



FACULTY OF LAW

SEMESTRAL QUALITY REPORT
SUMMER SEMESTER

2024-2025

Prishtina, Kosova

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: ANALYSIS OF STAFF EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS –	
PRISHTINA BRANCH	5
FIRST YEAR: SEMESTER II	5
SECOND YEAR: SEMESTER IV	8
THIRD YEAR: SEMESTER IV	11
FOURTH YEAR: SEMESTER VIII	14
4.1. Civil Specialization (Prishtina)	14
4.2. Criminal Specialization	16
CHAPTER II: ANALYSIS OF STAFF EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS –	
PRIZREN BRANCH	19
YEAR 1: SEMESTER II (Prizren Branch)	19
SECOND YEAR: SEMESTER IV (Prizren Branch)	22
THIRD YEAR: SEMESTER VI (Prizren Branch)	24
VIII – CRIMINAL SPECIALIZATION (Fourth Year, Prizren Branch)	27
CHAPTER 3: MASTER PROGRAMS	30
3.1. Civil and Property Law (LLM) – Semester II (Prishtina)	30
3.2. Criminal Law (LLM) – Semester II (Prishtina)	33
CONCLUSIONS	36

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Quality Report for the Summer Semester 2024-2025 aims to provide a detailed analysis of the performance of the study programs at the Faculty of Law, UBT College, during this academic period. Based on the results of a questionnaire conducted by the Quality Office, which was distributed to students of the two Bachelor programs (LLB in Law) in Prizren and Prishtina, as well as the two Master programs: LLM in Civil and Property Law, and LLM in Criminal Law, this report offers a comprehensive evaluation of the performance of these programs.

The evaluation results show that, overall, the level of student satisfaction with teaching and pedagogy elements is in line with the standards set forth in the Faculty's Strategic Plan, with most programs meeting or exceeding the 4.0 threshold as the quality performance indicator.

To further enhance the quality of teaching, the report recommends several key steps:

1. Improving interactivity during lectures and using appropriate assessment methods at all levels of study.
2. Ensuring that course requirements and study materials are clear and accessible to students.
3. Raising student awareness and participation in the evaluation of teaching quality and promoting the importance of this process in enhancing the overall quality of education at the Faculty.

These recommendations form a solid foundation for the further development of teaching quality at the Faculty of Law at UBT, ensuring a more effective and innovative learning environment for all students.

INTRODUCTION

The Quality Report for the Summer Semester 2024–2025 of the Faculty of Law aims to provide a detailed analysis of the performance of the study programs during this academic period. This report is based on the results of a questionnaire conducted by the Quality Office, which was distributed to students of the two Bachelor programs: LLB in Law in Prizren and Prishtina, as well as the two Master programs: LLM in Civil and Property Law, and LLM in Criminal Law. The report offers a comprehensive evaluation of the performance of these programs.

This report analyzes the evaluation results and provides a clear overview of the quality of teaching and pedagogy, addressing and assessing each element in detail. According to Sub-Objective 4.2 of the Faculty of Law's 5-Year Strategic Plan, available online at <https://www.ubt-uni.net/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/Action-Plan-for-Implementation-of-5-year-strategy-Law-Faculty.pdf>, the threshold for student satisfaction with teaching and pedagogical elements must be above 4.0 or 80%.

To achieve this goal, an analysis of the average satisfaction scores has been carried out for each semester and for each professor. The report evaluates student satisfaction for each element assessed in the questionnaire, including class schedule adherence, clarity of explanations and lecture methods, promotion of interactivity, collaboration with students, attitude toward students, clarity of course requirements, availability of study materials, and the evaluation methods used by professors.

If student satisfaction for any element falls below the 4.0 threshold, the report provides recommendations for improvement. These recommendations are based on the objectives set by each professor within their Individual Development Plans, particularly regarding pedagogical aspects.

Based on these analyses and recommendations, the Faculty aims to enhance the learning experience for its students and to ensure high consistency in the quality provided in the field of law.

CHAPTER I: ANALYSIS OF THE STAFF EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS – PRISHTINA BRANCH

FIRST YEAR: SECOND SEMESTER

A total of 21 first-year students from the Faculty of Law participated in this questionnaire, evaluating the performance of 6 academic staff members based on a range of pedagogical criteria. Evaluations were given on a scale from 1 (very poor) to 5 (excellent) and covered key aspects of the teaching process. The main findings and observations are presented below:

1. Clarity of course requirements according to the syllabus

Average score: 4.61

Students rated the clarity of the syllabus and the course requirements presented at the beginning of the semester positively. This indicates good administrative preparation and effective communication by the academic staff.

Table 1: Clarity of Course Requirements

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-024	4.0
JUR-STAFF-035	4.52
JUR-STAFF-026	4.57
JUR-STAFF-033	4.71
JUR-STAFF-008	4.95
JUR-STAFF-020	4.86

2. Regularity in Holding Lectures

Average Score: 4.89

This is the highest-rated criterion, reflecting strong dedication and discipline of the academic staff in fulfilling their teaching schedule and responsibilities. Students highly appreciated the consistency and the absence of delays.

