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**Part I**

**­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­**

**General**

1. **Introduction**

In accordance with its mission, the document presents its findings and its evaluation of the **High Medical School-Nursing program, University of Montenegro**.

1. **The Assessment Panel**
   1. **Composition**

The assessment panel is composed in accordance with agreement of the consortium

The panel assigned to evaluate the **Nursing Education at the High Medical School, University of Montenegro** includes the following members.

Chairman: **André Govaert , PhD, University of Gent, Belgium**

**Expert 1:** Belinda Drieghe, Odisee University, Belgium

**Expert 2:** Lubica Rybarova, PhD, University of Presov, Slovakia

**Expert 3**: Maja Račić, PhD, University of East Sarajevo, BiH

Administrative members: **Willem vanden Berg, Srdjan Masic**

**Faculty representatives were: Goran Nikolić, MD, PhD, dean, Olivera Miljanovic, MD, PhD, vice-dean, Sonja Vukicevic, secretary, Mirka Knezevic, assisstent to teacher, Bogdan Asanin, MD, PhD, project coordinator for University of Montenegro and professor of surgery.**

* 1. **Task Description**

Based on the program’s self-evaluation report (SER) and the interviews that were conducted during the assessment visit, the assessment panel will provide the following in its report:

* An evaluation of the criteria and the indicators as defined in our framework;
* An all-encompassing evaluation of the program;
* A formulation of recommendations to bring about quality improvement in the program.
  1. **Working Method**

The assessment of the **High Medical School-Nursing program, University of Montenegro** is conducted in conformity with the guidelines.

The panel’s procedure is characterized by four identifiable phases:

* Phase 1 Preparation
* Phase 2 Visit to the institution of higher education
* Phase 3 Reporting

**Phase 1: Preparation**

Every panel member studied the self-evaluation report and its appendices, previously sent by Prof Ašanin by emails to all panel members. The panel members also provide an individual checklist that lists all their questions, their temporary evaluation and their argumentation. Based on the discussion and the panel members’ questions team finally made an inventory of the key points.

**Phase 2: Visit to the higher education institution**

CCNURCA consortium group provided a visit to University of Montenegro. On this occasion, the facility was assessed and interview with faculty members and students was conducted.

The panel used the checklists’ and questionnaires’ synthesis for further interviews.

The visit schedule contained two consultation meetings that allow the panel members to exchange their findings with each other and to come to mutual, more definitive evaluations.

At the end of the assessment visit, the panel’s chairperson gave an oral report on the panel’s experiences and findings, without uttering any explicit value judgments with regard to its contents.

**Phase 3 Creation of the assessment report**

Based on the self-evaluation report, the checklists, representative of the group drove up a draft of the assessment report, in dialogue with the chairperson and the other panel members.

This draft assessment report describes the panel’s evaluation and the motivation per criterium and per indicator. In addition to that, points of attention and possible recommendations for improvement are formulated if found necessary or desirable by the panel members.

**Part II**

**­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­**

**Assessment Report**

General information

Faculty of medicine Podgorica (University of Montenero) was established on 17.10.1996 (No of act.:02-2637). By the decision of the Council for Higher Education of the Government of Montenegro No. 05-1/5-150 from 11 June 2012., the certificate of reaccreditation of the University of Montenegro was awarded for a period of five years (starting from academic 2012/2013, until the end of the academic year 2016/2017)

There are three study programs at Faculty of medicine Podgorica : Medicine, Dentistry and Nursing. Mainly, training in nursing is conducted in Berane.

Preparing for the implementation of the EU Directive 2005/36 EC and 2013/55/EU for regulated professions in accordance with the National Development Plan of qualifications for the performance of regulated professions from 2013 until in 2018, the Faculty of Medicine ( University of Montenegro) has applied up and received the TEMPUS project " Competency Based Curriculum Reform in nursing and caring in the Western Balkans Universities "

The project is carried out in co-operation with 17 partner countries from the European Union and the countries of the Western Balkans. Project Coordinator is KAHO-HUB High medical schools from Ghent (Belgium). The representative of University of Montenegro is prof. dr Bogdan Asanin, professor of surgery. As a result of the project, curriculum of Nursing program was modified and complied with the Directives of the EU .

Nursing program takes three years to complete (the bachelor degree). Currently, 250 students are enrolled with this program. The students of nursing are not the members of Faculty council.

