; written at the right level; written in appropriate language; tracked to assessment / grading criteria; will lead to valid assessment outcomes | Y | |
| **5.5** The assessment tools enable the learner to produce appropriate evidence to meet the criteria to which the assessment relates | Y | |
| **5.6** Accurate documented feedback is given to learners | N | |
| **5.7** Standardisation of Assessor decisions happens where there is more than one Assessor per unit | Y | |
| **5.8** The assessment of learners who are learning at a distance is accurate | Y | |
| 5.1 Assessments are primarily organised as one exam and one assignment per unit. A range of assessment methods are therefore made available but care should be taken in developing suitable assessment methods to ensure assessment criteria are fully satisfied.  5.2 Software is used by students to demonstrate that their work has not been plagiarised.  5.3 Students sign declarations of authenticity for all assessments.  5.4 Assessments are generally fit for purpose but could be improved to include more suitable scenarios and formats of evidence submitted.  5.5 Assessments generally produce appropriate evidence but similarly improvement are ongoing as Assessors develop better quality assessments that reflect the new pilot assessment requirements.  5.6 Documented feedback to students is not a strong point on this pilot programmes. The university has plans to engage further training sessions to provide additional support to Assessors. There is no written evidence that any feedback is given.  5.7 Assessors do not share the delivery of whole units but allocate specific Learning Outcomes when timetabled for common units.  5.8 Assessment of blended learners takes place in a monitored environment at the university. | | | |
| **Essential action required?** | No | | |
| **Essential action** - any actions here need to be copied into the Summary box on page 1 | **By date** | | |
|  |  | | |
| **Recommendation** | **By date** | | |
| 1 - Provide additional training sessions to staff to raise the quality and development of assessment practices, especially in the area of providing feedback to learners.  2 – Develop a system to provide audio or written feedback via offline or online methods.  In order to fully support their learning, students must be able to recognise what has been achieved, what needs to be achieved and how to continue to progress. Critical to this is the process of feedback. It is through feedback from tutors, peers and themselves that students may develop and enhance their reflective practice in support of their own learning.  Broadly speaking, feedback is “any information, process or activity which affords or accelerates student learning based on comments relating to either formative assessment or summative assessment activities.”  Students need and want feedback. However, feedback is often an area where students suggest that improvement is required from tutors and institutions. For feedback to be effective it must be:   * **Timely** - feedback should be provided as soon as possible after a student has completed an activity. The longer it takes for the student to receive feedback, the less supportive and constructive the feedback will be. Your centre will have a policy on how soon a student may expect formal feedback (typically related to summative assessment), but it is equally important to consider the timeliness of formative feedback. * **Constructive** - while it is important for students to recognise where they may have taken a wrong direction or missed something, and how this is communicated plays an important part in how students can make use of the feedback. Saying “you did this wrong” focuses on the negative and only identifies that something was not as expected. While saying “this area needs improvement...” allows the student to recognise that their work was lacking in some aspect, but presents it as something that can be addressed. * **Feed-forward** - just as students need to recognise that they may have areas which need improvement, they will benefit from advice on how to make those improvements for the future. While the results of a summative assessment are final, comments which are ‘feed-forward’ assist the student in thinking about how to improve their work for the future. | Next visit | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Internal verification** | | |
| **6.1** Verification of assignment briefs is thorough, planned, recorded and used to enhance future assessment practice | | Y |
| **6.2** Verification of sampling of assessment decisions is thorough, planned, recorded and used to enhance future assessment practice | Y | |
| **6.3** Verification records are accurate and available for audit | Y | |
| 6.1 Assignment briefs are internally verified prior to issue to students. New assignments are developed each year and for each pilot programme.  6.2 Internal verification of assessment decisions was carried out at 100% for the first year of delivering the new pilot programmes.  6.3 Internal verification records were made available to the standard verifier. | | |
| **Essential action required?** | No | |
