External Review Reports

Compliance Matrix and Recommendation Synthesis

13 Expert-Team Draft / Final Reports
May-June 2026

Prepared as a direct transcription of the final compliance tables, followed by an implementation-oriented synthesis of recommendation patterns.

UBT College

Purpose, scope and method

Purpose. This document completes the requested work in two ordered steps: *(1) a programme-by-programme compliance matrix transcribed from the final tables at the end of each expert-team report; and (2) a cross-report analysis of recommendation patterns, with a practical allocation of actions between central institutional level and faculty/programme level*.

Evidence rule: the compliance matrix does not re-score, infer, or normalize expert judgments. Every cell is copied from the report's final "Overall Evaluation and Judgments of the ET" table (or equivalent final recommendation table).

Programmes reviewed

The source set comprises 13 reports: Mechanical Engineering; Architecture and Spatial Planning (BSc and MSc); Public Health and Management; Environmental Engineering and Sustainable Infrastructure; Psychology; Law in Prishtina; Law in Prizren; Aesthetics and Cosmetology; FinTech and Business Analytics; FinTech and Innovation Management; Biochemistry; and Information Systems.

Reading key

Fully Compliant	Substantially Compliant	Partially Compliant	Mandatory standard (as marked in some reports)
Strong / no material concern in the final table	Improvement required; programme remains acceptable	Material weakness identified in the final table	Designation retained in source reports; not a separate rating

Important interpretation note. The overall level in the ET tables is an expert judgment and is not treated here as a mechanical average of the seven standard areas. This matters because several reports show a fully compliant overall judgment while one or more individual standards are substantially compliant.

Step 1 - Final compliance matrix

Programme	1 Mission	2 Quality	3 Academic Staff	4 Educational Process	5 Students	6 Research	7 Infrastructure	Overall
ME Mechanical Engineering, BSc	Substan-tially	Partial	Fully Compliant	Substan-tially	Substan-tially	Fully Compliant	Fully Compliant	**Substan-tially**
ASP-B Architecture and Spatial Planning, BSc	Fully Compliant	Fully Compliant	Fully Compliant	Substan-tially	Fully Compliant	Partial	Fully Compliant	**Substan-tially**
ASP-M Architecture and Spatial Planning, MSc	Fully Compliant	Fully Compliant	Fully Compliant	Substan-tially	Fully Compliant	Partial	Fully Compliant	**Substan-tially**
PHM Public Health and Management, MSc	Substan-tially	Substan-tially	Fully Compliant	Substan-tially	Substan-tially	Fully Compliant	Fully Compliant	**Substan-tially**
EESI Environmental Engineering and Sustainable Infrastructure, BSc	Fully Compliant	Fully Compliant	Fully Compliant	Substan-tially	Fully Compliant	Fully Compliant	Fully Compliant	**Fully Compliant**
PSY Psychology, BSc	Fully Compliant	Fully Compliant	Fully Compliant	Fully Compliant	Substan-tially	Fully Compliant	Fully Compliant	**Fully Compliant**
LAW-P Law (Prishtina), LLB	Fully Compliant	Substan-tially	Substan-tially	Substan-tially	Substan-tially	Substan-tially	Fully Compliant	**Substan-tially**
LAW-Z Law (Prizren), LLB	Fully Compliant	Substan-tially	Substan-tially	Substan-tially	Substan-tially	Substan-tially	Fully Compliant	**Substan-tially**
AC Aesthetics and Cosmetology, BSc	Fully Compliant	Fully Compliant	Fully Compliant	Substan-tially	Fully Compliant	Fully Compliant	Fully Compliant	**Fully Compliant**
FT-B FinTech and Business Analytics, BSc	Fully Compliant	Fully Compliant	Fully Compliant	Substan-tially	Substan-tially	Substan-tially	Fully Compliant	**Substan-tially**
FT-M FinTech and Innovation Management, MSc	Fully Compliant	Fully Compliant	Fully Compliant	Substan-tially	Substan-tially	Substan-tially	Fully Compliant	**Substan-tially**
BIO Biochemistry, MSc	Fully Compliant	Substan-tially	Substan-tially	Substan-tially	Substan-tially	Partial	Fully Compliant	**Substan-tially**
IS Information Systems, BSc	Fully Compliant	Substan-tially	Fully Compliant	Substan-tially	Substan-tially	Fully Compliant	Fully Compliant	**Fully Compliant**

Source register and expert-team recommendation context

This register records the exact final-table page used to populate Step 1 and, separately, the duration and annual intake recommended in the final ET judgment.