The **Core Competences for nursing students were defined as follows:**

1. Management of patients health
2. Quality of care
3. Management competences
4. Educational and legal issues
5. Ethics
6. Research
7. Administration of documentation
8. Communication skills
9. Teamwork competences

**Criterion 1. Educational Objectives**

**Indicator 1.1 Level and Orientation**

The educational objectives are focussed on getting the student to master general competences such as:

* Obtaining and processing information;
* Ability to reflect critically and to be creative;
* Ability to perform leadership tasks;
* Ability to communicate information, ideas, problems and solutions;
* An attitude of life-long learning.

The educational objectives are also focused on getting the student to master general scientific or (academic) competences such as:

* A research attitude;
* Knowledge of research methods and techniques;
* Ability to collect relevant data that can influence the judgment of social, scientific and ethical questions;
* Ability to appreciate uncertainty and ambiguity;
* The limits of knowledge and the ability to problem guided initiating of research.

The educational objectives are focused on getting the student to master the specific competences of the domain and the scientific field of the study program.

**The opinion of the assessment panel and recommendations for improvement:**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination of and on the consideration of the following**:**

*General objectives are well-defined through categorization of knowledge, skills and attitudes. LO are also defined during CCNURCA project. So as final output of the program at least on the paper it can be seen what knowledge, skills and attitudes graduate students should poses in the end of the studies. We noticed that LO are not defined on the course level and that should be done and match them with program outcomes. Matrix of competences should be developed and during creation of the matrix, Bologna recommendation and EU directives for specially regulated professions should be take into account. Students should know in advance what is the minimum knowledge, skills and competences they should know or posed to pass exam.*

**Indicator 1.2 Domain Specific Demands**

Assessment criteria:

The educational objectives (mentioned as the end qualifications of the student) join the demands that are set by (foreign) colleagues and the relevant work field for an education within the domain (field of study/discipline and / or professional practice). They are partially in line with the regulations. The end qualifications for bachelor’s degrees are derived from the scientific disciplines, the internationally performed research and the courses that are considered to put research into practice in the relevant professional field.

* General study program objectives (desired final qualifications of the graduates at study program level) and their genesis;
* Alignment of the objectives with the bachelor’s/ master’s competences in the Bologna declaration and European Qualification framework;
* Attention for the international dimension in the study programs objectives;
* Attention for academic/professional/artistic skills in the objectives;
* Familiarity with the objectives among students and staff involved in the study program;
* Profiling the study program with regards to domestic and/or foreign study programs in order to determine the study program objectives and (including recent and imminent developments) to make the comparison with the own vision on the vocation/discipline;
* Alignment of the objectives with the professional regulations/legislation;
* Alignment of the objectives with the needs and wants of the intended work field;
* Genesis of the discipline-specific objectives.

**The opinion of the assessment panel:**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination of and on the consideration of the following:

*Based on the results of former EU Tempus Project (REFINE) with the aim of implementation of a new curriculum and modern teaching and examination methods in nursing education in Balkan region, there is a fair development reached in comparison with the international level of nursing education. Newly developed curricula is based on competences based approaches. Big problem is still the involvement of main stakeholders in creation of LO and curricula****.*** *More activities have to be addressed in the direction of collaboration with the work field. There are no differences in job description and responsibilities of nurses with BA and nurse assistants (high school education only).*

**Opinion on Criterion 1, Educational Objectives:**

Based on the opinions of:

Indicator 1.1, level and orientation:

Indicator 1.2, domain specific demands:

the assessment panel holds the opinion that generic quality, concerning criterion 1, is present in the study program. There is still room for improvement.

**Criterion 2. Curriculum**

**Indicator 2.1 Correspondence Between Objectives and the Content of the Program**

Assessment criteria:

The program is an adequate realization of the end qualifications of the education, as to level, orientation and demands specific for the domain. The end qualifications are adequately translated towards the learning objectives in (parts) of the program. The content of the program offers students the possibility to achieve the end qualifications.

* Translation of the objectives in the curriculum;
* Level (bachelor) and content of the study program components;
* International dimension in the study program/internationalisation of the curriculum (policy, participation rate, cooperation forms, international contacts, etc.);
* Degree to which recent advancements in education at home and abroad have found expression in the curriculum;
* Procedures for curriculum revision and innovation;
* Participation of relevant stakeholders in curriculum development, revision and innovation.