| **Essential action** - any actions here need to be copied into the Summary box on page 1 | **By date** | |
|  |  | |
| **Recommendation** | **By date** | |
| 1 – Improve verification records for assessment decisions in a way that they include assessment of quality of mapping of points with LOs as well as feedback provided to students. |  | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Pilot programmes** | | |
| **7.1** The university has assured the academic standardsof the pilot programme (s) by conducting an annual assessment board. **(please provide details in the comments section to confirm if you attended the assessment board OR minutes were made available)** | | Y |
| **7.2 For pilot programmes assessed in English**, Learners meet Language requirements as specified on our website | N/A | |
| **7.3** Any resubmission is supported by accurate documentation signed and dated by a member of the Assessment Board | Y | |
| **7.4** Any retake is supported by accurate documentation signed and dated by a member of the Assessment Board | Y | |
| **7.5** The university has completed the Annual Programme Monitoring Report Form(s) | Y | |
| **7.6** Marketing materials (website and brochure) for the pilot programme (s) are accurate | Y | |
| 7.1 The Assessment Board is made up of the Academic Staff. (minutes made available to the Standard Verifier).  7.2 Not applicable – no pilot programmes were delivered and/or assessed in English.  7.3/7.4 Currently resubmissions and retakes are to be approved by the full Assessment Board.  7.5 The university’s Annual Programme Monitoring Report is produced in Serbian and covers all programme sectors. The last APMR was made available to the Standard Verifier.  7.6 The university website has been updated to include additional references to the pilot programmes. | | |
| **Essential action required?** | No | |
| **Essential action** - any actions here need to be copied into the Summary box on page 1 | **By date** | |
|  |  | |
| **Recommendation** | **By date** | |
|  |  | |

**Assessment sampling**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sample number** | 1 | | | |
| **Programme** | | **Assessor name** | | | |
| PT Information systems | | Prof. Dr. Svetlana Cvetanović | | | |
| **Unit** | | **Learner name** | | | |
| IS205 – Osnove informacionih sistema | | Dražen Janković | | | |
| **Learner registration number** | | 3471 | | | |
| **Standards and learner performance** | | | | |
| **Has the Assessor accurately assessed the learner work** | | | Yes | | |
| **Justification** | | | | |
| Unit delivery was well planned. Digital materials are developed for students via in-house state-of-the-art LAMS for each study session and Learning Outcome.  Assessment was planned via four types: Part – A (10%): student participation; Part – B (60%) homework (5), tests (5) and assignment (1); Part C (30%): written examination (120 minutes).  Student was awarded grade 9 out of 10, meaning that student has achieved at least 81 points out of 100.  University has provided the following student work:   * Homework 2 * Homework 3 * Homework 4 * Assignment   Homework 1 was provided from another student. No examination material was provided. In total only 2 students’ work were provided.  Minimum requirements to enter written examination is at least 50% pass on assignment. This ensures the credibility of achieved Learning Outcomes.  No documentation for single assessment decision was provided. | | | | |
| **Essential action required?**  Existence of an essential action here will **BLOCK** certification for this programme | | | | No | |
| **Essential action** - any actions here need to be copied into the Summary box on page 1 | | | | **By date** | |
|  | | | |  | |
| **Recommendation** | | | | **By date** | |
| Provide all students work required by the assessment plan for sampling (all homework, all tests, assignment and examination)  At least 8 students’ work with different grade range should be made available for sampling  Ensure recording keeping for oral examination (assignment oral presentation) via lecture recording system or witness statements (presentation material and presentation minutes).  Provide documentation for each assessment decision and map it with learning outcomes of the programme (e.g. Homework 1: 3 points out of 4.5 ; LO1, LO2).  Adopt assessment methodologies to ensure all unit learning outcomes are met by the student on at least minimum level – i.e. 50%. Via percentage assessment student may compensate 100% knowledge of LO1 with 30% knowledge of LO2. | | | | Next visit | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sample number** | 2 | | | |
| **Programme** | | **Assessor name** | | | |
| PT Information systems | | Not available | | | |
| **Unit** | | **Learner name** | | | |
| NT111 – Engleski jezik 1 | | Bojana Rajić | | | |
| **Learner registration number** | | 3488 | | | |
| **Standards and learner performance** | | | | |
| **Has the Assessor accurately assessed the learner work** | | | Yes | | |
| **Justification** | | | | |
