



COLLEGE UBT

**THEMATIC ANALYSIS OF PROGRAM
COMPLIANCE WITH KOSOVO
ACCREDITATION AGENCY STANDARDS
BASED ON EXTERNAL EXPERT TEAM
EVALUATIONS INCLUDING BRANCHES**

July 2025

Thematic Analysis of Program Compliance with KAA Standards

This analysis provides an overview of the compliance of the institution and study programs at institutional level with the Kosovo Accreditation Agency (KAA) standards. The categorization of each program is based on three levels of alignment: Fully Compliant, Substantially Compliant, and Partially Compliant. This analysis aims to identify the programs that demonstrate high alignment with the KAA Manual, those that require further strengthening, and those that require significant improvement. It is intended to guide institutional planning and program development efforts.

At institutional level UBT College has achieved full compliance with 8 standards, substantial compliance with 2 standards, and partial compliance with 1 standard. The key gaps identified under the Financial Planning standard relate primarily to inadequate direct funding for basic and applied research, lack of transparent competitive research funding mechanisms, and a misalignment between research financing and actual research output. While UBT has demonstrated financial sustainability and clear processes for budgeting and institutional oversight, the evaluation highlighted that relying on salary allocations as evidence of research funding is conceptually flawed, as it does not guarantee active research engagement. Additionally, although research income from contracted projects has increased, it is largely service-oriented and does not substitute for investment in curiosity-driven or scholarly research essential for scientific publication. The institution also lacks sufficient investment in dedicated research infrastructure, and there is minimal clarity regarding paid internships and structured financial support for student training through industry partnerships. The main gaps identified in **the institutional research standards** stem from a limited engagement in competitive, high-impact academic research and an over-reliance on applied consultancy work that, while societally useful, contributes modestly to advancing disciplinary knowledge. Although UBT has a detailed and mission-aligned research strategy, supported by incentives, R&D units, and spin-off initiatives, the evidence of successful participation in nationally or internationally competitive research programs remains scarce. Research output is primarily tied to internal management support rather than a robust, grant-driven academic culture. There is a lack of systematic integration of faculty research into teaching across all faculties, and student involvement in research—though encouraged—remains inconsistently implemented. While incentive schemes and internal regulations exist, their impact on producing internationally competitive publications or funded projects is still limited, and the institution has not yet established a strong track record in aligning teaching topics with externally validated research achievements. In Staff Employment Standard, while UBT College has implemented structured and transparent staff recruitment and development processes aligned with national legislation and institutional policies, several key gaps remain. There is a lack of clarity and consistency in the workload allocation

framework, particularly in how teaching, mentoring, and research responsibilities are distributed and documented across different staff categories. Although the institution demonstrates a high ratio of full-time and PhD-qualified staff, the integration of research into teaching remains insufficiently evidenced across faculties, with limited documentation of research outputs directly related to teaching subjects. Furthermore, despite efforts to involve external associates in academic delivery and student supervision, formal mechanisms for compensation, continuous training, and systematic evaluation of their performance are underdeveloped. The absence of clearly defined partnerships with industry for structured internships and feedback loops limits the full alignment of external engagement with curriculum objectives and labor market needs. Additionally, while onboarding and international mobility are prioritized for internal staff, similar structured development opportunities for external associates are minimal, indicating a gap in ensuring consistent quality and alignment with academic standards across all teaching contributors.

The program compliance with KAA standards have been presented in the Table below.

Program Compliance Overview Table

| Study Program | Fully Compliant | Substantially Compliant | Partially Compliant |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|---------------------|
| Design Bachelor Professional Prizren | 7 | 0 | 0 |
| MBE Ferizaj | 6 | 1 | 0 |
| Menaxhimi i Patundshmërive | 6 | 1 | 0 |
| Stomatologji | 6 | 1 | 0 |
| Sport BSc | 6 | 1 | 0 |
| Sport MSc | 6 | 1 | 0 |
| Kimi Aplikative BSc | 6 | 0 | 1 |
| Inxhinieri e Mekatronikës BSc | 4 | 3 | 0 |
| E Drejta Komeriale | 4 | 3 | 0 |
| Inxhinieri e Mekatronikës MSc | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| Shëndet Publik dhe Shkenca Mjekësore | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| Biokimi Mjekësore BSc | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| Psikologji MSc | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| Shkenca Paramedikësore | 3 | 3 | 1 |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| Inxhinieri e Agrikulturës dhe Mjedisit BSc | 2 | 5 | 0 |
| Shkencat e Ushqimit dhe Bioteknologji | 2 | 5 | 0 |
| Teknik i Radiologjisë | 2 | 4 | 1 |

Performance of the institution in all programs by standard

| Standard | Fully Compliant | Substantially Compliant | Partially Compliant |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|---------------------|
| Mission and Governance | 9 | 4 | 4 |
| Quality Management | 12 | 5 | 0 |
| Academic Staff | 9 | 8 | 0 |
| Educational Process Content | 10 | 5 | 2 |
| Students | 11 | 6 | 0 |
| Research | 10 | 7 | 0 |
| Infrastructure | 15 | 2 | 0 |

Based on the performance summary across all evaluated study programs, the **Infrastructure standard** emerged as the most successful. It received **full compliance in 15 programs** and only **2 cases of substantial compliance**, with **no partial compliance at all**. This indicates that institutions have consistently invested in and maintained the necessary facilities, resources, and support systems to meet infrastructure expectations.

Following Infrastructure, the **Quality Management standard** also performed strongly, achieving **full compliance in 12 programs** and **no cases of partial compliance**. This reflects a well-established internal quality assurance system across many programs, although some improvements in implementation consistency are still needed.

The **Students standard** ranks next in terms of success, with **11 fully compliant ratings** and **6 substantial**—again, **no partial compliance**. While support systems and student-centered approaches are largely in place, challenges remain in ensuring transparency, inclusiveness, and international engagement across all programs.

The **Educational Process Content standard**, while receiving **10 full compliance ratings**, also saw **5 substantial and 2 partial compliance evaluations**. This suggests that although many programs meet expectations in curriculum design and delivery, several still face challenges in constructive alignment, the use of measurable learning outcomes, and the integration of practice components.

The **Research standard** also had **10 fully compliant programs**, but with **7 substantial ratings**, indicating a need for improvement in consistent research engagement, integration of research into teaching, and international research collaboration.

