

**Report of external evaluation for:**

**Independent University of Banja Luka**

**HEAARS number: 01/1.3.38-1-5/18**

**Dates of visit:** 28th, 29th and 30th of May 2019.

**Location: Banja Luka**

**External evaluation commission:**

- Prof. Marko Djogo, PhD, representative of the academic community in B&H, chairman;
- Prof. Nevenka Maher, PhD, international expert, member;
- Ing. Bosko Borojevic, MA, representative of commerce and practice, member;
- Mirza Oruc, MS, student representative, member;

**Koordinator:** Ing. Tatjana Radakovic, MA

**Evaluation criteria:** Standards and guidelines for insuring the quality in european higher education area – ESG (*Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in European Higher Education Area - European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education, 2015*), Criteria for accreditation of higher education institutions in Republic of Srpska and B&H, Criteria for accreditation of study programs of first and second cycle of studies in Republic of Srpska and B&H, , Ordinance of accreditation of higher education institutions and study programs of Republic of Srpska.

**Content:**

<b>1.0 <a href="#">Application</a></b> .....	<b>3</b>
1.1 <a href="#">Information about accreditation process</a> .....	3
1.2 <a href="#">Higher education institution data</a> .....	5
1.3 <a href="#">Application information</a> .....	6
<b>2.0 <a href="#">External evaluation</a></b> .....	<b>7</b>
2.1 <a href="#">Preliminary activities</a> .....	7
2.2 <a href="#">On site visit to the higher education institution</a> .....	10
<b>3.0 <a href="#">Opinion about the result of the external evaluation</a></b> .....	<b>13</b>
3.1 <a href="#">Quality assessment based on individual criteria</a> .....	14
3.2 <a href="#">Study programs accreditation report</a> .....	24
3.3 <a href="#">Accreditation recommendation</a> .....	30

## 1.0 Application

### 1.1 Information about the accreditation process

The Independent University of Banja Luka (hereinafter: the University) has submitted an application for re-accreditation of the University and a review for the purpose of accreditation of 5 study programs on February 27, 2018. to the Higher Education Accreditation Agency of the Republika Srpska (hereinafter: the Agency), which is registered under the Agency Protocol number 01/ 1.3.40 /18. The application was submitted within the deadline set by the previous University Accreditation Decision No. 49/13 from February 27, 2013. By the act No. 04/26/2018. Act 01 / 1.3.40-4 / 18 the Agency requested the Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republika Srpska, as the competent administrative body, to verify the legitimacy of the institution, and on May 23, 2019. by the act no. 01/ 1.131- / 18 from the Republic Administration for Inspection Affairs data regarding the inspection supervision of the University. The Ministry informed the Agency that for all study programs subject to review for the purpose of accreditation, decisions and licenses were issued for the implementation of study programs, and that no second-instance proceedings were conducted in the Ministry in which the complainant is a University. By letter No. 24.012/9993-143-8/18 dated June 12, 2018, the Republic Administration for Inspection Affairs notified the Agency that all measures ordered by the inspector had been implemented.

On January 17, 2018 the Agency signed a contract with the University for the review of study programs for the purpose of accreditation, which the Agency will perform on the basis of:

- analysis of compliance of the documentation with legal requirements (legitimacy of the request), completeness of documentation in relation to the regulations of the Agency, audit report with the proposal of measures for improvement, in accordance with the applicable legal regulations of Republika Srpska and Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as the rules of European associations in this field and
- reviews of study programs for the purpose of accreditation with the aim of determining compliance with the requirements of the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area, BiH - RS criteria and assessing the conformity of the structure and content of study programs with the defined exit profiles.

The following study programs are defined as the subject of the review for the accreditation of study programs for the purpose of accreditation:

- Security and Criminology

- Ecology
- Economics and business
- Political science
- Preschool education

The Agreement defines the obligations of the University and the Agency as well as the confidentiality of all information provided during the review process.

The Agency conducted the procedure of selecting the members of the expert commission in accordance with the Rulebook on Accreditation of Higher Education Institutions and Study Programs, and in accordance with the Law on Higher Education of the Republika Srpska, Act No. 01/1.3.40-2-2 /18 from June 5, 2018 submitted to the Agency for Development of Higher Education and Quality Assurance of BiH the request for the appointment of the Commission of domestic and international experts for quality assessment and audit and for the issuance of recommendations on accreditation (hereinafter: the Commission of Experts) as follows:

- Prof. Marko Djogo, PhD, representative of the academic community in BiH, President,
- Prof. Nevenka Maher, PhD, international expert, member,
- Ing. Bosko Borojevic, MA, representative of economy and practice, member
- Mirza Oruc, MS, Student Representative, Member.

After several months of correspondence, and bearing in mind that the proposed composition of the commission was not challenged with regard to the selection of experts from the List, on site visit to the higher education institution was started. In the meantime, the appointment of a commission of experts by the Agency for Development of Higher Education and Quality Assurance of BiH was made by decision No. 05-33-1-99-55/19 from March 12, 2019.

The contract for accreditation services of a higher education institution was concluded on January 23, 2018 between the Agency and the University where it is defined that the subject matter of the evaluation is the quality assurance system of the higher education institution and study programs that are covered by the review process for the purpose of accreditation. The Agreement defines the obligations of the University and the Agency as well as the confidentiality of all information provided during the accreditation process.