**The opinion of the assessment panel:**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination of and on the consideration of the following:

*Learning objectives are partly translated in curriculum, for the undergraduate level of education. International dimension has been achieved through projects but internationalization could not be recognized in the realization of the program. Acquired modern teaching methodology is partly integrated in new curriculum but not accepted by all teaching staff. There should be a team concerned with the further development and implementation of the curriculum with members of all professional groups and students, which will have the backup and power of the Dean to organize and implement decisions. Too many courses are inside curriculum. Some courses have small number of ETCS points. A recommendation can be that nursing study programs should try to merge some courses and on that way to decrease the total number of subjects. Some courses are still oriented toward medical training.*

**Indicator 2.2 Demands Professional and Academic Alignment**

Assessment criteria:

The development of knowledge by students when there is an interaction between the education and the scientific research within relevant disciplines. The program matches with the developments in the relevant scientific discipline(s) by demonstrable connections with topical scientific theories. The program guarantees the development of scientific research skills. With certain courses, there are demonstrable connections with the topical practice of the relevant professions.

* Attention in the curriculum for knowledge development;
* Attention in the curriculum for skills that support professional functioning;
* Attention in the curriculum for work field experience: interaction with professional practice, attitude, content, level and guidance of practical training final projects, etc.;
* Alignment with recent (international) developments in the field/discipline and professional practice (among other things, as researcher);
* Research alignment of the study program; among other things: feedback of (own) research to the study program, active involvement of students in research within the study program;
* Attention in the curriculum for development of research skills – conveying the research attitude – research skills. Interaction between study program and academic services.

**The opinion of the assessment panel:**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination of and on the consideration of the following:

*The feedback from the institutions about quality of the employed students was lacking. Internal organization of professional and academic alignment should be pointed as one of the main strategic points in the future institution development. Nursing students should be encouraged to participate in different research programs.*

**Indicator 2.3 Coherence Program**

Assessment criteria:

Students take a coherent course program with regard to content.

* Sequential structure and coherence of the curriculum in terms of the standard process;
* Harmony of the curriculum in the cooperation with other university departments and institutions;
* Relation between the curriculum and flexible learning process.

**The opinion of the assessment panel:**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination of and on the consideration of the following:

*Standard coherence in nursing education, preclinical and some basic nursing subjects followed by clinical subject could be recognized. Nursing students are introduced with clinical practice in the first years and this is a very important step in the curriculum reform. Still, it is largely influenced by medical training and not completely oriented toward nursing training. Only small part of training is conducted by nursing professors (only one professor of nursing is engaged with undergraduate training).*

*The practical education should be improved and quality parameters should be introduced to control the efficiency of this education.*

*It is very hard to speak about horizontal and vertical coherence of the program. There is a recommendation to improve the competence matrix in the future and then to precisely define he responsibilities for gaining competences per course. On this way unnecessary repetitions and missing of some important topics will be avoided. It is recommended that the content of some courses should be changed according to the matrix plan.*

**Indicator 2.4 Workload**

Assessment criteria:

The actual amount of study hours per academic year is being checked and reaches the standard of 60 credits.

* The study program fulfills the formal requirements with regard to the size of the curriculum for bachelor :
* It is possible to follow the program adequately since factors that hinder the learning process are being eliminated as much as possible;
* Study time measurements and follow-up;
* Agreement between estimated and actual study time;
* Spread of the study time in the study program;
* Presence of factors obstructing or promoting study and any steps.

**The opinion of the assessment panel:**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination of and on the consideration of the following:

*Nursing program curriculum consists of 3 academic years of 60 credits each (180 in total). There is no master program but the students can apply for vocational training after completion of undergraduate school. This, study program is in line with the formal requirements with regard to the minimal duration of an international accepted nursing education (3 years: 5400 h (L,S,Lab,CLT), Contact Hours (L,S-1695h,Lab-465h,CTL-2445h)-4605h,(1week-43 hours), T-37%,P-63%(Lab-10%,CLT-53%),IW - 795h).*

*According to the description of the curriculum the student workload fulfills the requirements. There should be an internal quality control mechanism to assess the reality of workload in comparison to the accepted form of the curriculum.*

**Indicator 2.5 Coherence of the Organization of the Learning Process and Contents**

Assessment criteria:

The structure and the content of the curriculum are coherent and it is in line with modern didactic approaches (new teaching methodologies, innovations in teaching, etc.). The quality of the educational resources is high and there is an alignment of the learning resources with the didactic concept and the objectives (at study program level).