Academic Staff presented a more mixed picture, with **9 programs fully compliant** and **8 substantially compliant**. Although most institutions meet national regulations regarding staff qualifications and recruitment, issues such as staff workload, research activity, and alignment of expertise with teaching responsibilities remain areas for development.

Lastly, the **Mission and Governance standard** showed the most uneven performance. It received **only 9 fully compliant ratings**, alongside **4 substantial** and **4 partial compliance ratings**. This reflects continuing challenges in institutional transparency, strategic implementation, and responsiveness to prior recommendations—particularly in defining program identities, governance structures, and demonstrating alignment with broader institutional missions.

Thematic Analysis

The analysis reveals a strong level of compliance among programs such as Design Bachelor Professional with all seven standards achieving full compliance. Additionally, MBE Ferizaj, Real Estate Management, Stomatology, and both Sport programs, which all scored 6 criteria as fully compliant, with only minor adjustments needed. These programs are well-aligned with the institutional, curricular, and infrastructural expectations of the KAA Manual.

Moderate compliance is observed in engineering, public health, and biochemistry programs, which typically meet 4 criteria fully, but have 2–3 standards either substantially or partially aligned.

Programs such as Agricultural and Environmental Engineering, Food Sciences and Biotechnology, and Radiologic Technology demonstrate more limited alignment, with only 2 standards fully met and a higher proportion of substantial compliance. These programs should be prioritized for quality improvement plans focused on strengthening academic content delivery, assessment alignment, and stakeholder engagement.

STUDY PROGRAM – DESIGN BACHELOR PROFESSIONAL PRIZREN BRANCH

All seven standards are fully compliant.

STUDY PROGRAM – DENTISTRY

All standards but Research have been evaluated as fully compliant. The **Research Chapter** of the Dentistry program at UBT College was evaluated as **substantially compliant** rather than fully compliant due to shortcomings in *actual research output and faculty involvement*. Although the Faculty of Dentistry has developed a Strategic Research Plan (2021–2026) with clearly defined priority areas (e.g., Dental Biomaterials, Oral Public Health), the expert team found that implementation lags behind. Specifically, few faculty members regularly publish in peer-reviewed journals, and most output is limited to local conference proceedings with modest academic reach. While policies supporting research exist and students are required to complete a thesis, faculty engagement in research activities is inconsistent and falls short of the standards expected for an academic program of this nature. The expert team emphasized the need for structured research incentives, stronger publication efforts, and better utilization of available funding to raise the academic reputation and scientific contribution of the program. These gaps in *research productivity, visibility, and implementation* ultimately led to the “substantially compliant” rating.

STUDY PROGRAM – MANAGEMENT, BUSINESS, AND ECONOMICS BSC FERIZAJ BRANCH

All standards but Educational Process Content have been evaluated as fully compliant. The **Educational Process Content** chapter of the *Management, Business and Economics* (MBE) program at UBT College – Ferizaj was evaluated as **substantially compliant** instead of fully compliant due to several notable gaps in syllabus design and assessment transparency. Although the program has clearly formulated learning outcomes and aligns with European and national qualification frameworks, the expert team identified inconsistencies in the mapping between course-level learning outcomes and program-level outcomes. In particular, some modules lacked properly defined learning outcomes in the competence category, and the syllabi generally did not include **assessment criteria**—only assessment methods were described. Additionally, the documentation did not explicitly show how individual learning outcomes were assessed, which is essential for verifying whether students achieve intended outcomes in line with the ECTS workload. These omissions hindered the evaluation of constructive alignment and made it difficult to ensure that learning outcomes are consistently assessed and achieved. The experts recommended revising syllabi to include outcome-assessment matrices, clearly link course outcomes to program outcomes, and incorporate precise assessment criteria. These shortcomings in syllabus clarity and alignment ultimately resulted in the chapter being rated as substantially compliant.

STUDY PROGRAM – MANAGEMENT OF REAL ESTATE AND INFRASTRUCTURE BA

All standards but Educational Process Content have been evaluated as fully compliant. The **Educational Process Content** chapter of the *Real Estate and Infrastructure Management (BA)* program was evaluated as **substantially compliant** due to two main gaps identified by the expert team. First, several of the **program learning outcomes** were formulated using **non-measurable verbs** such as “understand” and “learn to,” which are not aligned with best practices for outcome-based education, particularly at the bachelor's level where measurable verbs are essential for clarity and assessment. Second, although the program includes a **compulsory practice component**, the **specific learning outcomes for this practice** were not provided in the initial self-evaluation report or annexes and were only submitted later as part of factual corrections—too late for full consideration. Additionally, these learning outcomes were not explicitly mapped to the overall program learning outcomes. These weaknesses in the formulation and integration of learning outcomes, especially for a key practical component, led the expert team to evaluate the chapter as substantially rather than fully compliant.

STUDY PROGRAM – SPORTS SCIENCE AND MOVEMENT BSC

All standards but Students have been evaluated as fully compliant. The *Students* chapter for the *Sports Science and Movement BSc* program was evaluated as **substantially compliant** due to several gaps in transparency, inclusiveness, and strategic coordination of student support services. Although the admissions process includes multiple components aligned with the demands of the field, it lacks clarity on specific grade thresholds, evaluation criteria for motivational letters, and public information about fairness, equity, or support for underrepresented groups. Furthermore, despite various support initiatives like tutoring, peer mentoring, and academic advising, the processes for identifying at-risk students, coordinating interventions, and ensuring consistency across all courses remain insufficiently described. The international mobility infrastructure is well developed institutionally, but no students from the program have participated in mobility over the past three years, and alternative formats tailored to athlete schedules are not yet implemented. Student support services are functional but fragmented, lacking an integrated, student-centered model with clear leadership oversight. Career services are not fully embedded into the curriculum, and information about learning support, including services for students with disabilities, is not publicly communicated. These shortcomings in accessibility, systematic coordination, and inclusion led to a substantial compliance rating.

