



Certification Report – ASIIN System Seal

University of Ljubljana

Faculty of Computer and Information Science

Version: 14/02/2017

Status: finalized

Table of Content

Executive summary	3
A About the Certification Process	5
B Analysis and Findings of Peers	7
C Recommendation of the peers (30/09/2015)	9
D Decision of the Accreditation Commission for Quality Management (03/12/2015)	11
E Fulfilment of Requirements	12

Abbreviations:

ASIIN	=	Agency implementing the present evaluation procedure
AT	=	Audit Team
ERU	=	Education and Research Unit
FRI	=	Faculty of Computer and Information Science
HE	=	Higher Education
HEI	=	Higher Education Institution
SER	=	Self Evaluation Report (used identical with "Self-Assessment-Report")
CMQS	=	Committee for the Monitoring of Quality and Self Evaluation
UL	=	University of Ljubljana
QA	=	Quality Assurance

In order to facilitate the legibility of this document, any gender-specific terms used in this document apply to both women and men.

Executive summary

In the framework of project KUL, ASIIN conducted an evaluation at the *UL Faculty of Computer and Information Science* in April 2014, leading to the following report. The report fixes waypoints on a journey towards a fully established quality management in higher education ensuring the institutional, procedural and cultural framework for good teaching and successful learning within the faculty. The evaluation by external peers followed an internal assessment delivering the information base to the external peers. Both, the internal and external assessment in the present evaluation exercise followed a pre-defined and agreed catalogue of evaluation criteria and subsequent assessment questions aiming at quality performance in teaching and learning.

Based in this evaluation the *Faculty of Computer and Information Science* applied for a ASIIN-System-Seal

Overall, the major findings and respective recommendations are summarized as follows:

Regarding the criteria on “Definition of quality”

Concerning the evaluation criteria agreed on with UL around the definition of quality for the faculty’s activities and performance, the peers appreciate the strategy presented by FRI. They perceive an elevated level of transparency and integration of internal and external stakeholders in developing this strategy. The faculty presents itself as to be able to self-detect deficiencies in strategic guidance and to react on these deficiencies.

In view of the peers, this is proven in an elevated level of awareness of faculty staff about strategic and quality related issues, which are promoted not at least by the annual pedagogical conference. Although the peers do not doubt that FRI is following the path chosen, there seems to be room for improvement yet. The faculty has already begun to implement a business management approach into its operations – although the respective project is juvenile yet. In view of the peers, this is a highly valuable instrument to strengthen the alignment between the defined objectives and the activities of FRI. They strongly support this project and recommend FRI to emphasize the appropriate activities.

Regarding the criteria on “Educational programmes / courses / trainings”

The peers consider the institutional setting for the development of education programmes to be established and controlled. The faculty shows a high level of awareness concerning the needs of prospective employers and serves this need by the implementation of a few well chosen profes-

sional programmes – fulfilling its own need for human resources with a more theoretically based interdisciplinary programme conducted with another faculty.

A drawback in the representation of internal stakeholders in quality management activities is the detected lack of integration of PhD-students: Because of their hybrid status as employees and as beneficiaries of educational provisions, they are presently not integrated into the commissions responsible for the third cycle. The peers therefore strongly encourage FRI to establish a mode of participation, taking into account the students' hybrid status, ensuring a visible handling of the PhD-students' feedback on quality issues.

With regards to monitoring procedures, there seems to be a dissent between students and FRI concerning the implementation of a course based quality survey – leading student representatives to apply monitoring activities in parallel to the faculty's survey. The peers recommend FRI to establish a consensus avoiding redundant activities. Another option to foster quality monitoring procedures is to strengthen the monitoring of graduates' performance e.g. by implementing an alumni survey in the name of the FRI Alumni Club.

Regarding the criteria on “Management of resources”

With regards to management of resources, the peers consider FRI's institutional setting to be established and controlled. They appreciate FRI utilizing the newly constructed building in alignment to its educational approach – promoting and valuing student competition. Approaches towards the combination of research and teaching are visible.