* The didactic concept is in line with the objectives;
* The work forms are aligned with the didactic concept. Work forms used (lectures, working groups, project work, practical work, self-study, workshops, etc.);
* Alignment of the didactic work forms with the objectives, the didactic concept and the characteristics of the student intake;
* Attention for recent educational developments at home and abroad in the didactic concept and its elaboration;
* Variation of educational forms;
* Educational resources used and quality (syllabi, guides, courses, teaching and learning aids, etc.): Alignment of the learning resources with the didactic concept, the objectives (at study program level and study program component level) and the characteristics of the student intake.

**The opinion of the assessment panel:**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination of and on the consideration of the following:

*In general there is a good intention for introducing a new teaching methodology and alignment of the didactic method with the objectives. During to the CCNURCA project some nurses are trained for introducing new modern didactic approaches such as PBL, mind mapping, clinical skills labs, Payton 4 steps. Despite the intention, responsible teachers did not accept new teaching approaches so far as stated by interviewed students. Although the Faculty provided new teaching equipment, there is no specific lab for clinical skills. Examination methods like OSCE stations are not used in practice. The practical clinical teaching should be improved and new teaching and assessment methods should be introduced.*

**Indicator 2.6 Final Thesis**

Assessment criteria:

Before obtaining the master’s degree students have to make a final project, by which the student has to prove his/her analytic and synthetic capability or independent problem solving capability on academic level or his/her artistic capability. The final project reflects the general critical reflection of the student’s intentions to do research.

* Place/relative weight of the thesis in the study program;
* Content and concept of the thesis;
* Preparation for the master’s thesis;
* Guidance of the thesis;
* Cooperation between students and researchers;

Cooperation between students and the professional field;

**The opinion of the assessment panel:**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination of and on the consideration of the following:

*The students have to complete the final thesis after passing the last exams. Final thesis is 10 ECTS. The students provide small research as the part of their thesis, conducted in PHC, community or in hospital setting. They have to show basic understanding of research methodology (definition of research problem, hypothesis and study aims, results presentation). There are specific instructions and rules defined by Faculty of medicine Podgorica.*

**Opinion on Criterion 2, Curriculum:**

Based on the opinions of:

Indicator 2.1, correspondence between objectives and the content of the program:

Indicator 2.2, demands professional and academic alignment:

Indicator 2.3, coherence programme:

Indicator 2.4, workload:

Indicator 2.5, coherence of the organization of the learning process and contents:

Indicator 2.6, final thesis:

the assessment panel holds the opinion that generic quality, concerning criterion 2, is present in the study program.

*Although Faculty of medicine Podgorica fulfilled many requirements from Indicator 2, there is still room for improvement. Professors of nursing should take more part in the undergraduate training, and the curriculum should be in accordance with the competences of nursing profession. The names of few courses should be changed and adapted to the level of competences.*

**Criterion 3. Staff**

**Indicator 3.1 Quality of the Staff**

Assessment criteria:

The staff is qualified for the educational, organizational realization of the program. They are also qualified to take care of the content of the program.

* Human resources policy (including recruitment, determination of tasks, appointments, promotions, evaluation procedure, advice and decision making bodies);
* Impact of substantive, educational and didactic qualities in the recruitment and promotion, evaluation and monitoring of the staff;
* Policy with regard to the staff for educational activities;
* Factors obstructing the pursuit of a good human resources policy;
* Professionalization (life-long learning approach) of the staff;
* Expertise of the teaching/academic staff (substantive, educational and didactic);
* Involvement of the teaching/academic staff;
* Technical, administrative and organizational expertise of the staff;
* Introduction and guidance of staff and equal opportunities policy.

**The opinion of the assessment panel:**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination of and on the consideration of the following:

*Staff is motivated for teaching. The main problem is the lack of teachers with nursing background. There is only one professor of nursing involved, while the rest of the training is conducted by medical doctors. This problem is recognized and there is important trend to resolve it. Internationalization of this study program must be supported. There are no staff development programs on the faculty and no regular trainings for teachers. Those trainings should be introduced on regular basis. The dissemination seminar on teaching and assessment methods should be provided.*

*There is need of support from the management to give the staff more time and financial support for research processes and publications. One on one tutoring should be encouraged.*

**Indicator 3.2 Demands Professional/Academic Alignment**

Assessment criteria:

For some courses it is necessary that a sufficient amount of staff members have knowledge and insight with regard to the profession. The course matches with the following criteria with regards to the effort of staff made within a professional, academic education:

* Professional experience and knowledge of the professional practice among the staff with educational or education-supporting tasks;
* Research expertise and research activity in the practice and the development of the arts;
* Range of specializations among the staff with research tasks;
* Educational contribution from the professional field and the staff’s international contacts, including feedback with regards to the study program, the participation in international networks and the partnerships with domestic and foreign partner institutions.