STUDY PROGRAM – HEALTH AND PHYSICAL ACTIVITY MSC

All standards but Students have been evaluated as fully compliant. The *Students* chapter of the *Health and Physical Activity MSc* program was rated as **substantially compliant** due to several gaps related to **admissions transparency**, **student support structure**, and **internationalization efforts**. While the admission process generally aligns with national

regulations and includes structured interviews, it lacks detailed public criteria regarding acceptable prior qualifications, GPA thresholds, and how research potential is evaluated. There is also insufficient public guidance for international applicants, including recognition of qualifications or bridging mechanisms for interdisciplinary entrants. Although support mechanisms like mentoring, tutoring, and advising are in place, their **referral procedures, consistency across courses, and monitoring of impact remain unclear**, limiting scalability as student numbers grow. Additionally, while the institutional framework for international mobility is robust, **actual participation in the program is minimal**, and tailored mobility options for employed students are not yet developed. Finally, the student support system, though multi-layered, is **fragmented and lacks targeted services** for underrepresented groups such as part-time, mature, or disabled students. These shortcomings in transparency, inclusiveness, and coordination led to the substantial compliance rating.

STUDY PROGRAM – APPLIED CHEMISTRY BSC

All standards but the standard of mission and governance have been evaluated as fully compliant. The *Mission, Objectives, and Administration* chapter of the **Applied Chemistry BSc** program was evaluated as **partially compliant** due to persistent structural and organizational deficiencies that significantly affect transparency and capacity. Despite a clear articulation of the program's relevance to national development goals and industry needs, the expert panel identified critical issues with **UBT's internal faculty structure**, particularly the **absence of the Faculty of Medical Biochemistry and Biotechnology** on the public website, which undermines institutional clarity and accountability. This issue has been repeatedly raised in past accreditation reports without adequate resolution. Additionally, concerns remain about **UBT's ability to accommodate growing student numbers**, especially in laboratory-based disciplines like applied chemistry, where hands-on activities are essential. The **overarching strategy to rapidly expand offerings risks diluting quality**, and there is insufficient evidence that these expansions are supported by proportional infrastructural or human resource investments. These cumulative gaps—in organizational visibility, responsiveness to prior recommendations, and demonstrable operational readiness—justified the evaluation of *partial compliance*.

STUDY PROGRAM – MECHATRONICS BSC

Four standards are evaluated as fully compliant and three as substantially compliant such as Mission and governance, Academic Staff, and Research. The program mission and objectives are aligned with UBT's overall institutional goals and with Kosovo's needs for advanced engineering education. However, the expert team observed a gap in the clarity and visibility of the internal organizational structure—particularly the lack of a clearly

defined Faculty of Mechatronics Engineering on the official website. While institutional documents refer to the faculty, it is not publicly visible, raising transparency concerns. Furthermore, despite UBT's high ambitions for research and innovation, the strategic emphasis appears overly demand-driven, focusing more on expanding student numbers than strengthening academic quality. While UBT employs a strong academic core with relevant qualifications in engineering and related disciplines, the expert team highlighted a key issue: an imbalance in the academic staff-to-student ratio considering the program's scale and growth trajectory. There is a reliance on part-time staff and a limited number of full-time professors with doctoral degrees dedicated specifically to Mechatronics. This could undermine continuity in teaching, mentorship, and research development. Additionally, the institution should formalize academic development plans and mentoring structures for junior staff to maintain long-term academic quality. In Research, although Mechatronics students and faculty are involved in various research activities, including national and international projects, the research culture in the program remains underdeveloped relative to its ambitions. The expert team found that the link between teaching and research is still emerging, and that research output—especially peer-reviewed publications and externally funded projects specific to Mechatronics—is limited. Moreover, students' involvement in applied research and innovation could be strengthened through better integration of final year projects and industry collaborations into research streams.

STUDY PROGRAM – COMMERCIAL LAW LL.M

Four standards are evaluated as fully compliant and three as substantially compliant such as Quality Management, Academic Staff, and Students. 2. Quality Management – Substantially Compliant While UBT has a functioning internal quality assurance system supported by institutional policies, the implementation for the Commercial Law LL.M program remains inconsistent. The expert team observed that while student and academic staff surveys are in place, the analysis and follow-up actions were insufficiently documented, and it was unclear how this feedback directly informs improvements in teaching or curriculum. Furthermore, while program evaluations occur, there is limited evidence of a structured quality cycle—plan, implement, review, revise—being fully operational at the program level. The linkage between institutional-level QA processes and the specific needs of the LL.M program needs strengthening. The program benefits from a core of qualified and experienced academic staff; however, there are notable gaps in the formalization of their roles and availability. The expert panel found that while full-time staff are listed, some were also engaged in other programs or institutions, raising concerns about their actual availability for the LL.M program. The coordination between academic load and program demands is not fully transparent. Additionally, while staff development is encouraged institutionally, there was insufficient evidence of targeted training in advanced legal education or recent participation in international academic mobility or conferences directly related to the commercial law specialization. The student support system is present but underdeveloped for the specific needs of LL.M students. While general services like advising and orientation are available, the documentation lacks clarity on how individualized academic guidance is provided at the postgraduate level. Furthermore, while student progression and feedback mechanisms exist, their

adaptation to part-time students, working professionals, or international students in the program is limited. The low involvement in academic research, moot courts, or publication activities also signals that more active support and engagement measures are needed to optimize the postgraduate student experience in legal education.