Table 2: Regularity in Teaching

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-024	4.76
JUR-STAFF-035	4.76
JUR-STAFF-026	4.71
JUR-STAFF-033	4.76
JUR-STAFF-008	4.95
JUR-STAFF-020	4.9

3. Clarity During Lectures

Average Score: 4.62

The results indicate that most of the staff successfully conveyed course content in a clear and understandable manner. However, some comments suggest that a small portion of the staff need to improve their communication with students.

Table 3: Clarity in Lecturing

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-024	3.29
JUR-STAFF-035	4.29
JUR-STAFF-026	4.57
JUR-STAFF-033	4.76
JUR-STAFF-008	4.81
JUR-STAFF-020	4.76

4. Encouragement of Interactivity and Collaboration with Students

Average Score: 4.64

Students reported a high level of collaboration and engagement during lectures. This is a particularly positive aspect, especially for first-year students, who require more support and encouragement to become actively involved.

Table 4: Interactivity

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-024	3.76
JUR-STAFF-035	4.48
JUR-STAFF-026	4.62
JUR-STAFF-033	4.71
JUR-STAFF-008	4.81
JUR-STAFF-020	5.0

5. Appropriateness and Accessibility of Teaching Materials

Average Score: 4.61

The provided materials were rated as appropriate and accessible, particularly through the Moodle platform. This reflects a strong commitment in terms of technical and logistical support.

Table 5: Course Materials

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-024	3.95
JUR-STAFF-035	4.52
JUR-STAFF-026	4.62
JUR-STAFF-033	4.62
JUR-STAFF-008	4.76
JUR-STAFF-020	4.81

6. Assessment Methods and Use of Continuous Assessment

Average Score: 4.55

This category has the lowest average (though still high). Students have indicated that, although different assessment methods are used, there may be room for greater clarity regarding testing procedures throughout the semester.

Table 6: Assessment Methods

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-024	3.76
JUR-STAFF-035	4.48
JUR-STAFF-026	4.57
JUR-STAFF-033	4.71
JUR-STAFF-008	4.76
JUR-STAFF-020	4.76

Qualitative Comments from Students:

- Students have appreciated the motivation, dedication, and professionalism of the majority of professors.
- Some individual critical comments were made regarding the clarity of communication of certain professors.
- There were requests for more engaging and practical activities in some courses.
- An organizational issue was also mentioned regarding the reduction of exercise time to avoid overload.

Conclusion

Overall, the results are very positive, especially considering the group of first-year students who are still adapting to university education. The staff's performance is evaluated as professional and effective, with some opportunities for improvement in communication and assessment methods.

SECOND YEAR: FOURTH SEMESTER

A total of 5 second-year students from the Faculty of Law participated in this questionnaire, evaluating the performance of 7 academic staff members based on a set of pedagogical criteria. Evaluations were given on a scale from 1 (very poor) to 5 (excellent) and covered key aspects of the teaching process. Below are the main observations and analyses:

1. Clarity of course requirements according to the syllabus

Overall average: 4.97

Students gave the highest ratings for the clarity of the syllabus and the course requirements presented at the beginning of the semester. This reflects a high standard of transparency and organization by the staff.

Table 1: Clarity of Course Requirements

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-006	5.0
JUR-STAFF-018	5.0
JUR-STAFF-019	5.0
JUR-STAFF-029	5.0
JUR-STAFF-016	4.8
JUR-STAFF-002	5.0
JUR-STAFF-031	5.0

2. Regularity in Holding Lectures

Overall average: 4.94

Except for one isolated case, the evaluations are perfect. This indicates a high level of staff commitment to respecting the schedule and maintaining continuity of lectures.

Table 2: Regularity in Teaching

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-006	4.4
JUR-STAFF-018	5.0
JUR-STAFF-019	5.0
JUR-STAFF-029	5.0
JUR-STAFF-016	5.0
JUR-STAFF-002	5.0
JUR-STAFF-031	5.0

3. Clarity During Lectures

Overall average: 5.00

All staff members received the highest possible rating, demonstrating excellent ability in knowledge transmission and clarity in academic communication.

Table 3: Clarity in Lecturing

Staff Code	Average Score
Të gjithë	5.0

4. Encouragement of Interactivity and Collaboration with Students

Overall average: 5.00

Students reported a high level of collaboration and encouragement of active participation. This reflects the staff's ability to create an interactive and inclusive learning environment.

Table 4: Interactivity

Staff Code	Average Score
Të gjithë	5.0

5. Appropriateness and Accessibility of Teaching Materials

Overall average: 5.00

All evaluations were perfect, confirming that the course materials were well-organized and accessible to students.

Table 5: Course Materials

Staff Code	Average Score
Të gjithë	5.0

6. Assessment Methods and Use of Continuous Assessment

Overall average: 5.00

This category was also rated at the maximum level, demonstrating fairness and dedication in the student evaluation process.