Code	Programme	Final table location	ET overall level	ET recommended duration / annual intake
ME	Mechanical Engineering, BSc	PDF p. 56	Substantially Compliant	3 years; 70/year
ASP-B	Architecture and Spatial Planning, BSc	PDF p. 46	Substantially Compliant	3 years; 280/year
ASP-M	Architecture and Spatial Planning, MSc	PDF p. 43	Substantially Compliant	3 years; 120/year
PHM	Public Health and Management, MSc	PDF p. 29	Substantially Compliant	3 years; 50/year
EESI	Environmental Engineering and Sustainable Infrastructure, BSc	PDF p. 27	Fully Compliant	3 years; 60/year
PSY	Psychology, BSc	PDF p. 24	Fully Compliant	5 years; 100/year
LAW-P	Law (Prishtina), LLB	PDF p. 36	Substantially Compliant	3 years; 100/year
LAW-Z	Law (Prizren), LLB	PDF p. 36 (printed p. 37)	Substantially Compliant	3 years; 50/year
AC	Aesthetics and Cosmetology, BSc	PDF p. 19	Fully Compliant	3 years; 50/year
FT-B	FinTech and Business Analytics, BSc	PDF p. 35	Substantially Compliant	3 years; 100/year
FT-M	FinTech and Innovation Management, MSc	PDF p. 37	Substantially Compliant	3 years; 50/year
BIO	Biochemistry, MSc	PDF p. 26	Substantially Compliant	3 years; 50/year
IS	Information Systems, BSc	PDF p. 44	Fully Compliant	5 years; 250/year

What the final tables show at a glance

Overall judgments. Four programmes are rated Fully Compliant overall (Environmental Engineering and Sustainable Infrastructure Bsc, Psychology Bsc, Aesthetics and Cosmetology Bsc, and Information Systems Bsc), while nine are rated Substantially Compliant overall. No programme is rated Partially Compliant overall.

Strongest common area. Infrastructure and Resources is rated Fully Compliant in all 13 final tables.

Most recurrent development area. Educational Process Content is rated Substantially Compliant in 12 programmes and Fully Compliant only in Psychology. Student-related standards are also frequently Substantially Compliant (9 of 13).

Research is the most differentiated area. It is Fully Compliant in 6 programmes, Substantially Compliant in 4, and Partially Compliant in the two Architecture programmes and MSc Biochemistry. Quality Management is also uneven: 7 Fully, 5 Substantially, and Mechanical Engineering Partially Compliant.

Standard-level distribution

Standard area	Fully	Substantially	Partially
1. Mission, objectives and administration	11	2	0
2. Quality management	7	5	1
3. Academic staff	10	3	0
4. Educational process content	1	12	0
5. Students	4	9	0
6. Research	6	4	3
7. Infrastructure and resources	13	0	0
Overall compliance	**4**	**9**	**0**

Step 2 - Trends and patterns in recommendations

The following analysis draws on the recommendation sections throughout the 13 reports. It identifies recurrent implementation needs rather than attempting to rank individual programmes. The categorisation of responsibilities is an implementation-oriented governance mapping prepared for UBT; it is not a verbatim ownership classification made by the Expert Teams.

Pattern	What appears repeatedly in the reports	Why it matters / matrix signal
1. Closed-loop quality assurance, data and traceability	Repeated requests for programme-level action logs, KPI baselines and targets, feedback-to-action evidence, documented impact, version control and current public information.	This matches the uneven Quality Management results: 6 programmes are below Fully Compliant in Standard 2, including one Partially Compliant result.
2. Curriculum coherence, learning outcomes, assessment and workload	The recurring request is to prove constructive alignment: PLO-CLO-course-assessment mapping, measurable outcomes, assessment descriptors/rubrics, moderation, credible ECTS/workload calculations and updated syllabi.	This is the most common standard-level issue: Standard 4 is Substantially Compliant in 12 of the 13 programmes.
3. Practice-based learning and internship governance	Reports repeatedly ask for formal practical-learning arrangements: clear internship partners, placement capacity, mentors, learning outcomes, logbooks, selection/assignment rules, assessment and employer feedback.	This is especially prominent in Health, Psychology, Law, Aesthetics, Mechanical Engineering, Information Systems and both FinTech programmes.
4. Programme-specific staffing evidence and staff development	Typical requests concern verified staff data, workload and staff-student ratios, programme-specific staff-course-competence matrices, disciplinary fit, thesis supervision, external-associate records and documented professional development.	This is more than a HR evidence issue: it is linked to capacity, delivery quality and the use of external expertise in practice-oriented courses.
5. Student success, support, inclusion and international mobility	Common themes include clearer information on student support, early warning and referral, progression/retention analysis, appeals and recognition processes, accessible provision, targeted mobility promotion and follow-up.	Standard 5 is Substantially Compliant in 9 programmes, even where institutional support systems are judged to exist.
6. Research capacity, visibility and student participation	The reports seek stronger externally funded project pipelines, current records of publications/projects, research-to-teaching linkage, international collaboration, researcher mentoring and structured student involvement in research and publications.	The pattern is most evident where Standard 6 is Partially or Substantially Compliant, but the recommendations apply across the portfolio.
7. Digital, laboratory, library and financial renewal	Recommendations point to regular renewal of laboratories/software, current reading lists and databases, capacity monitoring as enrolment grows, transparent investment decisions and risk-tested programme finance.	Infrastructure is fully rated in all final tables, but the recommendations emphasize sustained readiness rather than basic availability.