Upon receipt of the University Re-accreditation Application, the Agency, by Decision No. 01/1.5.40-2-4 / 18, appointed the Expert Advisor for Accreditation in Higher Education, ing. Tatjana Radakovic, MA.

## 1.2 Data on higher education institution

Higher education institution data:	
Name, address and e-mail address of the institution	Independent University of Banja Luka; Veljka Mladjenovica 12 E; <a href="mailto:info@nubl.org">info@nubl.org</a>
Internet address	<a href="http://www.nubl.org">www.nubl.org</a>
Title, number and date of the founding act	Decision on the establishment of the Independent University of Political and Social Sciences Banja Luka; cartridge number 5-82-000 Banja Luka from October 11, 2006.
Tax identification number (PIB)	44402522740000
Registration number assigned by the Institute of Statistics of the Republic of Srpska	11011225
Name, surname and address (name and headquarters) of the founder	Zoran Kalinic; Save Mrkalja 3, 78 000 Banja Luka
Number and date of decision on appointment of the person authorized to represent	<u>Decision on the election of Rector of the Independent University of Banja Luka No. 71-7 278-2 / 17 ofrom October 25, 2017</u>
Number and date of license for work of higher education institution	07.023/602-2086/09 from October 1, 2009
Number and date of license to operate out of headquarters	-
Visiting Organizational Units and Responsible Persons	Faculty of Economics - Sasa Cekrljija, PhD Faculty of Education - Prof. Milomir Martic, PhD Faculty of Political Science - Prof. Dr. Ljubomir Zuber Faculty of Ecology - Slobodanka Pavlovic, PhD Faculty of Security and Protection - Prof. Slobodan Zupljanin, PhD
Contact person (for on site visit)	Prof. Slobodan Zupljanin, PhD
Phone number	051/456-600

### 1.3 Application information

In addition to the request for re-accreditation, the University submitted a completed application form, which follows the structure of standards and criteria in relation to which the accreditation is performed, the self-evaluation report of the University, and other supporting documents that are linked to the application form by hyperlinks (Statute, Solutions and Permits, Strategy, Rulebook on Quality Assurance at the University, Plan for Removal of Comments from the Accreditation Committee for the Period 2013-2017, Standard for Quality Assurance at the University and Faculties, etc.). At the same time, on the form prescribed by the Agency, a special application was submitted for all applied study programs, following appropriate standards and criteria, as well as self-evaluation reports for all applied study programs and supporting documentation.

Study programs that the University has applied for accreditation that have previously undergone the review process:

Study programs applied for accreditation		
The name of the study program:	Study level	Name(s) of the exit qualifications
Security and Criminology	First cycle	Graduate in Law and Criminal Justice - 240 ECTS
Political science	First cycle	Graduate in Political Science - 240 ECTS
Ecology	First cycle	Graduate ecologist - 240 ECTS
Economics and business	First cycle	Bachelor of Economics (with module addition) - 240 ECTS
Preschool education	First cycle	Pre-school graduate - 240 ECTS

## 2.0 External evaluation

The subject of external evaluation is the functioning of the overall quality system of the University, i.e. institution (the system set up and its operation) and the quality of the programs and their outcomes (results that are student employability).

## 2.1 Previous activities

After reviewing the submitted study program documentation by the Agency, reviewing the List of national and international experts for quality assessment and audit and making recommendations on the accreditation of higher education institutions, ie their study programs, it was found that the List does not include experts from all scientific fields and areas that belong to the study programs submitted for review. The Agency has therefore taken steps to provide experts in all relevant scientific fields and areas and to establish a Review List (<http://heears.com/index.php/en/lis-rc-nz-n>) which is an open source list with the purpose of continuous replenishment. When selecting the reviewers, care was taken to select internationally recognized national and international university teachers, scholars or artists who were selected to professions in the narrow scientific field of the study program in question in order to obtain the highest quality review reports. All reviewers recruited for study program reviews were regional experts. In two cases, the reviewer was replaced for objective reasons.

All reviewers have signed declarations of non-existence of conflicts of interest, contracts that oblige them to act professionally and permanently store all information acquired during the review process. The reviewers received completed application forms for study programs, self-evaluation reports, numerous supporting documents, Standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area, Criteria for accreditation of study programs of the first and second cycle of study in Republika of Srpska and BiH, Rulebook on Accreditation of Higher Education institutions and study programs of the Republic of Srpska, the form of the instruction manual for the reviewer, which also represented the checklist of the reviewers, as well as the form of the review report. Upon submission of the preliminary report, it was considered by the Agency's expert collegium and accepted the reports in the first version, or possibly requested an update of the report if all requirements of the criteria and standards were not met.