Table 6: Assessment Methods

Staff Code	Average Score
Të gjithë	5.0

Qualitative Comments from Students:

- Students highly appreciate the professionalism of all professors.
- It was mentioned that UBT does not need improvements but rather recognition from students who will become leaders.
- One comment requested that the schedule be more spread out during the week to avoid overload.

Conclusion

Overall, the results are very positive, reflecting excellent academic staff performance in all aspects. Fourth-semester students showed a high level of satisfaction with the clarity, engagement, and support of the staff. The only suggestions relate to the organizational aspect of scheduling. The staff involved in this semester set an example of successful teaching practice.

THIRD YEAR: FOURTH SEMESTER

A total of 4 third-year students from the Faculty of Law participated in this questionnaire, evaluating the performance of 5 academic staff members based on a set of pedagogical criteria. Evaluations were given on a scale from 1 (very poor) to 5 (excellent) and covered key aspects of the teaching process. Below are the main observations and analyses:

1. Clarity of course requirements according to the syllabus

Overall average: 4.16

The results show a satisfactory level of clarity regarding student obligations; however, there are noticeable differences among staff. Some instructors received maximum ratings, while others received significantly lower scores, affecting the overall average.

Table 1: Clarity of Course Requirement

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-014	3.5
JUR-STAFF-002	2.75
JUR-STAFF-013	4.5
JUR-STAFF-041	4.5
JUR-STAFF-027	4.75

2. Regularity in Holding Lectures

Overall average: 4.75

The staff, in general, was rated as very punctual in delivering lectures, with only one isolated case slightly lowering the average for one staff member.

Table 2: Regularity in Teaching

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-014	5.0
JUR-STAFF-002	3.75
JUR-STAFF-013	4.75
JUR-STAFF-041	5.0
JUR-STAFF-027	4.75

3. Clarity During Lectures

Overall average: 4.25

There is a mix of ratings for this criterion, with some staff rated very highly, while one or two received significantly lower scores, which lowered the average in this category.

Table 3: Clarity in Lecturing

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-014	3.25
JUR-STAFF-002	3.0
JUR-STAFF-013	4.75
JUR-STAFF-041	4.5
JUR-STAFF-027	4.75

4. Encouragement of Interactivity and Collaboration with Students

Overall average: 4.0

This is the criterion with the lowest ratings compared to the others. It appears that some professors have not managed to engage students interactively to the same extent as others.

Table 4: Interactivity

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-014	2.75
JUR-STAFF-002	3.0
JUR-STAFF-013	4.75
JUR-STAFF-041	4.5
JUR-STAFF-027	3.75

5. Appropriateness and Accessibility of Teaching Materials

Overall average: 4.95

Students highly rated the preparation and accessibility of materials for all courses. This is one of the most positive criteria for this semester.

Table 5: Course Materials

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-014	4.75
JUR-STAFF-002	5.0
JUR-STAFF-013	5.0
JUR-STAFF-041	5.0
JUR-STAFF-027	4.75

6. Assessment Methods and Use of Continuous Assessment

Overall average: 4.45

Although most professors received high ratings in this aspect, one or two cases with low scores affected the average. Nevertheless, the evaluation remains at a satisfactory level.

Table 6: Assessment Methods

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-014	4.25
JUR-STAFF-002	2.75
JUR-STAFF-013	5.0
JUR-STAFF-041	4.75
JUR-STAFF-027	4.75

Qualitative Comments from Students:

- The need for more frequent study visits to institutions beyond the courts was emphasized.
- One comment expressed dissatisfaction with a specific professor and included a request for replacement.
- There were suggestions for a stronger connection between theory and practice within the courses.

Conclusion

The evaluation results for the sixth semester reflect a generally positive experience, though with noticeable differences among staff for certain criteria, particularly in clarity and interactivity. Students highly appreciated the regularity of lectures and the quality of teaching materials, while also highlighting the need for improved communication and greater engagement during class sessions. The comments indicate interest in a more practical and modern approach to lectures.

FOURTH YEAR: EIGHTH SEMESTER

4.1. Civil Specialization (Prishtina)

A total of 7 students participated in this questionnaire, evaluating the performance of 4 lecturers from the Faculty of Law based on six main criteria. Each criterion was rated on a scale from 1 (very poor) to 5 (excellent).

1. Clarity of Course Requirements According to the Syllabus

Overall average: 4.11

Three professors received very high ratings (up to 5), while JUR-STAFF-046 received lower ratings from some students.

Table 1: Clarity of Course Requirements

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-046	2.71
JUR-STAFF-002	4.14
JUR-STAFF-037	4.71
JUR-STAFF-012	5.00

2. Regularity in Lectures

Overall average: 4.39

All lecturers were rated positively, but JUR-STAFF-046 received some lower ratings that negatively affected the average.

Table 2: Regularity in Teaching

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-046	3.29
JUR-STAFF-002	4.71
JUR-STAFF-037	4.86
JUR-STAFF-012	5.00

3. Clarity During Lectures

Overall average: 4.36

Overall, the performance was very good, with the exception of JUR-STAFF-046.

