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

**Institution details and certification**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Institution name and country** |  |
| School of Electrical and Computer Engineering of Applied Studies | 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 school is situated in the centre of BelgradeAddress: Vojvode Stepe 283, 11000 Belgrade, Serbia |
| **Standards Verifier** |  |
| Žan Dapčevič |  |
| **Date of sampling** | **Duration** | **Method** |
| 9 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. Vera Petrovic (vera.petrovic@viser.edu.rs) | Director |
| **Name of people to whom feedback was presented**  | **Role in the organisation** |
| Prof. Dr. Vera PetrovicSvetlana Strbac-Savic | DirectorHead of E-Business Study Programme |
| **Programme title**  | **Programme number**           | **Language of delivery and assessment**      | **Number of students at institution** | **Mode of delivery** | **Release / NYFS / Block** |
| SCHE Profesionalni razvoj nastavnika i saradnika | N/A   |  Serbian     | 94 | Online | Block |
| SCHE Dijagnostika vozila | N/A   |  Serbian     | 9 | Online | Block |
| SCHE Web Application Programmer | N/A |  Serbian | 18 | Online | Block |

\*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** |
| School has provided limited material for internal quality monitoring and control. 1. School has not provided any student work, therefore sampling is not possible. School should by end of the project provide a sample of students work in the following manner:
	1. Select 8 students per 3 programmes, therefore at least 2 students per programme
	2. Provide work for every unit of each programme from selected students
 | By start of the new delivery. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Areas of good practice** |
| Identify any areas of particularly good practice **not mentioned** in other sections of this report |
| University has prepared a well-documented pilot implementation self-report, which includes monitoring report and analysis on administration of SCHE, technical realization of SCHE, Learning materials, examination and student satisfaction. |

|  |
| --- |
| **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. Vera Petrovic, Director, Svetlana Strbac-Savic, Head of e-business study programme, 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 limited access to materials and to the online platform developed via the project and needed to carry out this standard verification.Student work has not been submitted and therefore SV could not provide any feedback. SV strongly recommends VISER management to engage with Belgrade Metropolitan University, Academia and/or University of Aberdeen to develop:* internal verification systems for delivery and assessment
* adequate online learning platform to deliver online programs and plan Guided Learning Hours – beyond Moodle platform.
 |

**Detailed comments**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **University management systems**
 |
| 1.1 Senior management are allocating appropriate time and resources to support programme delivery/review | N |
| 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 | N |
| * 1. The university allocates the recommended GLH for the delivery of each unit only via face-face learning. Design of online delivery DOES NOT allow the school to allocate recommended guided learning hours as student are only passively engaged (e.g. Moodle). Sufficient study resources for classroom work and computing facilities are available at the university’s city centre site both in Belgrade. There are NO Internship / Work-based learning facilities are arranged through partner IT employers and research organisations.

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 NO internal verification system that would allow cross-programme learning outcome comparisons as well it ensures the credibility of learning outcomes mapping – achieved vs. planned. |
| **Essential action required?** | Yes |
| **Essential action** - any actions here need to be copied into the Summary box on page 1 | **By date** |
| 1 Develop Internal Verification Systems for Assessment Plan, Assignment Brief and  Assessment Decision1. Develop units with Work-Based Learning / Internship components as usually designed in SCHE in EU
2. For online studies implement engaging platform called ACTIVE learning management system rather than limit it to LMS – Moodle. Every F2F GLH should be replaced with online GLH in a way that student is engaged in the real-time activity
3. Purchase plagiarism detection tool for online examination and delivery (e.g. TurnitIn)
 | By next delivery start date         |
| **Recommendation** | **By date** |
|  |            |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Published documentation is in place and being used for:**
 |
| 2.1 Internal verification | N |
| 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 | N |
| 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) | N |
| 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?** | Yes |
| **Essential action** - any actions here need to be copied into the Summary box on page 1 | **By date** |
| 1 – Internal verification system should be developed (please see above)2 – Purchase plagiarism detection tool for assignment submissions (e.g. Turnitin)3 – Implement rules for online GLH as well as online assessment to ensure credibility of the program delivery | by start of new delivery         |
| **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.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. 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 Classroom and IT facilities are provided for students at the city university site in Belgrade4.3 Appropriate delivery methods are NOT provided through the Belgrade centre site. 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. There are no on-line tutorials, from the in-house developed learning tool, to enhance student tuition throughout their programme where relevant modules are available.Insufficient 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** |
| Based on the essential actions from the above, self-report on pilot implementation SV strongly suggests the school to implement work-based learning environments into the programs – internships.  | By next delivery start 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 | N |
| **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 No 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 | N |
| **6.2** Verification of sampling of assessment decisions is thorough, planned, recorded and used to enhance future assessment practice | N |
| **6.3** Verification records are accurate and available for audit | N |
| 6.1 There is no internal verification of assignment briefs.6.2 There is no internal verification system for sampling of assessment decision6.3 There are no records on internal verification |
| **Essential action required?** | Yes |
| **Essential action** - any actions here need to be copied into the Summary box on page 1 | **By date** |
| 1 – Develop a system for internal verification | By next delivery start date     |
| **Recommendation** | **By date** |
|  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| 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** |
| Not available | Not available |
| **Unit** | **Learner name** |
| Not available | Not available |
| **Learner registration number** | Not available |
| **Standards and learner performance** |
| **Has the Assessor accurately assessed the learner work** | Not available |
| **Justification** |
| No student work has been submitted by the school. |
| **Essential action required?** Existence of an essential action here will **BLOCK** certification for this programme | Yes |
| **Essential action** - any actions here need to be copied into the Summary box on page 1 | **By date** |
| 1 – provide student work from at least 8 students from each study programme; at least two per programme for every unit they have passed | By next delivery start date |
| **Recommendation** | **By date** |
|  |        |