STUDY PROGRAM – MECHATRONICS MSC

The evaluation of this program by experts is 4 standards – fully compliant, 2 – substantially compliant and 1 – partially compliant. In **Mission, Objectives and Administration**, despite the alignment of the MSc in Mechatronics Engineering with UBT's institutional mission and the program's responsiveness to labor market needs, the expert team found several deficiencies preventing full compliance. Most notably, the program lacks a clearly articulated strategic implementation plan with measurable indicators, including financial projections, KPIs, and mechanisms for tracking graduate employment or industry impact. The mission and vision, while published, are generic and not sufficiently differentiated from other European programs, failing to present a distinctive value proposition. Additionally, the program's documentation does not provide a robust didactic or research concept uniquely supporting the mission, nor does it clearly outline how external partnerships, grants, or strategic goals are evaluated or managed for long-term relevance and sustainability. Feedback tools such as student and staff questionnaires are in place but do not comprehensively capture course quality, workload, or research engagement, limiting their effectiveness in informing program improvements. Lastly, the research plan lacks a clear publication strategy and budgetary framework, further contributing to gaps in strategic alignment and governance. In **Academic Staff Standard**, while the MSc in Mechatronics Engineering at UBT is supported by qualified academic staff and aligns with national regulations for recruitment and promotion, several gaps hinder full compliance. Notably, research engagement among faculty remains limited, with moderate output primarily in conference proceedings rather than indexed journals. There is insufficient participation in international research networks such as Horizon Europe or Erasmus+, limiting both research visibility and opportunities for cross-border collaboration. Though UBT offers some professional development support—such as training and conference participation—this is not part of a structured, incentivized framework linked to strategic research targets. A formalized research plan with annual goals, internal mentoring, and funding acquisition support is lacking. Furthermore, external industry lecturers, while academically and professionally qualified, are not fully embedded within the institutional quality assurance system, lacking standardized performance monitoring and collaborative mechanisms with core faculty. Without improvements in these areas, particularly in structured faculty development and international research integration, the academic staff component falls short of full compliance. In **Research Standard**, although the MSc program in Mechatronics Engineering at UBT exhibits a well-aligned research mission with institutional goals, the program demonstrates several limitations that prevent full compliance. First, while faculty members are active in research and supervise student projects, their publication output in **high-impact indexed journals** (e.g., Scopus, WoS, IEEE) remains inconsistent. The absence of a **structured faculty research assessment process** results in unclear standards for monitoring research quality. Despite institutional incentives for publishing,

not all staff are engaged in producing peer-reviewed publications or participating in significant international research collaborations. Additionally, **limited integration of faculty research into course content** and the lack of clear guidelines for updating teaching materials based on the latest advancements reduce the potential for a truly research-led curriculum. Moreover, **student research output**, although encouraged through conference participation and thesis work, still lacks **strong experimental validation and methodological rigor**, as illustrated by exemplary theses evaluated by the expert team. The literature reviews in these theses did not consistently reference recent high-quality sources, and applied testing or benchmarking was often minimal. Although UBT facilitates industry collaboration, it has yet to **formally embed industry internships into the MSc curriculum with ECTS credit**, nor has it fully aligned its research projects with industry-driven themes such as AI, automation, and smart systems. These shortcomings indicate a promising but underdeveloped research environment in need of structured improvements and clearer performance expectations for both faculty and students.

STUDY PROGRAM – PUBLIC HEALTH AND MEDICAL SCIENCES BSC

The evaluation of the program is 4 standards fully compliant, 2 substantially compliant and 1 partially compliant. In **Academic Staff Standard**, despite the overall strength of the academic staff framework in the BSc Public Health and Medical Sciences program—including transparent recruitment, solid qualifications, and well-defined advancement procedures—several **critical gaps** were identified. First, although the program boasts a sufficient number of full-time, qualified instructors, the **availability of dedicated mentors for thesis supervision** and overall student academic progress was not clearly elaborated in the SER. This issue was flagged during the site visit, prompting leadership to commit to addressing it via mentorship training—indicating that while responsive, the issue remains **reactive rather than structurally embedded** in policy. Secondly, there is a **lack of clarity** in the SER regarding the **workload distribution** among teaching, research, and administrative responsibilities. This essential information was only clarified during the external evaluation team’s visit, revealing a flexible model dependent on individual preferences rather than a **systematic allocation framework**. Moreover, while staff advancement procedures are clearly documented and tied to merit-based outputs (e.g., high-impact publications), the **roles and qualifications of external associates** remain vague and inconsistently described. References to their involvement are scattered across unrelated program sections, such as content on the Nursing program, leading to confusion about whether external associates are adequately integrated and qualified to support the program’s intended learning outcomes. In **Educational Process Content standards**, despite several strengths—such as alignment with national and European frameworks, inclusion of practical experiences, and implementation of student-centered learning principles—the *Educational Process Content* of the study program exhibits notable gaps that justify its partial compliance rating. Firstly, while the intended learning outcomes (ILOs) are well-aligned with strategic goals and described using Bloom’s taxonomy, the **balance between public health and medical sciences is uneven**, leaning disproportionately toward public health. This undermines the credibility of the “medical sciences” component in the program title, and raises concerns about **misalignment with**

EU directives on regulated professions, particularly where medical qualifications require significantly more clinical exposure. Furthermore, the **lack of a detailed curriculum matrix** mapping course-level outcomes to program-level ILOs hinders transparency and systematic evaluation. The **absence of a semester-by-semester curriculum breakdown** prevents a clear understanding of progression and coherence across the years of study. Although the SER refers to EQF Level 6, there are **typographical errors referencing EQF Level 7**, indicating editorial oversights and potential miscommunication regarding qualification level. In addition, the **program lacks detailed evidence on how clinical practice hours align with EU Directive 2005/36/EC**, making it difficult to validate any claim of preparing graduates for regulated medical professions. The **rationale for including 'medical sciences' in the program title remains ambiguous**, potentially misleading students regarding professional qualifications. Lastly, although student-centered learning and ECTS-based workload allocation are discussed, the SER does **not provide mechanisms for collecting or acting on student feedback** about workload consistency. A more structured feedback loop and mentorship system during practical placements is also missing, limiting the program's ability to adaptively support student progression. **In Research Standard**, despite aligning with UBT's strategic research goals and demonstrating faculty research activity, the study program's performance in the **Research** standard reveals several gaps that limit its full compliance. Firstly, while the program's alignment with UBT's mission—particularly its focus on SDG 3—is clearly stated, there is **limited evidence of program-specific research strategy implementation**. The strategic goals are institution-wide, but the **translation of these goals into measurable research priorities and outputs within the program** remains vague. Although faculty members have demonstrated research activity (e.g., indexed publications, topic alignment with teaching, and student co-authorship), the **SER lacks a systematic presentation of how research is embedded within the program structure**. There is **no clear plan for student research engagement**, such as capstone projects, formal research internships, or integration of research methods into the curriculum beyond isolated examples. The encouragement of student participation is anecdotal and not embedded as a structured component of the program. Additionally, the **evidence of interdisciplinary or cross-sectoral research collaboration is weak**. While the SER mentions collaboration and MOUs, it **fails to provide concrete examples** of joint research projects with health institutions, NGOs, or governmental bodies, which would be expected in a health-focused program. The mention of the Research Sub-Committee and CTT suggests institutional support structures, but **no tracking of their outcomes related to this specific program** is provided. Regarding internationalization, although participation in projects and co-authorship in indexed journals is noted, the **extent and nature of international cooperation remains unspecified**. There is **no mention of EU-funded health research programs**, Horizon Europe engagement, or WHO collaborations, which are common in high-quality public health research. Finally, while some CVs confirm publication output and topic alignment, the program does not clearly **demonstrate how faculty research informs teaching content in a systematic or traceable way**. A formal mechanism—such as research-based course design, project-based modules, or a research dissemination plan for students—is not documented.