Table 3: Clarity in Lecturing

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-046	2.71
JUR-STAFF-002	4.57

JUR-STAFF-037	4.71
JUR-STAFF-012	5.00

4. Interactivity and Collaboration with Students

Overall average: 4.36

Most staff members were rated very positively; JUR-STAFF-046 stands out with the lowest scores.

Table 4: Interactivity

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-046	2.57
JUR-STAFF-002	4.57
JUR-STAFF-037	4.71
JUR-STAFF-012	5.00

5. Appropriateness and Accessibility of Teaching Materials

Overall average: 4.43

All lecturers demonstrated good accessibility to materials, although JUR-STAFF-046 received some lower scores.

Table 5: Course Materials

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-046	3.14
JUR-STAFF-002	4.43
JUR-STAFF-037	4.71
JUR-STAFF-012	5.00

6. Assessment Methods and Use of Continuous Assessment

Overall average: 4.43

Most lecturers received very high scores; the exception was JUR-STAFF-046.

Table 6: Assessment Methods

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-046	3.00
JUR-STAFF-002	4.29
JUR-STAFF-037	4.86
JUR-STAFF-012	4.86

Qualitative Comments from Students

- Suggestions for more study visits, participation in conferences, and internships in courts.
- Complaints regarding excessive grade penalties.
- Very positive evaluations for JUR-STAFF-012 and JUR-STAFF-037, described as professional, clear, and supportive.

Conclusion

The evaluation of academic staff for the eighth semester shows an overall satisfactory performance, with clear distinctions among staff members. Key strengths include: Clarity and professionalism of certain lecturers. Engagement and interactivity from most staff members.

Recommendations for improvement:

- Improve clarity and interactivity for JUR-STAFF-046.
- Increase practical exposure through extracurricular activities, such as field visits and participation in academic events beyond the classroom.

4.2. Criminal Law Specialization

A total of 2 students participated in this questionnaire, evaluating the performance of 4 lecturers from the Faculty of Law based on six main criteria. Each criterion was rated on a scale from 1 (very poor) to 5 (excellent).

1. Clarity of Course Requirements According to the Syllabus

Overall average: 4.13

The results show a good level of clarity regarding student obligations from the beginning of the semester. Two staff members were rated with the highest scores by both students, while the other two received lower scores, which affected the overall average.

Table 1: Clarity of Course Requirements

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-046	3.0
JUR-STAFF-002	3.5
JUR-STAFF-013	5.0
JUR-STAFF-043	5.0

2. Regularity in Holding Lectures

Overall average: 4.38

The data indicates a high level of regularity in holding classes for most of the staff. Three out of four professors were rated with the highest score, reflecting consistency and dedication to the teaching schedule. Meanwhile, one professor received significantly lower ratings from both students, which lowered the overall average.

Table 2: Regularity in Teaching

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-046	1.5
JUR-STAFF-002	5.0
JUR-STAFF-013	5.0
JUR-STAFF-043	5.0

3. Clarity During Lectures

Overall average: 4.25

The data shows that most staff were rated positively for clarity during lectures and explanations in class. Three professors received the highest score from both students. However, one professor (JUR-STAFF-046) received significantly lower scores, which lowered the overall average for this criterion.

Table 3: Clarity in Lecturing

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-046	2.0
JUR-STAFF-002	5.0
JUR-STAFF-013	5.0
JUR-STAFF-043	5.0

4. Encouragement of Interactivity and Collaboration with Students

Overall average: 4.25

Tabela 4: Interactivity

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-046	2.0
JUR-STAFF-002	5.0
JUR-STAFF-013	5.0
JUR-STAFF-043	4.5

Three professors were rated very highly, while one professor received lower scores, which affected the lowering of the average.

5. Appropriateness and Accessibility of Teaching Materials

Overall average: 4.5

Students rated highly the accessibility and content of teaching materials for most of the staff. Three lecturers received maximum scores, reflecting good preparation and approach to teaching resources, while one staff member received lower scores.

Table 5: Course Materials

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-046	2.5
JUR-STAFF-002	5.0
JUR-STAFF-013	5.0
JUR-STAFF-043	5.0

6. Assessment Methods and Use of Continuous Assessment

Overall average: 4.38

The data shows that most staff used appropriate assessment methods, including continuous assessment throughout the semester. Three professors were rated with the highest score, while one received significantly lower ratings, which affected the overall average.

Table 6: Assessment Methods

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-046	1.5
JUR-STAFF-002	5.0
JUR-STAFF-013	5.0
JUR-STAFF-043	5.0

Qualitative Comments from Students:

No additional comments or suggestions were provided in this questionnaire.

General Conclusion

- The results for the eighth semester in the Criminal Law specialization reflect a generally positive and consistent experience with minor exceptions. Three out of four academic staff members were rated very highly in all categories, demonstrating dedication, clarity, and high professionalism in the teaching process.
- One lecturer, in particular, received significantly lower ratings across most criteria, indicating the need for internal evaluation and support for improvement in clarity, punctuality, collaboration, and accessibility to teaching materials.