**The reviews of the study programs:**

No.	Study program	Number of Review Reports
1.	Security and Criminology	01/1.3.38-2-8-2/18
		01/1.3.38-2-9-2/18
2.	Economics and business	01/1.3.38-2-4-2/18
		01/1.3.38-2-5-2/18
3.	Preschool education	01/1.3.38-2-10-2/18
		01/1.3.38-2-11-2/18
4.	Political science	01/1.3.38-2-6-4/18
		01/1.3.38-2-7-2/18
5.	Ecology	01/1.3.38-2-2-2/18
		01/1.3.38-2-3-2/18

After the completion of the activities with the reviews of the study programs for the purpose of accreditation, the preparations of the Commission of Experts started as follows:

- Prof. Marko Djogo, PhD, representative of the academic community in BiH, President,
- Prof. Nevenka Maher, PhD, international expert, member,
- Ing. Bosko Borojevic, MA, Economy and Practice Representative, Member
- Mirza Oruc, MS, Student Representative, Member.

The Commission received for consideration the University documentation, completed application form, self-evaluation report, numerous supporting documentation, pre-accreditation report, follow-up report taken between the two accreditation cycles, study program reviews (including reports and check-lists of reviewers), and plans for the improvement of study programs made on the basis of review reports. The Commission also received Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area, Criteria for Accreditation of Higher Education Institutions in Republika Srpska and BiH, Criteria for Accreditation of Study Programs of the First and Second Cycle of Studies in Republika



Srpska and BiH, Rulebook on Accreditation of Higher Education Institutions and study programs of the Republika Srpska, checklist forms for a member of the committee of experts and a report form.

The Agency organized a meeting of the Committee of Experts on April 9, 2019 which was attended by the Coordinator and all members of the Commission of Experts. On that occasion, the Commission established the methodology of work and, among other things, agreed, respecting the acts of the Agency and all relevant regulations in Republika Srpska and BiH, that each member of the commission is obliged to fill in the form of an individual checklist on the basis of the analyzed documentation of the higher education institution, which serves as a reminder to the member of the Commission with questions, observations, and requests for additional documents to visit the institution. At the same meeting, all details of the work were agreed, a common understanding of the requirements of the standards and criteria agreed. Previously, the Commission agreed on a Plan and Program of Visits to the institution of higher education which is Annex 2 of this report, and foresees a visit of three working days (including preparatory, working and training meetings of the Commission). In addition, the Commission signed individual statements on the absence of conflicts of interest.

Prior to the visit of the External Evaluation Committee, the management and representatives of the University's departments were briefed on the details during the forthcoming visit, and were provided with a visit plan and program in due time, which they supplemented with the names of the participants at each individual meeting. The subject of external evaluation is higher education institution and study programs, through assessment of the performance of basic activity in relation to the degree of fulfillment of the Criteria for accreditation of higher education institution in Republika Srpska and BiH and relevant European standards and guidelines for quality assurance in higher education, and through the evaluation of study programs in relation to the Criteria for Accreditation of Study Programs in Republika Srpska and BiH, as specified in the University Accreditation Application.

During the meeting, the focus on individual issues was agreed, opinions were exchanged after reviewing the application of the higher education institution, a harmonized way of conducting the interview as well as other issues important for the professional work of the Commission of Experts. Particular attention was paid to the review reports of the applied study programs and the promotion reports for each study program.

## 2.2 On site visit to the Higher education institution

The visit to the institution of higher education was realized on May, 28, 29 and 30, 2019 and the Plan and program of the visit to the University (hereinafter: the Plan of the visit) are available in the Agency's archive, in the file of the University and are approved by all members of the Commission of Experts, and submitted in a timely manner to the higher education institution in order to prepare the documentation and to organize the evaluation work as best as possible.

The plan of the visit stipulated that during the first day the Committee of Experts would talk with the following interlocutors:

- management of the institution of higher education and the quality team (ten representatives including the Rector, Director, Secretary General, President of the Board, Editor of SVAROG Journal, Vice-Rector for Teaching, Senate Representative, Quality Team Representative, Accounting Representative and President of the University Student Parliament) ,
- the quality team and the team for the preparation of the university's self-evaluation report and study programs (ten representatives),
- representatives of the student service, library, legal service of the University, accounting of the University (ten representatives),
- representatives of the University's Department for International Cooperation (four representatives),
- Management and representatives of the academic staff of the Security and Criminal Studies study program (Dean, Secretary General, Chief Accountant, academic staff representatives - twenty representatives),
- students of all years of study of the first cycle of the study program Security and Criminology - a sample of a maximum of 15 students,
- Management and representatives of the academic staff of the study program Ecology (Dean, Secretary General, Head of Accounting, representatives of academic staff - eighteen representatives),
- students of all years of study of the first cycle of the study program Ecology - sample of a maximum of 15 students
- graduate/alumni representatives (eleven representatives)
- representatives of industry and practice (fifteen representatives),

that during the second day the Committee of Experts visits and talks with:

- management and representatives of the academic staff of the study program Economics and Business (Dean, Secretary General, Head of Accounting, representatives of academic staff - eleven representatives),
- students of all years of study of the first cycle of the study program Economics and Business - a sample of a maximum of 15 students
- visit and presentation of the physical resources of the university,
- management and representatives of academic staff of the Political Science study program (Dean, Secretary General, Head of Accounting, representatives of academic staff - eighteen representatives),
- students of all years of study of the first cycle of the study program Political Science - a sample of a maximum of 15 students.
- management and representatives of the academic staff of the study program Preschool Education (Dean, Secretary General, Head of Accounting, representatives of academic staff - ten representatives),
- students of all years of study of the first cycle of the study program Preschool education - sample of maximum 15 students.