STUDY PROGRAM – MEDICAL BIOCHEMISTRY BSC

The evaluation of this program by experts is 4 standards – fully compliant, 2 – substantially compliant and 1 – partially compliant. In **Mission, Objectives and Administration**, While the **study program in Biochemistry** aligns with national strategic needs and addresses a societal demand for qualified professionals, **several systemic and structural deficiencies** were identified. Firstly, there is a **lack of consistency between UBT’s stated mission**—which aims to achieve international academic excellence—and the institution's **demand-driven expansion strategy**. The pressure to introduce competitive programs and enroll large student cohorts may compromise the high-quality delivery that the mission aspires to uphold. Secondly, **the institutional organizational structure remains unclear and inconsistently presented**, particularly on the official UBT website. The **Faculty of Medical Biochemistry and Biotechnology**, which is responsible for delivering the program, is not clearly identified online, creating concerns about **transparency, accountability, and governance**. This organizational ambiguity has been raised in prior external reports but has not yet been fully addressed, signaling a **lack of implementation of past recommendations**. Furthermore, although administrative and budgetary support exists, the **feasibility of delivering the program to an increasing number of students**, especially in terms of **laboratory capacity and practical training infrastructure**, is still questionable. These unresolved issues collectively weaken the program’s alignment with institutional goals, academic integrity, and public accountability, and thus prevent the standard from reaching full compliance. The **“Academic Staff”** area was rated as **substantially compliant** due to several key gaps identified by the Expert Team (ET), despite UBT College having transparent recruitment and promotion procedures in place. While the institution has recruited some highly qualified academic staff with PhDs from reputable institutions and demonstrated research capacity, **a significant portion of faculty members were found to lack excellence in key academic criteria**. These include limited publication records in peer-reviewed journals, poor alignment between their teaching content and research expertise, and insufficient international visibility or scientific impact. Furthermore, there is a lack of distinction between **conference presentations and valid journal publications**, and the **English proficiency of some faculty members** was deemed inadequate for delivering internationally competitive instruction or engaging in global academic discourse. Although the institution has a formal strategy for staff development and offers opportunities for training, the **actual implementation and impact appear uneven**. Many staff members have not yet reached the expected level of scholarly contribution or instructional capability. The ET emphasized that promotion to higher academic titles alone does not equate to improved research quality; instead, **rigorous research outputs and pedagogical alignment** are required. Therefore, UBT is urged to systematically enhance the competencies of its academic personnel and ensure consistency in CV documentation to accurately reflect educational background, job history, and scholarly productivity. These shortcomings collectively hinder full alignment with the institution’s declared mission of academic and research excellence. The **“Research”** standard for the Bachelor Study Program in Medical Biochemistry was rated as **substantially compliant**, primarily due to disparities in research productivity and recognition among academic staff. While the program demonstrates a strong conceptual alignment with UBT’s strategic goals—especially in fostering applied, ethical, and innovative research in medical biochemistry—and shows

promising metrics like a total of 323 indexed publications by staff, the **quality and consistency of research output across the academic body remain uneven**. A **small number of faculty members contribute the majority of high-quality research**, while a significant portion exhibit **limited publication records, minimal scientific impact, and low international visibility**. This inconsistency undermines the credibility of a cohesive research environment and suggests overreliance on a few prominent individuals rather than a systematically strong research culture. Moreover, while collaborations with international partners exist and are commendable, they are not yet fully leveraged to uplift the research capacity of all staff. To reach full compliance, the institution must **prioritize the development of a robust, inclusive research ecosystem**, offering targeted support for underperforming staff and ensuring that research excellence permeates all levels of academic engagement. Additionally, as the institution advances its doctoral education framework, it should capitalize on this to **establish stronger internal research mentorship, higher publication standards, and enhanced international scholarly presence**.

STUDY PROGRAM – PSYCHOLOGY MSc

The study program has achieved full compliance in 3 standards, substantial compliance in 3 standards and partial compliance in 1 standard. The evaluation of the **Academic Staff** standard for the MSc in Psychology program reveals several critical gaps that prevent it from reaching full compliance. While recruitment and advancement procedures are transparent and generally well-documented, the submitted staff CVs lacked consistency, clarity, and in some cases were not prepared in English, undermining the institution's claims of international orientation. A significant concern is the misalignment between teaching responsibilities and staff research expertise, with several faculty members teaching a wide range of courses that do not correspond directly to their academic or publication background. Moreover, a few individuals appear to publish predominantly in the same journals or in general research outlets of questionable quality, which raises concerns about the academic rigor and relevance of their research output. Finally, the teaching workload for certain staff members is not clearly delineated, particularly for those engaged in multiple programs, which introduces ambiguity around their capacity to maintain quality in instruction and research. The **Educational Process Content** for the MSc in Psychology program shows several critical gaps that contribute to its partial compliance. Firstly, although the intended learning outcomes are well-formulated and aligned with national and European frameworks, their absence from the institution's public platforms signals a lack of transparency at this stage. Secondly, the curriculum design suffers from internal inconsistencies—course titles vary across documents, and there appears to be a lack of alignment and coordination among instructors, resulting in redundancy, illogical sequencing, and unclear use of terms like "course" and "module." Thirdly, the program lacks a fully developed and operational practice component. There are no defined learning outcomes, ECTS allocations, or formal cooperation agreements with external institutions, which are essential for a psychology program aiming to prepare students for professional settings. Lastly, while ECTS allocations are present, the suggested reading materials are often unrealistic in volume and poorly aligned with course content, raising doubts about the actual student workload. Collectively, these