CHAPTER II: ANALYSIS OF STAFF EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS – PRIZREN BRANCH

YEAR 1: SEMESTER II (Prizren Branch)

Only one student participated in this questionnaire, who evaluated the performance of 6 academic staff members. Although the number of responses is minimal and not representative enough to draw general statistical conclusions, the results still provide an individual overview of this student's perception of each staff member. Ratings were given on a scale from 1 (very poor) to 5 (excellent) and include key aspects of the teaching process.

1. Clarity of Course Requirements According to the Syllabus

Overall average: 5.00

The student rated the clarity of the syllabus with the highest score for all lecturers.

Table 1: Clarity of Course Requirements

Staff Code	Average Score
All	5.0

2. Regularity in Delivering Lectures

Overall Average: 5.00

In this criterion as well, all lecturers were rated with the highest score, reflecting a strong commitment to adhering to the schedule and ensuring continuity in lectures.

Table 2: Regularity in Teaching

Staff Code	Average Score
All	5.0

3. Clarity During Lecturing

Overall Average: 3.0

This is the first criterion with lower ratings, particularly for some staff members. While some received a score of 5, others were rated 2 and 3, indicating significant differences in lecturing style and clarity of explanation.

Table 3: Clarity in Lecturing

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-024	2.0
JUR-STAFF-035	2.0
JUR-STAFF-039	3.0
JUR-STAFF-033	4.0
JUR-STAFF-008	5.0
JUR-STAFF-038	2.0

4. Encouragement of Interactivity and Cooperation with Students

Overall Average: 2.83

This is the lowest-rated criterion in this questionnaire. Students gained the impression that some professors were not sufficiently engaged in active interaction or collaboration with them.

Table 4: Interactivity

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-024	2.0
JUR-STAFF-035	2.0
JUR-STAFF-039	2.0
JUR-STAFF-033	4.0
JUR-STAFF-008	5.0
JUR-STAFF-038	2.0

5. Appropriateness and Accessibility of Teaching Materials

Overall Average: 3.17

While some professors received the highest ratings, others were rated very low, suggesting a lack of consistency in providing didactic resources.

Table 5: Course Materials

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-024	2.0
JUR-STAFF-035	2.0
JUR-STAFF-039	3.0
JUR-STAFF-033	5.0
JUR-STAFF-008	5.0

JUR-STAFF-038	2.0
---------------	-----

6. Assessment Methods and Use of Continuous Evaluation

Overall Average: 3.5

The ratings in this category are more mixed. Some lecturers received high scores for fairness and consistency in assessment, while others were rated lower. This suggests a need to harmonize assessment standards across the teaching staff.

Table 6: Assessment Methods

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-024	3.0
JUR-STAFF-035	3.0
JUR-STAFF-039	4.0
JUR-STAFF-033	4.0
JUR-STAFF-008	5.0
JUR-STAFF-038	2.0

Qualitative Comments from Students

- No additional comments or suggestions were provided in this questionnaire.

Conclusion

The results of the second semester questionnaire in Prizren indicate strong performance in organizational aspects, such as the clarity of the syllabus and the regularity of lectures. However, significant differences were noted in lecturing clarity, interactivity, and the provision of materials, which should be addressed in order to unify the student experience.

Improvements are especially recommended in the following areas:

- Enhancing interactivity and collaboration in the classroom.
- Ensuring the availability of high-quality and accessible materials for all courses.
- Applying consistent assessment methods.

Due to the limited number of responses (only 1 student), these findings should be interpreted with caution and considered as.

SECOND YEAR: SEMESTER IV (Prizren Branch)

A total of 3 second-year Law Faculty students participated in this questionnaire, evaluating the performance of 5 academic staff members across a range of pedagogical criteria. Evaluations were given on a scale from 1 (very poor) to 5 (excellent) and covered key aspects of the teaching process. Below are the main observations and analysis:

1. Clarity of Obligations According to the Syllabus

Overall Average: 5.00

All staff members were rated with the highest score in this category, which demonstrates a high standard of transparency and communication of course requirements.

Table 1: Clarity of Obligations

Staff Code	Average Score
All	5.0

2. Regularity in Delivering Lectures

Overall Average: 5.00

Students expressed complete satisfaction with the professors' commitment and punctuality in delivering lectures. No absences, delays, or early dismissals were reported.

Table 2: Regularity in Teaching

Staff Code	Average Score
All	5.0

3. Clarity During Lecturing

Overall Average: 5.00

All evaluations are at the maximum score, demonstrating the staff's excellent abilities in explanation and academic communication.

Table 3: Clarity in Lecturing

Staff Code	Average Score
All	5.0

4. Encouragement of Interactivity and Cooperation with Students

Overall Average: 5.00

Students reported a very high level of collaboration and engagement in the learning process, describing an open and supportive environment for learning and discussion.

Table 4: Interactivity

Staff Code	Average Score
All	5.0

5. Appropriateness and Accessibility of Teaching Materials

Overall Average: 5.00

Students rated the quality and accessibility of teaching materials very highly, indicating excellent preparation and organization of the courses.