During the third day the Committee of Experts shall hold:

- an internal meeting to prepare the draft opinion
- presentation of the draft report to the University management

All meetings were implemented in accordance with the visit plan.

Thus, during the first working day (May 28, 2019), the Commission held meetings with the University management, the quality team and the self-evaluation report preparation team, representatives of the University's professional services, director and members of the International Cooperation Department, management and representatives of the academic staff of the study program Security and criminology, students of all years of study of the first cycle of the study program Security and criminology, management and representatives of academic staff of the study program Ecology, students of all years of study of the first cycle of the study program Ecology, representatives of graduates/alumni association, representatives of industry and practice (fifteen representatives).

During the second day, as part of the resource visit, the Commission visited the resources of all the study programs reported. The visit included a tour of the space capacities, computer rooms, study rooms, library and student services, professional services of the university, the professors office,

interview with representatives of study programs (deans, deans, professors, secretary, librarian), as well as with students who found themselves in classes at the time. Meetings with management, professors and students of individual study programs were then continued.

During the third working day of the visit, on May 30. 2019 commission members held an internal meeting at which they agreed on the content and guidelines of the preliminary report with an assessment of the situation and recommendations for promotion, which emphasized the communication of strengths and weaknesses, and basic recommendations for improvement by each criterion individually.

Following the reconciliation of views, a joint closing meeting was held at which the Commission presented a preliminary external evaluation report to representatives of the University's management, deans and the quality and self-evaluation team. During the three-day visit, a record was kept, which is available in the Agency's Archives, the University file.

A list of participants at all interviews is available in the Agency's Archive as an integral part of the University Visit Plan.

After the meetings and discussions, the members of the Commission held internal meetings at the end of each working day, presenting individual observations and impressions from individual meetings, commenting on the information received and analyzing the work of the committee. During the discussion, all members of the Commission agreed on the views that form a good basis for the preparation of the report, with all the detailed analyzes according to each individual criterion for higher education institutions and study programs. Specific recommendations are also made on these observations below in the report.

### 3.0 Opinion on the outcome of the external evaluation

External evaluation was done by checking the level of fulfillment of requirements of ECG standards, Criteria for accreditation of higher education institutions and Criteria for accreditation of study programs of the first and second cycle of studies.

Criteria for assessing the level of fulfillment of requirements:

Level I - no evidence or partial, unreliable evidence of compliance (brand new or foreign to the organization),

Level II - request planned, only paper-based and/or partially implemented,

Level III - requirement planned, implemented and effects monitored,

Level IV - requirement planned, implemented, effects monitored, with/without the introduction of continuous adjustments and improvements based on comparisons with the best.

I	HEI does not fulfill the requirement
II	The HEI partially fulfills the requirement
III	The HEI mostly fulfills the requirement
IV	HEI fully complies with the requirement

### 3.1 Quality assessment by individual criteria

#### A.1 Quality assurance policy

Requirements of ESG standard 1.1 and RS/BiH criteria T.1.1, T.1.2, T.1.3, T.1.4, T.1.5, T.1.6

In order to clarify some aspects related to this criterion, the members of the Committee of Experts raised the following questions during the visit:

1. Are the objectives of the quality improvement action plan evaluated on an annual basis or at the level of strategy implementation time?
2. In what way is the data continuously collected for the development of strategic benchmarks and how is the stakeholder role in this process determined?
3. How are you involved in the self-assessment process (student question)?
4. Are they satisfied with the implementation of study program self-evaluation? (student question)
5. What is the vision of NUBL in the field of international cooperation? How and to what extent is NUBL staff familiar with it?
6. Are there evaluation forms and qualification recognition process?

#### **The good sides:**

- All documents relevant to the quality assurance policy (University Development Strategy, Quality Assurance Policy, Statute, Regulations, etc.) exist and are publicly available.
- University management and organizational units are aware of the importance of quality assurance.

**Weaknesses:**

- According to the SP and SER presented by HEI, the picture of the projects implemented by NUBL is not clearly visible.
- The involvement of stakeholders (students, employers, and others) in the creation and innovation of NPPs has not been adequately documented.
- SERs are very "sketchy" without showing clear data on the required criteria, as well as without a clear insight of students' participation in the field of SERs, since the students themselves are not directly involved in the quality assurance process except for the assessment of the teaching process.
- Financial allocations to support international co-operation are not clearly defined but are made on an ad hoc basis.
- It is not documented that there is a clear link between scientific research work and the teaching process.

**Recommendations for improvement:**

- Monitor and present annually the projects implemented at the HEI. Materials must be accessible and displayed with clear identification information.
- Formalize stakeholder involvement in the SER adoption and innovation process
- Appoint a competent person who will be solely responsible for creating and implementing a quality policy at HEI with the aim of strengthening the structure and process and policy of the quality assurance system at HEI.
- SERs should be worked on an annual basis based on reports, in accordance with the standards and criteria on accreditation of HEIs and SPs in RS and BiH.
- Develop a budget (budget line) of thr University for international cooperation for planning for students as well as the potential to strengthen international cooperation planning.
- Organizing an International Cooperation Service in the form of a Help Desk to bring international cooperation, especially mobility, closer to students.