For further enhancement, the peers recommend FRI to establish a more structured approach towards human resource development. There are offers for staff development available, but in perception of the peers the expectations of the faculty towards the – partly voluntary – attendance of its staff on those offers could become more visible.

Regarding the criteria on “Transparency and documentation”

The peers appreciate the transparent approach of the faculty towards the management of documents and the underlying value of openness and accessibility of information. They think that the institutional setting for the arrangement of documents could be enhanced and become more user specific by structuring documents in connection to internal processes. The peers support the efforts for the implementation of a business management approach within FRI.

A About the Certification Process

Certification subject	University of Ljubljana Faculty of Computer and Information Science	
Experts	Prof. Dr. rer. nat. Hans-Ulrich Heiß (Berlin University of Technology) Thomas Kirchner (Student member: University of Heidelberg) Prof. Dr.-Ing. Richard Korff (University of Applied Science Münster) Uwe Sesztak (Business representative: Visual Systems Software & Consulting GmbH)	
Representative/s of ASIIN Headquarter	Ass. Iur. Melanie Gruner Dr. Alexander Weber	
Timeline	Date	Milestone
	06/02/2014	Submission of the final version of the self-evaluation report of the faculty
	16-17/04/2014	Onsite visit of the peer group
	26/06/2014	Submission of the draft evaluation report
	08/07/2014	Feedback by UL FRI on the draft evaluation report
	18/07/2014	Submission of the final version of the evaluation report
	08/01/2015	Contract for the certification process
	30/09/2015	Recommendation of the peers
	03/12/2015	Decision Accreditation Commission
Relevant criteria and	Criteria for the ASIIN System Seal / Institutional Accreditation / Institu-	

sources

tional Assessment: Requirements for Good Teaching and Successful Learning (11/10/12) (used as evaluation criteria)

http://www.asiin-ev.de/media/Criteria_for_the_ASIIN_System_Seal_2012-10-11.pdf

Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (2009)

http://www.enqa.eu/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/ESG_3edition-2.pdf

B Analysis and Findings of Peers

Summarize of the maturity levels – for details see evaluation report:

Areas to review		Maturity 0 = non-existent; 1 = defined; 2 = implemented; 3 = established and controlled; 4 = predictive and proactive	Requirements/Recommendations
I. Definition of quality			
I.1 Objectives	a) institutional	2	E.1
	b) procedural	2	
	c) cultural	2	
I.2 (Quality-) management systems/ governance	a) institutional	3	A 2.
	b) procedural	3	
	c) cultural	3	
I.3 Monitoring/self-examination		3	A 1. E 1.
II. Programme / course / training offer			
II.1 Creation and further development of programmes / courses / trainings	a) institutional	3	
	b) procedural	2	E 2.
	c) cultural	2	E 2.
II.2 Organisation (implementation of programmes / courses / trainings on offer)	a) institutional	2	
	b) procedural	2	
	c) cultural	1	

Areas to review		Maturity 0 = non-existent; 1 = defined; 2 = implemented; 3 = established and controlled; 4 = predictive and proactive	Requirements/Recommendations
II.3 Cooperations	a) institutional	1	E 4.
	b) procedural	2	
	c) cultural	2	
II.4 Examination systems and organisation of exams	a) institutional	2	
	b) procedural	2	
	c) cultural	2	
II.5 Recognition of achievements	a) institutional	2	
	b) procedural	3	
	c) cultural	3	
II.6 Assistance and advice	a) institutional	3	
	b) procedural	3	
	c) cultural	2	
II.7 Monitoring/self-examination		2	A 1.
III. Management of resources			
III.1 Material and human resources	a) institutional	3	
	b) procedural	2	
	c) cultural	2	
III.2 Human resources development	a) institutional	2	
	b) procedural	1	E 2.
	c) cultural	3	
III.3 Research	a) institutional	2	

Areas to review		Maturity 0 = non-existent; 1 = defined; 2 = implemented; 3 = established and controlled; 4 = predictive and proactive	Requirements/Recommendations
	b) procedural	2	
	c) cultural	2	
III.4 Administration	a) institutional	2	
	b) procedural	2	
	c) cultural	2	
III.5 Monitoring/self-examination		2	E 1.
IV. Transparency and documentation			
IV.1 Rules and regulations for programmes / courses / trainings	a) institutional	2	
	b) procedural	2	A 2.
	c) cultural	2	
IV.2 Documentation	a) institutional	2	
	b) procedural	2	
	c) cultural	1	
IV.3 Monitoring/self-examination		1	