| Student was awarded grade 10 out of 10.  University has provided the following student work:   * Homework Reading Assignment * Homework 3 * Homework 4   Student received 70 out 70 point for pre-examination assessment and 25 out of 30 points at the examination assessment.  Pre-examination assessment had max 70 out of 100 points, examination 30 out of 100 points. In total work of 7 students.  Assessment nor delivery plan was submitted to Standard Verifier. SV cannot confirm whether necessary assessment methods were used by the Assessor as per course syllabus available on BMU’s website (oral and listening examination). From the submitted files and online resources SV assumes reading and writing comprehension has been used.  SV had no access to LAMS for this unit. | | | | |
| **Essential action required?**  Existence of an essential action here will **BLOCK** certification for this programme | | | | No | |
| **Essential action** - any actions here need to be copied into the Summary box on page 1 | | | | **By date** | |
|  | | | |  | |
| **Recommendation** | | | | **By date** | |
| At least 8 students’ work with different grade range should be made available for sampling, including those who did not meet the minimum requirements.  Ensure recording keeping for oral examination (assignment oral presentation) via lecture recording system or witness statements (presentation material and presentation minutes).  Provide documentation for each assessment decision and map it with learning outcomes of the programme (e.g. Homework 1: 3 points out of 4.5 ; LO1, LO2).  Adopt assessment methodologies to ensure all unit learning outcomes are met by the student on at least minimum level – i.e. 50%. Via percentage assessment student may compensate 100% knowledge of LO1 with 30% knowledge of LO2.  Design the unit by using standardized English assessment methodologies and standardize examination.  Provide delivery and assessment plan for SV along with access to this unit’s LAMS. | | | | Next visit | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sample number** | 3 | | | |
| **Programme** | | **Assessor name** | | | |
| PT Information systems | | Not available | | | |
| **Unit** | | **Learner name** | | | |
| OM100 Uvod u operacioni menadžment | | Igor Dragovic | | | |
| **Learner registration number** | | Not available | | | |
| **Standards and learner performance** | | | | |
| **Has the Assessor accurately assessed the learner work** | | | Not available | | |
| **Justification** | | | | |
| SV cannot sample this unit as none of the students have passed at the time of the visit. No assessment plan nor delivery plan nor access to LAMS for this unit was provided to SV. | | | | |
| **Essential action required?**  Existence of an essential action here will **BLOCK** certification for this programme | | | | No | |
| **Essential action** - any actions here need to be copied into the Summary box on page 1 | | | | **By date** | |
|  | | | |  | |
| **Recommendation** | | | | **By date** | |
| At least 8 students’ work with different grade range should be made available for sampling, including those who did not meet the minimum requirements.  Ensure recording keeping for possible oral examination (assignment oral presentation) via lecture recording system or witness statements (presentation material and presentation minutes).  Provide documentation for each assessment decision and map it with learning outcomes of the programme (e.g. Homework 1: 3 points out of 4.5 ; LO1, LO2).  Adopt assessment methodologies to ensure all unit learning outcomes are met by the student on at least minimum level – i.e. 50%. Via percentage assessment student may compensate 100% knowledge of LO1 with 30% knowledge of LO2.  Provide delivery and assessment plan along with access to this unit’s LAMS. | | | | Next visit | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sample number** | 4 | | | |
| **Programme** | | **Assessor name** | | | |
| SCHE Java Programmer | | Prof. dr Miroslava Raspopović Milić | | | |
| **Unit** | | **Learner name** | | | |
| K101 Uvod u IT sisteme | | Branislav Manjolović | | | |
| **Learner registration number** | | KP-11 | | | |
| **Standards and learner performance** | | | | |
| **Has the Assessor accurately assessed the learner work** | | | Yes | | |
| **Justification** | | | | |
| Student was awarded a grade 9 out of 10. Student has achieved 64.42 points out of 70 points at pre-examination assessment and 18.0 out of 30 points at the examination, total of 82.43 points.  Assessment plan consistent of 70 points\* out of 100 points for pre-examination activities and 30 points for examination activities being conducted on a computer. 10 test and 10 homework assignments count toward 70 points of pre-examination activities. Examination is being conducted on a computer in a limited timeframe of 60 minutes.  Student may enter examination only if they have collected at least 35 points (i.e. 50%) from pre-examination activities.  For the student sampled university has provided the following student work to SV:   * Homework 5 * Homework 8   *\*Note: there is a typo in assessment plan, where it states that only 60 points are allocated for pre-examination activities instead of 70 points.* | | | | |
| **Essential action required?**  Existence of an essential action here will **BLOCK** certification for this programme | | | | No | |