**Requirement Level:**

**III**

**A.2 Program design and approval**

Requirements of ESG standard 1.2 and RS / BiH criteria T.2.1, T.2.2

In order to clarify some aspects related to this criterion, the members of the Commission of Experts raised the following questions during the visit:

Are students actively involved in the process of curriculum innovation and improvement?

Is there a Rulebook on the adoption and evaluation of study programs?

**The good sides:**

- There is a Rulebook on the adoption and evaluation of study programs.
- Most of the SPs are in accordance with the structure of the subjects aligned with the SPs at the leading HEIs in the region, which enables student mobility.

**Weaknesses:**

- Documents were not presented to the Commission from which it could be concluded that anyone other than the HEI management was involved in the process of elaborating the study programs, although verbal information was provided that eminent experts from the region were consulted.
- The titles of individual SPs (specifically the SP Economy and Business) do not fully reflect the content of those SPs.

**Recommendations for improvement:**

- When innovating the SP, align the names of the SPs with what the HEI can provide.
- When designing the elaborate of justification for study programs, make sure that different stakeholders are formally involved in this process.

**Requirement Level:**

**III**



**A.3 Student-centered learning, teaching and assessment**

Requirements of ESG standard 1.3 and RS / BiH criteria T.3.1, T.3.2, T.3.3

In order to clarify some aspects related to this criterion, the members of the Committee of Experts raised the following questions during the visit:

1. All the reports, both of the University and the study programs, state one sentence for international cooperation: "There are also a number of students from the Republic of Serbia and Croatia who have completed their studies at the Faculty." Is there a clear number of students who spent a period of mobility at another HEI and how is it valued?
2. When do you get informed by your teachers of your course responsibilities and in what form? (student question)

**The good sides:**

- There is a Rulebook on study on the 1st and 2nd cycle of studies.
- From discussions with student representatives from all study programs, the Commission has the impression that the students are adequately informed about the rules of study and evaluation of their work.

**Weaknesses:**

- Mobility exists but is not systematically encouraged.

**Recommendations for improvement:**

- Select a student who will be appropriately involved or mandated in the QA system process to actively participate in all processes.
- Create a budget line for mobility
- Organize summer school or similar activities to increase mobility

**Requirement Level:**

**IV**

**A.4 Student enrollment, progression through studies, recognition and certification**

Requirements of ESG standard 1.4 and RS / BiH criteria T.4.1, T.4.2, T.4.3

In order to clarify some aspects related to this criterion, the members of the Committee of Experts raised the following questions during the visit:

How is the enrollment rate for the University and study programs defined?

**The good sides:**

- There are proper regulations.
- There is a procedure for exam recognition and international cooperation.
- There are transcriptional, recognition and equivalency committees appointed by the STC at the level of study programs.

**Weaknesses:**

- No weaknesses identified

**Recommendations for improvement:**

- No specific recommendations

**Requirement Level:**

**IV**

**A.5 Human resources**

Requirements of ESG standard 1.5 and RS / BiH criteria T.5.1, T.5.2, T.5.3, T.5.4, T.5.5

In order to clarify some aspects related to this criterion, the members of the Commission of Experts raised the following questions during the visit:

What has been done according to the recommendations of the residents to improve the situation in this field?

**The good sides:**

- At SP Political Science, management acted on the recommendations of the Researchers of this study program and hired a significant number, namely thirteen (13), additional teachers and associates, which significantly improved the situation, with the Commission recognizing that it was a supplementary working relationship. The commission was assured by the managers of this SP that they had done everything possible in such a short period to act on the recommendations of the reviewers, and that there was an intention to strengthen the personnel base in the coming period through the admission of teachers and especially associates from the best students.
- The Economics and Business SP presented to the Commission decisions of the STC and the Senate, according to which competitions for the selection of several teachers and associates in the ITA (Theoretical Economics, International Economics, Monetary Finance with Banking, Public Finance) will be immediately announced, thus enabling this study program very quickly (within a

few months) to meet the minimum requirements regarding adequate coverage of the teaching process with the own staff of the HEI.

- There is a Rulebook on the procedure and conditions for the selection of academic staff that adequately regulates this field.
- Employer stakeholders have a positive opinion about the work of the University
- Good communication with the student service of the institution
- The Commission is aware that the costs of participation in scientific meetings, the cost of publishing textbooks, etc. are funded by the teaching staff.
- There is a Student Valuation Ordinance.
- Student surveys are conducted regularly, evaluation of the results obtained and measures are taken to eliminate the problems identified.

**Weaknesses:**

- Documents were not presented to the Commission to show that there is a systematic approach to human resources management.
- Decisions on election to the profession were presented to the Commission. The Commission noted that there is a widespread practice of electing teaching staff at multiple narrow scientific fields, even when it comes to teachers who are not permanently employed by the HEI! The practice of election in several narrow scientific fields that are not even related, has been observed, which calls into question the competence of the teachers selected that way.
- Teaching staff is generally overburdened and close to the legal limit, although this practice is more widespread in some study programs (Economics and Business, Ecology). Particularly contributing to this is the practice of teachers conducting practical classes.