**The opinion of the assessment panel:**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination of and on the consideration of the following:

*Demands for the academic promotion are well defined. Lack of the research activity and publications in international journals are recognized as a problem and need to be addressed in the future. It is recommended to implement a strategy for research at the Faculty including the support of the teaching personnel. Nurses with master degree should be more engaged in nursing education but current law is not supporting it. So if law will not be changed in this direction, nurses should be encouraged to pursue PhD studies.*

**Indicator 3.3 Quantity of Staff**

Assessment criteria:

A sufficient amount of staff is being appointed to organize the course with the desired quality. Human resource policy is organized in a good and proper way. Recruitment policy is based on good selection of staff.

* Size of the workforce;
* Size of the workforce in proportion to the number of students;
* Ratios between the various categories of staff;
* Number and percentage of visiting professors;
* Age structure;
* Share of the various staff categories in education and research.

**The opinion of the assessment panel:**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination of and on the consideration of the following:

*Faculty offered new posts for teachers, but the outcomes are not known to panel. The percentage of visiting professor is high as well as their age. Majority of teachers are medical doctors. Few teachers are involved in research.*

**Opinion on Criterion 3, Staff:**

Based on the opinions of:

Indicator 3.1, quality of staff:

Indicator 3.2, demands professional/academic alignment:

Indicator 3.3, quantity of staff:

the assessment panel holds the opinion that generic quality, concerning criterion 3, is present in the study program.

*There is a recommendation for improvement. Larger number of nurses with master degree from system should be engaged with teaching, especially in practical parts of the training. Nurses should be encouraged to pursue further academic education.*

**Criterion 4. Students**

**Indicator 4.1 Assessment and Testing (Learning Assessment)**

Assessment criteria:

By means of assessments, tests and exams, students have been adequately tested. The learning assessment is in accordance with the proclaimed learning objectives (parts) of the program.

* Student guidance during assessment;
* Organisation of tests and examinations;
* Various assessment standards with regards to the objectives of the study program components and the study program as a whole: concept, orientation of the evaluation to the (integrated) tests of knowledge, insight, skills and attitudes, degree of difficulty;
* Criteria and method of the assessment by the evaluators;
* Criteria and method of the assessment by the examination committee;
* Transparency of the assessment: Familiarity of students with the requirements connected to the evaluation;
* Familiarity of students and staff with the assessment procedures;
* Quality assurance of examination matters.

**The opinion of the assessment panel:**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination of and on the consideration of the following:

*Weakness of the system of examination is recognized on interviews with students. The methods of assessment are not well defined in syllabi. The use of new assessment method should be introduced in teaching process (ie.OSCE stations).**The continual assessment of the students during the study process on all courses should be regulated in a way that students can collect credits which count for the final exams (at least 50%).*

**Indicator 4.2 Practical Training**

Assessment criteria:

The practical training enables students to acquire practical experience. Students develop professional skills and attitudes required for the independent practice under guidance and under conditions of increasing independence. The training is the result of an independent study on a problem that is relevant to the study program and the field of action. The results of the training reflect the student’s reasoning capacity, the information processing and critical reflection capacity and the competence in applying solution strategies in problem situations from professional practice.

* Place/relative weight of the practical training/thesis in the study program;
* Contents and concept of the practical training;
* Preparation for the practical training;
* Guidance in the practical training;
* Assessment of the practical training.

**The opinion of the assessment panel:**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination of and on the consideration of the following:

*Practical training is carried out in General hospital and Primary health care centre Berane. Future plans are to relocate School from Berane to Podgorica. There is Catalogue of the skills. There is need for obligatory introduction of all these documents through legal documentation to each department.*

*Practical training should be integrated into the quality control measures of the Faculty. Internal regulation has to give the background for this measure. Skills lab should be established in school over the period of next few months.*

**Indicator 4.3 Conditions of Admission**

Assessment criteria:

Content of the program fits in with the qualifications of the incoming students. Admission procedures are clear and transparent.