| **Essential action** - any actions here need to be copied into the Summary box on page 1 | | | | **By date** | |
|  | | | |  | |
| **Recommendation** | | | | **By date** | |
| At least 8 students’ work with different grade range should be made available for sampling, including those who did not meet the minimum requirements.  Provide documentation for each assessment decision and map it with learning outcomes of the programme (e.g. Homework 1: 3 points out of 4.5 ; LO1, LO2).  Adopt assessment methodologies to ensure all unit learning outcomes are met by the student on at least minimum level – i.e. 50%. Via percentage assessment student may compensate 100% knowledge of LO1 with 30% knowledge of LO2. In this case student passed monitored examination with only 60% - therefore grade provided may not reflect the LOs achieved. | | | | Next visit | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sample number** | 5 | | | |
| **Programme** | | **Assessor name** | | | |
| SCHE Java Programmer | | dr Miljan Milošević | | | |
| **Unit** | | **Learner name** | | | |
| KI201 Java 4: Strukture podataka i algoritmi – Deo A | | Zorana Milojkovic | | | |
| **Learner registration number** | | KP - 06 | | | |
| **Standards and learner performance** | | | | |
| **Has the Assessor accurately assessed the learner work** | | | Yes | | |
| **Justification** | | | | |
| Student was awarded a grade 10 out of 10. Student has achieved 66.00 points at pre-examination assessment and 26.25 points at the examination, total of 92.25 points.  It is unclear from the assessment and delivery plan how much 6 homework assignments and 5 test contribute towards a final grade. Project has a total of 30 points.  For the student sampled university has provided the following student work to SV:   * Homework 1 * Homework 2 * Homework 3 * Homework 4 * Homework 5 * Homework 6 * Homework 7 * Homework 8 * Project: tasks 1 – 6 * Exam: tasks 1 – 4   Assessment is task oriented with no opportunities for developing generic competences (e.g. critical thinking, reflection etc). | | | | |
| **Essential action required?**  Existence of an essential action here will **BLOCK** certification for this programme | | | | No | |
| **Essential action** - any actions here need to be copied into the Summary box on page 1 | | | | **By date** | |
|  | | | |  | |
| **Recommendation** | | | | **By date** | |
| At least 8 students’ work with different grade range should be made available for sampling, including those who did not meet the minimum requirements.  Provide documentation for each assessment decision and map it with learning outcomes of the programme (e.g. Homework 1: 3 points out of 4.5 ; LO1, LO2).  Adopt assessment methodologies to ensure all unit learning outcomes are met by the student on at least minimum level – i.e. 50%. Via percentage assessment student may compensate 100% knowledge of LO1 with 30% knowledge of LO2.  Consider providing opportunities to reflect on their achieved results via homework and tests, so they could improve their performance at next assessment. | | | | Next visit | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sample number** | 6 | | | |
| **Programme** | | **Assessor name** | | | |
| SCHE Java Programmer | | dr Vladimir Milicevic | | | |
| **Unit** | | **Learner name** | | | |
| KL204 Java 7: Enterprise Edition | | Katarina Ristanovic | | | |
| **Learner registration number** | | KP - 10 | | | |
| **Standards and learner performance** | | | | |
| **Has the Assessor accurately assessed the learner work** | | | Yes | | |
| **Justification** | | | | |
| Student was awarded a grade 7 out of 10. Student has achieved 39.40 points at pre-examination assessment and 30.00 points at the examination, total of 69.4 points.  From the assessment and delivery plan it is unclear how many point are awarded for homework assignments and examination. Project work consists of 30 points.  University has provided the following work from sampled student:   * Project work   There is limited opportunities for students to reflect or critically evaluate their work. | | | | |
| **Essential action required?**  Existence of an essential action here will **BLOCK** certification for this programme | | | | No | |
| **Essential action** - any actions here need to be copied into the Summary box on page 1 | | | | **By date** | |
|  | | | |  | |
| **Recommendation** | | | | **By date** | |
| At least 8 students’ work with different grade range should be made available for sampling, including those who did not meet the minimum requirements.  Provide documentation for each assessment decision and map it with learning outcomes of the programme (e.g. Homework 1: 3 points out of 4.5 ; LO1, LO2).  Adopt assessment methodologies to ensure all unit learning outcomes are met by the student on at least minimum level – i.e. 50%. Via percentage assessment student may compensate 100% knowledge of LO1 with 30% knowledge of LO2.  Consider providing opportunities to reflect on their achieved results via homework and tests, so they could improve their performance at next assessment. | | | | Next visit | |