issues hinder the coherence, practicality, and effective delivery of the program. The **Students** section for the MSc in Psychology program reveals several critical gaps that contribute to its substantial rather than full compliance. While admission policies are clearly defined and publicly accessible, the lack of actual enrolled students limits the ability to verify the functionality of progression monitoring, mobility support, and student services in practice. The institutional infrastructure for tracking academic performance, student mobility, and support services is in place, but not yet applied specifically to this program. Additionally, international student engagement remains limited despite structural readiness, with very few students across the institution having participated in mobility programs. Although support systems are designed to accommodate diverse student needs, including those from underrepresented groups or with disabilities, these remain theoretical for the MSc program until it becomes operational. Lastly, orientation materials, communication platforms, and specific guidance tailored to MSc Psychology students are not yet developed or implemented, which delays the program's ability to ensure a fully supportive learning environment from the outset. The **Research** section for the MSc in Psychology program reveals several notable critical gaps that contribute to its substantial compliance status. Although the Faculty and institutional research strategies are well-articulated and formally structured, they are overly ambitious given the current human and infrastructural capacity. A major concern is the declared intent to develop research across multiple subfields of psychology simultaneously, which is unrealistic for a small faculty lacking specialized staff and resources in each domain. Moreover, while academic staff are generally active in publishing and supported by institutional mechanisms, there is inconsistency in the quality and relevance of these outputs. Some publications appear in journals of questionable credibility or lack alignment with the subjects taught, raising issues around research-teaching integration. Additionally, while international cooperation exists, and there are some strong individual efforts, systematic alignment between staff research, program content, and institutional capacity remains insufficiently developed.

STUDY PROGRAM – PARAMEDICAL SCIENCES MSC

The study program has achieved full compliance in 3 standards, substantial compliance in 3 standards and partial compliance in 1 standard. The **Mission, Objectives, and Administration** standard for the MSc in Paramedical Sciences at UBT College reveals several critical gaps that contributed to the *partially compliant* rating: While the program aligns conceptually with the institutional mission and addresses national healthcare needs, gaps remain in the documentation and implementation of key elements. Notably, the Self-Evaluation Report (SER) does not include updated student or labor market needs analysis for the re-accreditation cycle, and program visibility is limited—there is no evidence of its presence on UBT's official academic offerings. Despite claims of module improvements based on previous recommendations (e.g., telemedicine, disaster response), these updates are not reflected in the curriculum. There are concerns about the effectiveness of internal data collection and its application to continuous improvement. Although policies for academic integrity and administrative support structures are in place, concrete evidence of how these systems impact this specific program is lacking. Efforts to follow up on external review recommendations appear inconsistent or

superficial, with uncertainties around how clinical practice is actually implemented. The unclear documentation and integration of real-world, supervised paramedical training—especially in regulated emergency contexts—raises doubts about practical readiness. These shortcomings reflect a gap between policy intentions and operational execution. The **Quality Management** standard for the MSc in Paramedical Sciences at UBT College, though rated *substantially compliant*, presents several critical gaps that limit full compliance: While an internal quality assurance system exists and engages stakeholders, there is a notable **discrepancy between policy and implementation**. Minimal Practical Requirements, though introduced in documentation, are neither clearly communicated to students nor reflected in syllabi. The alignment between clinical placement expectations and curriculum remains vague, and students expressed confusion during interviews. Furthermore, despite the stated use of feedback and monitoring systems, there is **no evidence of substantial curriculum revisions or structured program outcome evaluations**, even after the first cohort graduated. The monitoring processes appear heavily reliant on internal surveys without adequate **external stakeholder engagement**, limiting the assessment of job market alignment and graduate preparedness. Additionally, the **accessibility and clarity of program information** is inconsistent. Some key details, including updated syllabi and admission criteria (notably the meaning of “equivalent qualifications”), were missing or unclear on public platforms. The absence of evidence on how program learning outcomes are reviewed at the end of the cycle and how employer feedback is translated into curriculum updates indicates a **disconnect between graduate competencies and labor market demands**. This weakens the assurance that the program meets external expectations and supports students' professional development effectively. The **Students** standard for the MSc in Paramedical Sciences program was assessed as *substantially compliant* due to several critical shortcomings in transparency, data provision, and international engagement. While the self-evaluation report (SER) describes a structured admissions process with clear academic requirements for both national and international students, these criteria were **not publicly accessible** on the institutional website at the time of review, compromising transparency and stakeholder access to essential information. The absence of this data undermines the institution's claim of offering publicly available and clear admission procedures. Furthermore, although the institution describes a framework for monitoring student progression—including exams, projects, and academic support—**no quantitative data on progression, dropout, or extension rates was provided** in the SER. This limits the ability to evaluate the effectiveness of these support mechanisms or to identify systemic barriers to student success. Similarly, while mechanisms for supporting mobility are described, the **lack of historical data on incoming and outgoing student exchanges**—combined with confirmations during the site visit of low mobility rates—raises concerns about the practical implementation and effectiveness of the internationalization strategy. Finally, although general student support services are offered, **specific provisions for under-represented or vulnerable groups** (e.g., financial aid for minorities or accommodations for students with disabilities) were not clearly detailed, suggesting room for improvement in inclusive and equitable support strategies.

STUDY PROGRAM – AGRICULTURE ENGINEERING AND ENVIRONMENT BSC

The study program has achieved full compliance in 2 standards, substantial compliance in 5 standards. The main gaps in the "**Mission, Objectives and Administration**" standard stem from the lack of concrete documentation and implementation evidence related to quality improvement processes. While the mission aligns with institutional goals and societal needs, no formal quality improvement plan or SWOT analysis was submitted, and the SER does not fully adhere to the latest KAA structure. Additionally, student involvement in governance and decision-making processes is not clearly demonstrated, and although ethical procedures and administrative support are described, there is limited evidence of systematic tracking, budgeting, or scheduled implementation of external recommendations. The critical gaps in the "**Quality Management**" standard primarily relate to limited involvement of external experts and incomplete documentation of implemented quality mechanisms. While the internal quality system is well-structured and engages various stakeholders, the SER lacks concrete evidence of external expert participation in the design and review processes. Additionally, although industry feedback is referenced, no formal agro-food sector survey has been conducted specifically for the program. Key quality indicators—such as application numbers, completion rates, and course evaluation summaries—are not consistently included in the SER or QA system. The absence of appended reports from evaluations and a clearly defined monitoring mechanism for continuous progress weakens the transparency and completeness of the quality assurance process. A critical gap in the "**Academic Staff**" standard lies in the limited alignment between some external associates' expertise and the core thematic areas of the study program. Specifically, most external collaborators are rooted in food science and technology, which may not fully address the needs of the agricultural sector emphasized in the program's focus. While the program demonstrates strong compliance with national regulations for recruitment and workload, and full-time staff coverage is adequate, the inclusion of external experts from fields less directly related to agriculture weakens the relevance and depth of practical learning. Additionally, although institutional support for staff development exists, opportunities for training in English-language instruction, research funding acquisition, and technology-enhanced teaching—particularly related to AI—remain underutilized, hindering the long-term growth of academic excellence and international competitiveness. The main gaps in the standard on **Educational Process Content** relate to the limited integration of key skills and competencies into the curriculum. While the program learning outcomes are clearly defined and aligned with strategic goals, their practical acquisition—particularly in research, critical thinking, and methodological skills—is underdeveloped. The optional nature of the thesis and professional practice reduces opportunities for applied learning and research competency building. Additionally, the course learning outcome descriptors are inconsistently formatted, often lacking proper level alignment and appropriate Bloom's taxonomy verbs. Many course syllabi rely on outdated literature, and the absence of English language instruction, despite the use of English texts, may hinder student comprehension. Furthermore, although teaching methods are described as diverse, assessments rely heavily on written exams, even in courses requiring practical application, suggesting a misalignment between intended outcomes and evaluation