Governance allocation: central regulation vs faculty/programme execution

Central level should regulate common rules, systems, data definitions, due-diligence controls and institutional service capacity. Faculties/programmes should operationalise those requirements in a discipline-specific way and retain the evidence required for accreditation. Several workstreams are necessarily shared; the table assigns a primary owner to prevent gaps.

Workstream	Central / institutional primary responsibility	Faculty / programme primary responsibility	Required shared outcome
Quality assurance and accreditation evidence	Central Quality Office: single QA calendar; common annual programme-report template; KPI dictionary; action-log standard; evidence repository; audit of closure of previous recommendations.	Faculty QA Committee / Programme Team: collect stakeholder feedback; maintain action log; assign owner/deadline; supply evidence of implementation and impact; complete annual programme report.	One institutional QA evidence standard, but a distinct programme evidence file for every programme.
Public information, policies and regulatory control	Central Legal/Academic Affairs + ICT: approved templates and publication workflow for study regulations, admission, recognition, appeals, academic integrity/GenAI and web version control.	Faculty/Programme: validate and submit current curriculum, PLOs, syllabi, quota, assessment, practical-training and outcome data; check that website content matches approved documents.	No programme page should rely on generic, outdated or other-programme documentation.
HR data, staffing and professional development	Central HR: authoritative staff register; CV/contract/appointment validation; recruitment portal; cross-programme workload monitoring; institution-wide induction and academic-development framework.	Dean/Programme Coordinator: staff-course-competence matrix; disciplinary staffing plan; thesis-supervisor capacity; external-associate register; individual development and mobility plans.	Central source of truth + faculty proof that staff capacity fits the specific programme.
Student support, inclusion, admissions and mobility	Central Student Support / Registry / International Office: standard admissions, recognition, appeals and non-discrimination procedures; support portal; early-warning data capability; mobility frameworks and partner governance.	Faculty/Programme: early identification and referral; academic advising; internship selection/assignment; targeted mobility promotion; completion of programme-level progression and support follow-up.	Central policy must be visible and usable; faculty must show actual student-facing uptake and outcome.
Research support and internationalisation	Central Research and Projects Office: grant-development support; research information system/portal; incentive framework; central project pipeline; institutional Erasmus/Horizon support.	Faculty/Programme: research plan with annual targets; research-to-teaching mapping; staff mentoring; local/disciplinary partners; student research, conference and publication pathways.	Portfolio-wide capacity is central; subject-relevant research execution and evidence belong to faculties.
Infrastructure, library, IT and finance	Central Finance / ICT / Library: procurement standards; software/database subscriptions; preventive maintenance policies; central financial-risk assumptions; institutional resource dashboards.	Faculty/Programme: laboratory/software reading-list requirements; capacity and utilization evidence; investment priorities linked to curriculum and quota; maintenance and replacement plan for specialist equipment.	A fully compliant infrastructure rating does not remove the need for programme-specific resource planning.

Priority central actions

- Issue one compulsory programme-quality evidence pack: annual programme report, KPI baseline/target sheet, action log, stakeholder-feedback record, previous-recommendation tracker and evidence-of-impact form.
- Create a single authoritative staff-data and workload-control process across all programmes and locations, with a faculty-facing extract for accreditation files.
- Adopt a controlled publication workflow for programme pages and regulations so that final approved programme information, quotas, statistics and applicable policies are current and traceable.
- Standardize academic-integrity, GenAI, recognition, appeals, student-support and inclusion implementation guidance, then require programme-level evidence of use.
- Strengthen central support for research grants, research information management, library/database use, mobility and digital-resource renewal.