**Recommendations for improvement:**

1. Urgently call for applications for the admission of a large number of teachers and associates, as follows (integral to all SPs):
  - at least three (3) teachers of two (2) full-time associates at SP Economy and Business.
  - Call for applications for the admission of at least one (1) teacher and one (1) associate at SP Ecology.
  - Convert two (2) teachers from supplementary to permanent employment at SP Political Science and admit at least three (3) associates from the ranks of the best students of this faculty within one year.
2. Associate election choices with employment contract with HEI.
3. Define in the Rulebook that it is possible to have the choice of titles for only one narrow scientific

field.	
4. Formalize a system of cooperation with stakeholders through questionnaires, reports, monthly meetings or the establishment of bodies as stakeholder forums at the University level.	
<b>Requirement Level:</b>	<b>III</b>
<b>A.6 Student Learning and Support Resources</b>	
Requirements of ESG standard 1.6 and RS / BiH criteria T.6.1, T.6.2, T.6.3, T.6.4, T.6.5	
<p>In order to clarify some aspects related to this criterion, the members of the Committee of Experts raised the following questions during the visit:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Are they satisfied with their physical resources? (Question for students)</li> <li>3. For all study programs, the same documents with spatial capacities were provided, are there any own study program premises?</li> <li>4. Is there an annual action plan for improving physical resources? (question for higher school management)</li> <li>5. Is the number of library units appropriate for all study programs and the entire HEI, but also is there a plan to acquire literature or produce your own literature for teaching units?</li> </ol> <p><b>The good sides:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Physical resources of the SP Security and Crime highly meet the criteria in this field.</li> <li>- The Commission was presented with work to build a new campus with which physical resources will be significantly enhanced.</li> <li>- Teaching literature included in the cost of tuition</li> <li>- Libraries have a satisfactory library stock</li> <li>- There are both electronic and written exam applications.</li> <li>- The exam results are published on the faculty website.</li> <li>- The student complaint process is forwarded to the appropriate services. There are patterns for these elements.</li> <li>- A system of education and training for administrative staff exists sporadically. There are a total of 10 administrative staff at HEI, who have expressed their satisfaction with the training opportunities offered by HEI management. Goals and strategy are available to all NUBL workers. The records for scientific research publications are kept.</li> <li>- There is a subscription to electronic journals and databases, but there is some overlap, as a recommendation to create a plan for accessing and allocating resources for accessing databases.</li> <li>- Use of an electronic platform for publishing electronic literature.</li> </ul>	

**Weaknesses:**

- SP Economics and Business, SP Political Science, SP Ecology and SP Preschool education share resources at the HEI headquarters.
- The Commission is of the opinion that the laboratory exercises in Bihac are not credible, that is, they do not fulfill what was promised in the Curriculum of this SP.

**Recommendations for improvement:**

- Establish a special didactic hall for the needs of SP Preschool education.
- Set up a special laboratory for the needs of SP Ecology as soon as possible so that students do not have to travel to Bihac to see an adequate laboratory at all.
- Staff are trained through various types of training, but it would not be bad to draw up a plan for the annual training of administrative staff.

**Requirement Level:**

**III**

**A.7 Information management**

Requirements of ESG standard 1. 7 and RS / BiH criteria T.7.1

In order to clarify some aspects related to this criterion, the members of the Commission of Experts raised the following questions during the visit:

Are the analyzes on own key performance and indicators done (financial aspects, scientific research and other key aspects) and for what purpose are the results used? Are trends being followed?

**The good sides:**

There are good resources regarding information systems.

It was presented to the Commission that most of these analyzes exist.

**Disadvantages:**

- These analyzes are sporadically conducted within the self evaluation report.

**Recommendations for improvement:**

- Introduce scientific records for all teachers engaged at HEI with the annual obligation to enter data on scientific research work and to present this data in self evaluation report.

**Requirement Level:**

**IV**

**A.8 Publicity**

Requirements of ESG standard 1. 8 and RS / BiH criteria T.8.1, T.8.2, T.8.3

**The good sides:**

- There is a Marketing and Public Relations Service.
- HEI has a Communication Strategy adopted.
- SVAROG magazine,
- Some SPs organize scientific conferences,
- HEI supports the publication of textbooks and other literature.

**Weaknesses:**

- There is a lot of unused space in such a way that the public and certain target groups (eg the female population) are not aware of the opportunities and benefits of studying at HEI.
- Conferences are not held periodically

**Recommendations for improvement:**

Improve the flow of information by all departments and all employees towards the Marketing Service

**Requirement Level:**

**IV**

**A.9 Continuous monitoring and periodic review of the program**

Requirements of ESG standard 1. 9 and RS / BiH criteria T.9.1, T.9.2, T.9.3

In order to clarify some aspects related to this criterion, the members of the Commission of Experts raised the following questions during the visit:

- How often do you do self evaluation reports?
- How is the Alumni Association involved in the curricula innovation process?

**Good sides:**

- Alumni Association founded 2 years ago.
- When innovating the Security and Criminology curricula, the general public was involved in the process.