methods. While the **infrastructure and resources** supporting the study program are generally adequate, key gaps remain that prevent full compliance. Specifically, the existing laboratory equipment—particularly for agriculture-specific needs like greenhouses and advanced agri-labs—is insufficient and requires upgrading. Library facilities, though well-resourced, lack adequate seating for group work and limit access to electronic databases to on-campus use only. Additionally, while IT equipment is available, there is a need to expand and modernize it to better support both on-site and online learning. The program's funding model is overly reliant on tuition fees, and the budget lacks detailed operational cost planning, raising concerns about long-term sustainability. These shortcomings, though not critical, must be addressed to fully meet the standard.

STUDY PROGRAM – FOOD SCIENCE AND BIOTECHNOLOGY MSC

The study program has achieved full compliance in 2 standards, substantial compliance in 5 standards. The main gaps in the "**Mission, Objectives and Administration**" standard stem from the lack of concrete documentation and implementation evidence related to quality improvement processes. While the mission aligns with institutional goals and societal needs, no formal quality improvement plan or SWOT analysis was submitted, and the SER does not fully adhere to the latest KAA structure. Additionally, student involvement in governance and decision-making processes is not clearly demonstrated, and although ethical procedures and administrative support are described, there is limited evidence of systematic tracking, budgeting, or scheduled implementation of external recommendations. The critical gaps in the "**Quality Management**" standard primarily relate to limited involvement of external experts and incomplete documentation of implemented quality mechanisms. While the internal quality system is well-structured and engages various stakeholders, the SER lacks concrete evidence of external expert participation in the design and review processes. Additionally, although industry feedback is referenced, no formal agro-food sector survey has been conducted specifically for the program. Key quality indicators—such as application numbers, completion rates, and course evaluation summaries—are not consistently included in the SER or QA system. The absence of appended reports from evaluations and a clearly defined monitoring mechanism for continuous progress weakens the transparency and completeness of the quality assurance process. A critical gap in the "**Academic Staff**" standard lies in the limited alignment between some external associates' expertise and the core thematic areas of the study program. Specifically, most external collaborators are rooted in food science and technology, which may not fully address the needs of the agricultural sector emphasized in the program's focus. While the program demonstrates strong compliance with national regulations for recruitment and workload, and full-time staff coverage is adequate, the inclusion of external experts from fields less directly related to agriculture weakens the relevance and depth of practical learning. Additionally, although institutional support for staff development exists, opportunities for training in English-language instruction, research funding acquisition, and technology-enhanced teaching—particularly related to AI—remain underutilized, hindering the long-term growth of academic excellence and international competitiveness. The main gaps in the standard on **Educational Process Content** relate to the limited integration of key skills

and competencies into the curriculum. While the program learning outcomes are clearly defined and aligned with strategic goals, their practical acquisition—particularly in research, critical thinking, and methodological skills—is underdeveloped. The optional nature of the thesis and professional practice reduces opportunities for applied learning and research competency building. Additionally, the course learning outcome descriptors are inconsistently formatted, often lacking proper level alignment and appropriate Bloom’s taxonomy verbs. Many course syllabi rely on outdated literature, and the absence of English language instruction, despite the use of English texts, may hinder student comprehension. Furthermore, although teaching methods are described as diverse, assessments rely heavily on written exams, even in courses requiring practical application, suggesting a misalignment between intended outcomes and evaluation methods. While the **infrastructure and resources** supporting the study program are generally adequate, key gaps remain that prevent full compliance. Specifically, the existing laboratory equipment—particularly for agriculture-specific needs like greenhouses and advanced agri-labs—is insufficient and requires upgrading. Library facilities, though well-resourced, lack adequate seating for group work and limit access to electronic databases to on-campus use only. Additionally, while IT equipment is available, there is a need to expand and modernize it to better support both on-site and online learning. The program's funding model is overly reliant on tuition fees, and the budget lacks detailed operational cost planning, raising concerns about long-term sustainability. These shortcomings, though not critical, must be addressed to fully meet the standard.

STUDY PROGRAM – RADIOLOGY TECHNICIAN BSC

The program achieved full compliance in 2 standards, substantial compliance in 4 standards, and partial compliance in 1 standard. **In Mission and Governance**, despite aligning well with UBT’s mission and addressing a critical societal need for radiology professionals, the program demonstrates several key gaps that led to only substantial compliance. Notably, while strategic goals and national healthcare priorities are clearly addressed, the SER lacks detailed, publicly available graduate employment data and a systematic, documented needs analysis process to substantiate labor market alignment. Although academic integrity policies are well-established, there is limited evidence of how data collected from surveys and feedback loops tangibly influences program improvements, curriculum revisions, or resource allocation. Administrative support is described broadly, but program-specific staffing details and coordination for clinical placements are not adequately addressed, which is essential for a practice-oriented field. Additionally, while the program reports the implementation of prior QA recommendations, the documentation does not clearly trace each recommendation to concrete actions and outcomes. These limitations hinder full demonstration of evidence-based management, accountability, and targeted support for teaching and clinical learning. While the **internal quality assurance system** for the Radiology Technologist program at UBT College is formally in place and engages key stakeholders, several critical gaps prevent full compliance. There is limited documentation on how the feedback collected—particularly from students and alumni—is systematically used to implement changes, and no structured review cycles or responsible bodies for periodic