Table 5: Course Materials

Staff Code	Average Score
All	5.0

6. Assessment Methods and Use of Continuous Evaluation

Overall Average: 5.00

All lecturers were rated with the highest score for their use of fair and continuous assessment methods, reflecting integrity in the academic evaluation process.

Table 6: Assessment Methods

Staff Code	Average Score
All	5.0

Qualitative Comments from Students

Students expressed complete satisfaction with the engagement and professionalism of the academic staff. They emphasized the high quality of teaching and the fairness of the instructors. In particular, JURSTAFF-031 was praised for clarity in explanations, professionalism, and the respect shown toward students.

Conclusion

The results of the questionnaire for the fourth semester in Prizren are exceptionally positive. Students rated all staff members with the highest marks across all categories. The qualitative comments highlight the quality, dedication, and respect that students have for their professors, especially for JURSTAFF-031.

The performance in this semester reflects a high professional standard and can serve as a model of successful teaching for other programs.

THIRD YEAR: SEMESTER VI (Prizren Branch)

A total of 3 third-year students from the Faculty of Law participated in this questionnaire, assessing the performance of 5 academic staff members based on a series of pedagogical criteria. The evaluations were given on a scale from 1 (very poor) to 5 (excellent) and covered key aspects of the teaching process. Below are the main observations and analysis:

1. Clarity of Obligations According to the Syllabus

Overall Average: 4.93

The evaluations indicate a very high level of clarity regarding course obligations. Students are generally satisfied with the presentation of the syllabus.

Table 1: Clarity of Obligations

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-014	5.0
JUR-STAFF-016	4.67
JUR-STAFF-041	5.0
JUR-STAFF-027	5.0
JUR-STAFF-024	4.67

2. Regularity in Holding Lectures

Overall Average: 5.00

All staff members were rated with the highest score, demonstrating a strong commitment to adhering to the schedule and ensuring the smooth delivery of lectures.

Table 2: Regularity in Teaching

Staff Code	Average Score
Të gjithë	5.0

3. Clarity During Lectures

Overall Average: 4.93

In this criterion as well, most evaluations are at the maximum level. The differences are minimal and indicate a high level of ability to communicate clearly and explain the course content effectively.

Table 3: Clarity in Lecturing

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-014	5.0
JUR-STAFF-016	4.67
JUR-STAFF-041	5.0
JUR-STAFF-027	5.0
JUR-STAFF-024	5.0

4. Encouraging Interactivity and Collaboration with Students

Overall Average: 5.00

All evaluations are at the highest level, demonstrating active student engagement and a favorable climate of collaboration in the classroom.

Table 4: Interactivity

Staff Code	Average Score
Të gjithë	5.0

5. Relevance and Accessibility of Teaching Materials

Overall Average: 5.00

Students have given the highest ratings for the course materials, reflecting good preparation and easy access to the relevant resources.

Table 5: Course Materials

Staff Code	Average Score
Të gjithë	5.0

6. Assessment Methods and Use of Continuous Evaluation

Overall Average: 5.00

This criterion received the highest score from all students, indicating fairness and consistency in the application of continuous assessment.

Table 6: Assessment Methods

Staff Code	Average Score
Të gjithë	5.0

Qualitative Comments from Students

The students' comments are generally positive. Two students did not provide any additional comments or suggestions, while one highlighted the need for greater clarity and control over the content of teaching materials, presenting this as constructive criticism for continuous improvement.

Conclusion

The results of the questionnaire for the sixth semester in Prizren are very positive, with maximum ratings in most categories. Students showed high satisfaction with the organization, cooperation, and assessment by the academic staff. Only one comment lightly criticizes the clarity of materialsan- important suggestion for improvement.

VIII-CRIMINAL SPECIALIZATION (FOURTH YEAR, PRIZREN BRANCH)

Only one student participated in this questionnaire, evaluating the performance of 4 academic staff members in the Criminal Specialization. Although the number of responses is minimal and not representative for drawing general statistical conclusions, the results nonetheless provide an individual insight into this student's perception of each staff member.

1. Clarity of Obligations According to the Syllabus

Overall Average: 4.5

The student rated three out of four instructors with the highest score for the clarity of the syllabus, with one exception (score of 3), which slightly lowered the average.

Table 1: Clarity of Obligations

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-016	5
JUR-STAFF-042	3
JUR-STAFF-026	5
JUR-STAFF-043	5

2. Regularity in Holding Lectures

Overall Average: 4.5

The evaluation is generally positive, with two ratings of 4 and two ratings of 5.

Table 2: Regularity in Teaching

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-016	4
JUR-STAFF-042	4
JUR-STAFF-026	5
JUR-STAFF-043	5

3. Clarity During Lectures

Overall Average: 4.0

All instructors received a consistent rating of 4 in this category.