<b>Weaknesses:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Periodic analysis of self-evaluation reports by different faculties are being done in different time frames.</li> <li>- The findings in the self-evaluation reports are mostly descriptive. There are few concrete measures for improving the situation, so it seems that HEI is more compiling self-evaluation reports for others than for its own purposes.</li> </ul>	
<b>Recommendations for improvement:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Use the Alumni Association for a network of hands-on tutors.</li> <li>- More actively involve alumni in the process of curricula innovation.</li> <li>- Introduce an obligation to compile annual self-evaluation reports for all teaching units.</li> </ul>	
<b>Requirement Level:</b>	<b>III</b>
<b>A.10 Periodic external quality assurance</b>	
Requirements of ESG standard 1. 10 and RS / BiH criteria T.10.1	
<b>Good sides:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- HEI adequately performs cyclical external quality assurance.</li> </ul>	
<b>Weaknesses:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No weaknesses identified</li> </ul>	
<b>Recommendations for improvement:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mandatory regular cyclical checking and analysis of the quality situation with the production of self-evaluation reports annually</li> </ul>	
<b>Requirement Level:</b>	<b>IV</b>

### 3.2 Accreditation Report for Study Programs

External evaluation of study programs was done on the basis of:

- Reports of reviews of 5 study programs by independent, anonymous reviewers, distinguished experts in the narrow scientific fields of study programs that were the subject of observation,
- Improvement plans prepared by study programs based on the reports of reviewers,
- On site visit to a higher education institution and real-world insights from a panel of experts.

The study programs were evaluated against the Criteria for accreditation of study programs of the first and second cycle of study, as follows:

- 1. Study program quality assurance policy (1.1, 1.2, 1.3),
- 2. Creating and adopting study programs (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6),
- 3. Student-centered learning, teaching and evaluation (3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7),
- 4. Student enrollment and promotion, recognition and certification (4.1, 4.2, 4.3),
- 5. Human Resources (5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4),
- 6. Resources and financing (6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5),
- 7. Management of study program information (7.1, 7.2),
- 8. Informing the public about study programs (8.1),
- 9. Continuous monitoring, periodic evaluation and revision of study programs (9.1, 9.2, 9.3, 9.4)  
and
- 10. Mobility of academic staff and students (10.1, 10.2, 10.3).



<b>Name of the study program:</b>	<b>Level of study:</b>	<b>Name(s) of exit qualifications:</b>
Security and Criminology	First cycle	Graduate in Law and Criminal Justice - 240 ECTS
<p><b>The good sides:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Adequate teaching ensemble</li> <li>- Good physical resources</li> <li>- Teachers accessible to students</li> <li>- Practical teaching and employment support upon graduation</li> <li>- There is support for HEI's scholarly work by teachers and associates</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Weaknesses:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Excessive centralization of all processes in the hands of HEI management. It is necessary to divide the day-to-day management of this SP from the advancement of the profession.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Recommendations for improvement:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Develop a medium-term plan for the development of human resources and material and technical investments.</li> <li>- Involve teachers and associates to a greater extent in decision making related to the advancement of the profession.</li> <li>- Improve student career counseling</li> <li>- Involve students in the formal quality assurance system through student representatives.</li> <li>- Increase the mobility of teachers, associates, administration and students by organizing the Help Desk for International Cooperation and at this (spatially separated) SP.</li> </ul>		
<b>Requirement Level:</b>	<b>IV</b>	

Name of the study program:	Level of study:	Name(s) of exit qualifications:
Ekologija	First cycle	Graduate ecologist - 240 ECTS
<b>The good sides:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The study program is in accordance with the requirements of the labor market.</li> <li>- There is occasional (on request) support for the training of teachers and associates</li> <li>- Positive attitudes of students on the teaching process and competences.</li> <li>- Organizational unit management expressed its desire to receive new associates from the top students.</li> <li>- Students participate in the preparation of a self-evaluation report.</li> <li>- Libraries receive contemporary literature.</li> </ul>		
<b>Recommendations for improvement:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Urgently call for full-time admission of at least one teacher and associate (epidemiologist or specialist in hygiene and environmental protection)</li> <li>- It is necessary to innovate the curriculum, whereby care must be taken to allocate a certain number of hours / lessons to practical classes and this should be converted into ECTS credits and credits should be included.</li> <li>- Introduce the institution of a student demonstrator</li> <li>- Appoint a quality assurance associate</li> </ul>		
<b>Requirement Level:</b>	<b>III</b>	

<b>Name of the study program:</b>	<b>Level of study:</b>	<b>Name(s) of exit qualifications:</b>
Economics and business	First cycle	Bachelor of Economics (with module addition) - 240 ECTS

**The good sides:**

- The curriculum is modern and aligned with the most renowned HEIs in the region
- Current and graduate students have a very good opinion of the teachers who teach them and the competences they acquire at this SP.
- The management and the Scientific-Educational Council of the organizational unit have accepted the recommendations of the reviewers and have submitted a request to the Senate to announce a competition for the admission of new teachers and associates.
- This is one of the few SPs at this HEI where student mobility is also represented in practice.