C Recommendation of the peers (30/09/2015)

Based on the evaluation report the peers recommend to award the ASIIN System Seal to the quality management system of the Faculty of Computer and Information Science of the University of Ljubljana with requirements for one year. The extension of the certification until 30 September 2021 is subject to the fulfillment of the requirements. An additional onsite visit is not required.

Requirements

- A 1. The modus operandi of course-related monitoring/self-examination measures needs to be reviewed in terms of efficiency and validity. In the face of present discrepancies and the resulting double efforts it is necessary to involve students' representatives in this process.
- A 2. It has to be ensured that the needs and interests of doctoral students are represented in the governmental structure of FRI. In particular it is necessary to establish feedback mechanisms that consider their status both as students and employees.

Recommendations

- E 1. It is recommended to stronger align quality related measures towards defined quality objectives. Therefore (1) the figures presented in the "annual report" should show a closer relation to the quality and development objectives of the faculty and (2) the ongoing implementation of a business management approach for the operations of the faculty should be further pursued.
- E 2. It is recommended to institutionalize the alumni-work within the faculties' quality management system. In particular the feedback of former students in terms of the educational process should be considered in a more formal way.
- E 3. It is recommended to establish a more structured approach towards human resource development.
- E 4. It is recommended to strengthen the international orientation of the faculties' first cycle degree programs by, among other things using the scope of international networks and co-operations systematically.

D Decision of the Accreditation Commission for Quality Management (03/12/2015)

Assessment and analysis:

The Accreditation Commission takes note of the recommendation of the peer panel to issue a certification made on the basis of the evaluation.

The Commissions amends requirement 1 in order to specify that the deficits of the official evaluation are currently counterbalanced by the student evaluations.

Decision:

The Accreditation Commission decides to award the ASIIN System Seal to the quality management system of the Faculty of Computer and Information Science of the University of Ljubljana with requirements for one year. The extension of the certification until 30 September 2021 is subject to the fulfillment of the requirements. An additional onsite visit is not required.

Requirements

- A 1. Present deficits in the official evaluations should not be compensated by parallel students efforts. Therefore the modus operandi of course related monitoring/self-examination measures needs to be reviewed in terms of efficiency and validity.
- A 2. It has to be ensured that the needs and interests of doctoral students are represented in the governmental structure of FRI. In particular it is necessary to establish feedback mechanisms that consider their status both as students and employees.

Recommendations

- E 1. It is recommended to stronger align quality related measures towards defined quality objectives. Therefore (1) the figures presented in the "annual report" should show a closer relation to the quality and development objectives of the faculty and (2) the ongoing implementation of a business management approach for the operations of the faculty should be further pursued.
- E 2. It is recommended to institutionalize the alumni-work within the faculties' quality management system. In particular the feedback of former students in terms of the educational process should be considered in a more formal way.
- E 3. It is recommended to establish a more structured approach towards human resource development.
- E 4. It is recommended to strengthen the international orientation of the faculties' first cycle degree programs by, among other things using the scope of international networks and co-operations systematically.

E Fulfilment of Requirements

E. 1 Comments of the peers

The higher education institution has revised and adapted their evaluation system. Meaningful questionnaires have been developed that allow for a systematic analysis of survey results. Different stages of the student life-cycle, including after graduation, have been taken into account in the revised system. Particularly helpful is that evaluations are implemented during the teaching terms. This allows the lecturers to make amendments and modifications while the courses are still in progress. Furthermore, the inclusion of participants in the doctoral programmes in the new system is welcomed. It can also be noted that the number of students participating in the surveys has already been increased.

The requirements are fulfilled.

E.2 Decision of the Accreditation Committee (14.02.2017)

The Accreditation Commission decides to extend the ASIIN System Seal to the quality management system of the Faculty of Computer and Information Science of the University of Ljubljana until 30 September 2021.