Table 3: Clarity in Lecturing

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-016	4
JUR-STAFF-042	4
JUR-STAFF-026	4
JUR-STAFF-043	4

4. Encouragement of Interactivity and Collaboration with Students

Overall Average: 4.0

The ratings are the same for all staff members- a score of 4- indicating a good level of engagement but also room for improvement.

Table 4: Interactivity

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-016	4
JUR-STAFF-042	4
JUR-STAFF-026	4
JUR-STAFF-043	4

5. Suitability and Accessibility of Teaching Materials

Overall Average: 3.0

This is the lowest-rated criterion in this questionnaire. Two professors received a rating of 3, one received a 2, and only one received a 4, indicating a need for improvement in the preparation and accessibility of teaching materials.

Table 5: Course Materials

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-016	3
JUR-STAFF-042	2
JUR-STAFF-026	3
JUR-STAFF-043	4

6. Assessment Methods and Use of Continuous Evaluation

Overall Average: 3.25

This category was also rated moderately, with scores ranging from 3 to 4, suggesting the need for greater dedication in the methods of evaluating students throughout the semester.

Table 6: Assessment Methods

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-016	3
JUR-STAFF-042	3
JUR-STAFF-026	3
JUR-STAFF-043	4

Qualitative Comments from the Student:

No additional comments or suggestions were provided in this questionnaire.

Conclusion:

- Considering that the questionnaire was completed by only one student, the results cannot be regarded as representative of the group of students in the Criminal Specialization. However, they provide useful insights:
- The staff's performance in the fundamental aspects of teaching (clarity, regularity, interactivity) has been rated positively.
- There is room for improvement in the approach to teaching materials and assessment methodology.
- It is recommended that in the future a broader participation be ensured to generate a more reliable overview.

CHAPTER 3: MASTER PROGRAMS

3.1. Civil and Property Law (LLM) -Semester II (Prishtina)

A total of 5 master's level students enrolled in the Civil and Property Law program participated in this questionnaire. The students evaluated 5 academic staff members based on 6 main criteria, which include clarity of obligations, regularity in teaching, interactivity, and the use of assessment methods. Ratings were given on a scale from 1 (very poor) to 5 (excellent). Below are the observations and analysis for each criterion:

1. Clarity of Obligations According to the Syllabus

Overall Average: 4.36

Most staff members were positively rated for the clarity of the syllabus and the obligations presented at the beginning of the semester. However, two staff members received lower scores, which affected the overall average.

Table 1: Clarity of Obligations

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-012	4.2
JUR-STAFF-027	5.0
JUR-STAFF-037	5.0
JUR-STAFF-021	4.4
JUR-STAFF-007	3.2

2. Regularity in Holding Lectures

Overall Average: 4.52

The staff received generally good ratings for regularity, with the exception of two cases where slightly lower scores were given. This aspect generally indicates adherence to schedules and teaching obligations.

Table 2: Regularity in Teaching

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-012	4.2
JUR-STAFF-027	4.4
JUR-STAFF-037	5.0
JUR-STAFF-021	4.8
JUR-STAFF-007	4.2

3. Clarity During Lectures

Overall Average: 4.48

The staff generally received high marks for their communication skills and clarity in explaining lecture content, except for one staff member who was rated 1 by two students.

Table 3: Clarity in Lecturing

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-012	4.8
JUR-STAFF-027	4.8
JUR-STAFF-037	4.8
JUR-STAFF-021	4.4
JUR-STAFF-007	3.2

4. Encouragement of Interactivity and Collaboration with Students

Overall Average: 4.4

Students rated the staff as dedicated and willing to collaborate, with generally consistent evaluations overall. However, there was a low rating for one staff member, which affected the average score.

Table 4: Interactivity

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-012	4.6
JUR-STAFF-027	4.8
JUR-STAFF-037	5.0
JUR-STAFF-021	4.6
JUR-STAFF-007	3.2

5. Suitability and Accessibility of Teaching Materials

Overall Average: 4.4

The materials were rated as useful and accessible by the majority of students, except for one case where the lowest score was given. Overall, this aspect was well managed by the staff.

Table 5: Course Materials

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-012	4.4
JUR-STAFF-027	4.6
JUR-STAFF-037	4.6
JUR-STAFF-021	4.6
JUR-STAFF-007	4.0

6. Assessment Methods and Use of Continuous Evaluation

Overall Average: 4.56

This criterion received high ratings, indicating that the assessment methods were considered fair and clear. However, one staff member received a rating of 1 from a student, which slightly lowered the average.

Table 6: Assessment Methods

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-012	4.4
JUR-STAFF-027	5.0
JUR-STAFF-037	5.0
JUR-STAFF-021	4.6
JUR-STAFF-007	3.8

Qualitative Comments from Students:

- Three students did not provide comments or only submitted non-content symbols.
- One student specifically praised jur-staff-012 and jur-staff-027 for excellent teaching.
- One student raised a complaint about unclear scheduling and unexpected changes, suggesting more accuracy in planning contracts and respecting predetermined conditions.