**Weaknesses:**

- The title of the study program does not correspond to the content (HEI does not have the capacity to fulfill the expectations arising from this type of SP).
- The number of full-time teachers and associates currently (until the competition ends) does NOT meet the legal standard.
- Existing teachers are overburdened and close to the legal maximum (12 hours a week) despite the fact that most of them are not full-time.
- There are no scientific records for teachers and associates, but the evaluation of their scientific and research work is carried out only periodically (when choosing vocations).
- SP shares limited space resources with four other SPs at the University headquarters.
- There is a widespread practice of electing teaching staff at multiple narrow scientific fields, even when it comes to teachers who are not permanently employed by the HEI. Also, the practice of selection in multiple ITAs that are not even related has been observed, which calls into question the competence of the teachers so selected.

**Recommendations for improvement:**

- Urgently complete the procedure for admission of additional teachers and associates in the open competitions in order to increase the number of full-time teachers by three (3) and the number of associates by two (2), thus fulfilling the minimum legal requirement for licensing/accreditation.
- Connect the election of titles with employment contract with HEI.
- Define in the Regulations that it is possible to have the election of titles for only one narrow scientific field.

**Requirement Level:**

**II**

Name of the study program:	Level of study:	Name(s) of exit qualifications:
Political Science	First cycle	Graduate in Political Science - 240 ECTS

**The good sides:**

- Full-time teachers, very dedicated to working with students, encourage their intellectual development even beyond what is foreseen by the NPP
- Current and graduate students have a very good opinion of the teachers who teach them and the competencies they acquire at this SP
- Organizational unit management followed the recommendations of the Researchers of this study program and hired a significant number, namely thirteen (13), additional teachers and associates, which significantly improved the situation, with the Commission recognizing that it was a supplementary working relationship. The commission was assured by the managers of this SP that they had done what was possible in such a short period to act on the recommendations of the residents, and that there was an intention to strengthen the personnel base in the coming period through the admission of teachers and especially associates from the best students.
- There is occasional (on request) support for the training of teachers and associates

**Weaknesses:**

- The number of full-time teachers and assistants is barely meeting the legal standard

- The SP shares limited space resources with four other SPs at the University headquarters	
<b>Improvement recommendations:</b>	
<b>Requirement Level:</b>	<b>III</b>

<b>Name of the study program:</b>	<b>Level of study:</b>	<b>Name(s) of exit qualifications:</b>
Preschool education	First cycle	Pre-school graduate - 240 ECTS
<b>The good sides:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Adequate teaching ensemble.</li> <li>- The study program is in accordance with the requirements of the labor market.</li> <li>- There is occasional (on request) support for the training of teachers and associates</li> <li>- Positive attitudes of students on the teaching process and competences.</li> <li>- Teachers dedicated to developing creativity of students.</li> <li>- Developed cooperation with preschool educational institutions both in the form of internships and subsequent employment.</li> </ul>		
<b>Weaknesses:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The absence of didactic hall.</li> <li>- The SP shares limited space resources with four other SPs at the University headquarters.</li> </ul>		
<b>Recommendations for improvement:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Equip the didactic hall.</li> </ul>		
<b>Requirement Level:</b>	<b>IV</b>	

### 3.3 Recommendation for accreditation

After reviewing the entire documentation submitted, on site visit to the higher education institution and analyzing all documents, procedures and ways of functioning of the higher education institution and conducting the assessment procedure, the following level of fulfillment of the requirements of the standards and criteria was determined:

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA	PERFORMANCE LEVEL
A.1 Quality assurance policy	III
A.2 Program design and approval	III
A.3 Student-centered learning, teaching and assessment	IV
A.4 Student enrollment, progression through studies, recognition and certification	IV
A.5 Human resources	III
A.6 Learning and Student Support Resources	III
A.7 Information management	III
A.8 Public information	IV
A.9 Continuous monitoring and periodic review of the program	III
A.10 Periodic external quality assurance	IV

After reviewing the submitted documentation, study program review reports, improvement plans prepared by study programs based on reviewers' reports, a visit to a higher education institution, and a real-life review by a panel of experts:

STUDY PROGRAM	PERFORMANCE LEVEL
Security and Criminology (First cycle)	IV
Political science (First cycle)	III
Ecology (First cycle)	III
Economics and business (First cycle)	II
Preschool education (First cycle)	IV

On the basis of the overall quality assessment, the Commission recommends to the Higher Education Accreditation Education Agency of Republika Srpska, in accordance with the Rulebook on Accreditation of Higher Education Institutions and Study Programs, that it **issues a 5-year accreditation decision** to the higher education institution the Independent University of Banja Luka.

Based on the insight into the independent reviews of the study programs and the external evaluations of the study programs applied for accreditation, the Commission **recommends** for the accreditation the study programs listed in the previous table whose levels of fulfillment are requirements III and IV, and for the letter of expectation the study programs whose level of fulfillment is requirements II.

Members of the commission:

Prof. Marko Djogo, PhD, chairman

\_\_\_\_\_

Prof. Nevenka Maher, PhD, member

\_\_\_\_\_

Eng. Boško Borojević, MA, member

\_\_\_\_\_

Mirza Oruč, MS, member

\_\_\_\_\_