Priority faculty/programme actions

- Complete a programme-specific evidence Self Evaluation Report for every programme, rather than relying on generic institutional material or evidence from another programme.
- Carry out a curriculum and syllabus audit: learning outcomes, assessment methods/rubrics, workload/ECTS, reading lists, prerequisites, practice components and public information must match.
- Formalize internship and applied-learning packages: partners, capacity, selection, mentor roles, outcomes, logbooks, assessment and employer feedback.
- Translate central policies into student-facing delivery: induction, access to support, early-warning response, mobility engagement, appeals and academic-integrity practice.
- Set annual, measurable research and resource plans linked to staff expertise, student participation, local/international partners, specialist equipment and programme capacity.

Programme-level action focus

This is a concise implementation reading of each report's recurring and high-salience recommendations. It does not replace the full recommendations in the original reports.

Programme	Priority action focus from report recommendations
ME Mechanical Engineering, BSc	Launch programme-specific QA evidence; verify disciplinary staffing/capacity; complete curriculum, laboratory and financial documentation.
ASP-B Architecture and Spatial Planning, BSc	Strengthen research visibility and student research involvement; formalize curriculum/assessment evidence and programme QA traceability.
ASP-M Architecture and Spatial Planning, MSc	Make MSc-specific QA, capacity and financial evidence consistent; strengthen research projects, staff-student publication support and assessment moderation.
PHM Public Health and Management, MSc	Align QA documentation with practice; make curriculum, syllabi and ECTS coherent; strengthen practical training and student-support visibility.
EESI Environmental Engineering and Sustainable Infrastructure, BSc	Operationalize programme QA and industry feedback; resolve workload/ECTS and staffing-documentation issues; plan financial and digital-resource risk.
PSY Psychology, BSc	Scale staffing and support with enrolment; formalize internship selection; strengthen academic-integrity practice, mobility and curriculum workload evidence.
LAW-P Law (Prishtina), LLB	Strengthen QA governance and KPI evidence; document staff development and thesis supervision; improve practical, English-medium and student-support delivery.
LAW-Z Law (Prizren), LLB	Mirror key Law QA and curriculum improvements at branch level; ensure equivalent practical-learning access, student support, mobility and research development.
AC Aesthetics and Cosmetology, BSc	Urgently align practical competencies with professional/legal boundaries; formalize competency-based assessment and internship governance; plan device renewal.
FT-B FinTech and Business Analytics, BSc	Generate first-cycle QA evidence; finalize PLO-CLO-assessment matrices, staff records and internship package; operationalize research and integrity controls.
FT-M FinTech and Innovation Management, MSc	Generate MSc-specific QA evidence; finalize Level 7 assessment and applied-project evidence; operationalize research, mobility and data/integrity controls.
BIO Biochemistry, MSc	Increase research activity and project funding; complete Level 7 curriculum and learning-outcomes revisions; improve programme web and student-support communication.
IS Information Systems, BSc	Standardize practice/Senior Project and programme data; reconcile staff records; improve public information, progression monitoring and research-grant support.

Implementation sequencing

The sequence below is an institutional management proposal based on the patterns in the reports; it does not replace any report-specific deadline.

Timing	Institutional action
Immediate / before implementation where applicable	Resolve curriculum, legal/professional-boundary, practice and public-information issues that could affect programme launch. This is particularly urgent for new or not-yet-operational programmes.
First 3-6 months	Deploy central QA templates and staff-data controls; publish current programme information; complete programme action logs, curriculum/assessment maps, internship packages and baseline KPI datasets.
Within the first implementation cycle	Produce actual evidence of student feedback, course reports, workload checks, progression data, staff workload, support interventions, mobility uptake, research activity and annual improvement actions.
Annual and continuous	Review academic integrity/GenAI practice, research targets, equipment/software/reading-list renewal, funding risk, programme capacity and outcomes against the final ET recommendations.

Closing observation

The evidence from the final tables is clear: UBT's portfolio has a strong common infrastructure base and broadly positive mission/administration judgments, but the highest-value portfolio intervention is to make programme-level quality evidence, curriculum/assessment alignment, student-success data, research execution and practical-learning governance systematic and auditable. Central regulation should provide one consistent operating system; faculties must show its programme-specific implementation and measurable effect.