Conclusion:

The evaluation results for this group of LLM students are very positive, especially regarding academic preparation and teaching quality. There are some critical assessments for certain staff members, but overall, students appreciated the dedication, professionalism, and transparency in the teaching process. Comments related to administrative accuracy (such as scheduling) should be taken into account for further improvements.

3.2. Criminal Law (LLM)- Semester II (Prishtina)

A total of 6 master's level students participated in this questionnaire, evaluating 2 instructors based on 6 pedagogical criteria related to the quality of lectures, collaboration with students, assessment methods, and clarity of the syllabus. Ratings were given on a scale from 1 (very poor) to 5 (excellent). The results are very positive and demonstrate a high level of staff engagement. Below are the averages and comments.

1. Clarity of Obligations According to the Syllabus

Overall Average: 4.75

Students rated very highly the way obligations and course structures were presented at the beginning of the semester. The professor with the code JUR-STAFF-002 received maximum scores from all students, while JUR-STAFF-013 achieved a high average with one slightly lower score.

Table 1: Clarity of Obligations

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-002	5.00
JUR-STAFF-013	4.50

2. Regularity in Holding Lectures

Overall Average: 5.00

Both professors received maximum scores from all students, indicating punctuality and full adherence to the schedule and academic obligations.

Table 2: Regularity in Teaching

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-002	5.00
JUR-STAFF-013	5.00

3. Clarity During Lectures

Overall Average: 5.00

Students rated the lecturing style as very clear and well-structured, with no criticisms. Both professors received the maximum rating.

Table 3: Clarity in Lecturing

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-002	5.00
JUR-STAFF-013	5.00

4. Encouragement of Interactivity and Collaboration with Students

Overall Average: 4.92

Students experienced an open and collaborative environment. Only one student gave a score of 4 for JUR-STAFF-013, while all others awarded a 5 to both professors.

Table 4: Interactivity

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-002	5.00
JUR-STAFF-013	4.83

5. Suitability and Accessibility of Teaching Materials

Overall Average: 4.83

Students reported that the course materials were accessible and adequate, although a rating of 3 for both professors slightly lowered the average.

Table 5: Course Materials

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-002	4.83
JUR-STAFF-013	4.83

6. Assessment Methods and Use of Continuous Evaluation

Overall Average: 4.83

For this criterion as well, both professors were rated very positively. Students perceived the assessment as fair and well-organized throughout the semester.

Table 6: Assessment Methods

Staff Code	Average Score
JUR-STAFF-002	4.83

Qualitative Comments from Students:

- One student praised the professors for their clear methods, dedication, and contemporary approach, emphasizing the positive impact they had on her professional development.
- Professor with code 013 was appreciated for his attentiveness and willingness to support students, while professor 012 was commended for his inspiration, approachability, and professionalism.
- Other students wrote comments such as “No comment,” “None,” or simply “.” – indicating silent satisfaction and a lack of complaints.

Conclusion

The results of the questionnaire for the LLM program in Criminal Law are exceptionally positive and consistent. Students unanimously rated the quality of teaching, clarity, regularity, and academic support very highly. The qualitative comments highlight not only the professors' academic competence but also their human and motivational role in the professional preparation of master's level students.

CONCLUSIONS

From the Quality Report for the Summer Semester 2024–2025 for the Faculty of Law, the following general conclusions can be drawn:

1. The overall quality of teaching is stable and positive, with most criteria exceeding the 4.0 threshold set in the Faculty's Strategic Plan.
2. Regularity in lectures and access to teaching materials are among the highest-rated aspects by students across all study levels.
3. Noticeable differences exist between academic staff members, especially in areas such as clarity of lecturing, student interaction, and assessment methods. Some recurring cases of low ratings require special attention.
4. The number of student responses in certain semesters is very low, which affects the statistical reliability of evaluations-particularly in the Prizren branch and in certain master's program groups.
5. Master's programs, especially the LLM in Criminal Law, demonstrate very strong performance and serve as a positive example in terms of staff commitment, clarity, and professionalism.
6. Students have emphasized the need for more interactivity, study visits, and a stronger connection between theory and practice-particularly in the advanced years of study.
7. The report recommends enhancing transparency in obligations, adopting more active teaching methods, and improving access to materials, while also promoting a culture of quality evaluation among students themselves.

Recommendations for Improvement

The report concludes with several key recommendations:

1. Increase interactivity and the use of active teaching methods during lectures;
2. Ensure clarity in the syllabus and course materials;
3. Raise student awareness on the importance of quality assessment.

ANNEXES

Questionnaire form

1. Were your obligations as a student regarding the course clear from the beginning, according to the syllabus presented?

1

2

3

4

5

2. Is the teacher punctual (does not have delays or end the class early)?

1

2

3

4

5

3. Is the teacher clear during lectures and explanations in class?

1

2

3

4

5

4. Does the teacher encourage interaction during lectures/exercises and collaborate with students?

1

2

3

4

5

5. Was the course material adequate for studying, and was it accessible at UBT?

1

2

3

4

5

6. Does the teacher use appropriate assessment methods and apply continuous assessment throughout the semester?

1

2

3

4

5

7. Any additional comments or suggestions