program monitoring are defined. Additionally, while key performance indicators (KPIs) are listed, the SER does not align them with actual results or corrective actions, and inconsistencies exist between the SER and the performance report. The SER also references examples from other programs (e.g., Law) rather than from Radiology, undermining the credibility of stakeholder feedback mechanisms. Moreover, publicly available information is incomplete; essential metrics such as progression, completion, and dropout rates are not published, and the definition of "equivalent qualifications" remains vague. These omissions weaken transparency, hinder effective monitoring, and limit stakeholder accountability in ensuring continuous program improvement. The key gaps in the **Educational Process Content** for the BSc in Radiology Technologist program primarily relate to the articulation and transparency of learning outcomes, assessment alignment, and ECTS distribution. While the program claims alignment with European and national frameworks, the intended learning outcomes (ILOs) lack clarity and measurable action verbs consistent with competence-based education models. Additionally, although learning outcomes are said to be mapped, the Self-Evaluation Report (SER) does not include detailed comparative analysis with similar European programs or show clear mapping matrices connecting ILOs to courses, assessments, or Bloom's Taxonomy levels. Practical learning components, such as clinical practice, are well-integrated but require increased hours and better mentorship structures. Moreover, inconsistencies in publicly available information—like the missing ILOs on the website despite the program's duration—diminish transparency. Assessment criteria are general and not fully linked to individual ILOs, and students lack access to specific assignment guidelines. ECTS allocation, while nominally compliant, needs better alignment with actual student workload, as revealed in the site visit. These gaps collectively indicate that, while structurally sound, the program requires further standardization, documentation, and transparency to fully comply with best practices. Key gaps identified under the **"Students"** standard relate primarily to the transparency, implementation, and documentation of student-related policies and support mechanisms. While admission procedures are described in the SER and during the site visit, inconsistencies in GPA requirements, unclear selection thresholds, and lack of publicly available entrance exam criteria hinder full transparency. The process for credit transfer lacks clarity, especially in cases where the originating program is less than 70% compatible, and decision-making procedures are not well-documented. Although a student progression monitoring system is claimed, there is no presented evidence of data or analysis to verify its implementation. Despite existing ERASMUS+ agreements, no outgoing mobility has occurred for this program, suggesting systemic or support-related barriers remain unaddressed. The support for diverse student populations exists in structure but lacks specificity regarding targeted interventions for vulnerable groups, and there is limited evidence of a proactive, student-led extracurricular culture. Furthermore, the absence of quantitative mobility data and underdeveloped student clubs points to a need for stronger inclusion, engagement, and internationalization strategies. Key gaps identified under the **"Research"** standard primarily relate to the limited depth of international collaboration, the need for clearer integration of research into teaching, and underdeveloped student involvement in research activities. While institutional alignment with strategic goals and national/international research agendas is well-articulated, the Self-Evaluation Report lacks specific evidence of cross-border academic staff cooperation or research projects

involving foreign institutions. The academic staff demonstrate solid research credentials, but the SER provides few concrete examples of how their professional activities—such as patents or consultancy—directly support or enrich the program. Although research outputs are aligned with teaching areas, there is limited evidence of active integration of research into classroom instruction, and student participation in research remains minimal. The current level of student inclusion—reported at only 30%—suggests missed opportunities for fostering a more robust research culture at the undergraduate level.

Institutional Trends and Pattern Analysis: UBT Program Accreditation Review

Institutional-Level Patterns

At the institutional level, UBT demonstrates strong compliance with most KAA standards, particularly in **infrastructure, quality management, and student support**. The facilities, laboratories, IT systems, and QA mechanisms provide a solid foundation. However, **research financing and culture remain underdeveloped**. Although UBT allocates resources for research, much of it is tied to consultancy and service contracts rather than competitive, curiosity-driven grants. This has led to modest publication output and limited international visibility. The **integration of research into teaching is inconsistent**, and student engagement in research is sporadic. Staff employment processes are transparent, but **workload allocation is unclear**, especially regarding the balance of teaching, mentoring, and research. External associates play a role, yet lack structured development, compensation frameworks, and evaluation mechanisms. Strategic follow-up on QA cycles is also uneven—while policies exist, documentation and evidence of follow-through are weak. Finally, **transparency gaps** remain: some faculties are missing from the website or have outdated online information, reducing accountability and accessibility.

Faculty-Level Patterns

Across faculties, **recurring weaknesses emerge in curriculum design and delivery**. Many programs formulate learning outcomes using vague verbs like “understand” or “learn to,” which are not measurable. There are frequent gaps in mapping course-level outcomes to program-level learning outcomes, and **assessment criteria are often missing or unclear**, focusing more on methods than measurable results. Some syllabi rely on outdated literature or lack alignment with ECTS workload principles. Research output varies significantly across faculties, with **low integration of faculty research into teaching** and minimal student involvement in applied projects. Academic staff are qualified overall, but **teaching loads and research expectations are not consistently defined or monitored**, creating risks of imbalance. Student support services are present, but their effectiveness varies: admission criteria are not always transparent, at-risk students are not systematically tracked, and inclusiveness strategies are fragmented. Mobility opportunities exist but are rarely utilized by students in practice.

Branch-Level Patterns (Prizren and Ferizaj)

- **Prizren Branch – Design Bachelor Professional:**
This program achieved **full compliance across all standards**, showing strong alignment with institutional, curricular, and infrastructural expectations. No major gaps were reported, positioning it as a **benchmark program** within branches.
- **Ferizaj Branch – Management, Business, and Economics (MBE):**
This program was rated fully compliant overall achieving a five year accreditation, except substantial compliance in the **Educational Process Content standard**. While program-level learning outcomes were defined, several course syllabi lacked measurable competence outcomes, and **assessment criteria were missing**—with only assessment methods described. This weakens constructive alignment and transparency of evaluation. Experts recommended revising syllabi to include outcome-assessment matrices and explicit assessment criteria. Overall, the branch shows **solid structural capacity**, but faces challenges in curriculum documentation and assurance of learning.

QUALITY MANAGEMENT OFFICE

JULY 2025