* Internal procedures for admission of students;
* Characteristics of the student intake and related policy;
* The curriculum is in line with the preliminary training;
* Specific activities with regard to the alignment between the preliminary training and the study program.

**The opinion of the assessment panel:**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination of and on the consideration of the following:

*Internal procedures for admission are well defined in SER. There is a preparatory program before admission on voluntary basis. After entering exams students are ranked according to marks gained during previous education and results got during entering exams.*

**Indicator 4.4 Student Involvement in the Improvement of the Teaching/Learning Processes**

Assessment criteria:

The institution evaluates the curriculum and the teaching processes itself by introducing student enquiries and satisfaction questionnaires. Student representatives are involved in the decision making process and in the managerial structures.

* Handling the results of enquiries;
* Influence of students on curriculum;
* Participation of students in different decision making bodies and influence on managerial structures.

**The opinion of the assessment panel:**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination of and on the consideration of the following:

*All the problems are identified during interviews with students and teaching staff representatives. There are needs for strategic engagement and obligations for students through legal documentations. Students should be involved more in the decision making processes. Their feedback is important for the further development and improvement of the curriculum. Generally students have their representatives in all important bodies but their role is rather passive in decision making process.*

**Indicator 4.5 Measures for Promoting Mobility, Including the Mutual Recognition of Credits**

Assessment criteria:

The existence of bilateral and multilateral agreements with domestic and foreign institutions for the exchange of students. Participation of institution and students in different exchange programs. Existence of ECTS and/or internal credit system

* Existence of bilateral and multilateral agreements in the country and abroad;
* Existence of student exchange programs;
* Acceptance of credits gain during exchange programs;
* Existence of ECTS or other credit systems.

**The opinion of the assessment panel:**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination of and on the consideration of the following:

*ECTS as basis for student exchange exist. There is good interest from the student’s part for exchange programs but more efficient support from the Faculty management is necessary. Students from this Faculty are not involved in exchange programs and not going abroad to spend part of their studies. More bilateral and multilateral agreements are needed as basis for exchange of students and teaching staff. There should be more support for the international mobility of the students (information and mentoring for Erasmus programs etc). University international office and management team from the Faculty should put more efforts in organizing this activity for nursing students.*

**Indicator 4.6 Coaching of Students**

Assessment criteria:

Coaching system is introduced. The coaching and the providing of information meet the students’ needs.

* Existence of coaching system and regular consultations;
* Way of coaching students.

**The opinion of the assessment panel:**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination of and on the consideration of the following:

*Coaching system is not yet recognized. There is no organized mentorship for students. Introduction of mentorship for nursing students is recommended by panel members.*

**Indicator 4.7 Information, Consultation and Complaint System**

Assessment criteria:

* Way of handling students’ complaints;
* Measures for student support;
* Information and advice during the study program by the study program/central services;
* Communication of educational objectives as well as education and examination regulations;
* Organisation and guidance of international student exchange (including guidance for and integration of foreign students).

**The opinion of the assessment panel:**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination of and on the consideration of the following:

*The fact that student are not well informed on the complain procedure is recognized at Faculty and more collaboration between management team and students is encouraged. Regular meetings should be organized. The syllabi and curriculum should be available to all students in a written form (pocket site) since information from the web site is not usable very often. Results of the student evaluation should be made transparent to all structures on the faculty.*

**Opinion on Criterion 4, Students:**

Based on the opinions of:

Indicator 4.1, assessment and testing:

Indicator 4.2, practical training:

Indicator 4.3, condition of admission:

Indicator 4.4, student involvement in the improvement of the teaching/learning process:

Indicator 4.5, measures for promoting mobility, including mutual recognition of credits:

Indicator 4.6, coaching of students:

Indicator 4.7 information, consultation and complaining system:

the assessment panel holds the opinion that generic quality, concerning criterion 4, is present in the study program.

*Students from this Faculty are not involved in exchange programs and not going abroad to spend part of their training. More bilateral and multilateral agreements are needed as basis for exchange of nursing students and teaching staff. There should be more support for the international mobility of the students. University international office and management team from the faculty should put more efforts in organizing this activity for nursing students. Information, Consultation and Complaint System should be improved. Coaching system is not yet recognized. Introduction of mentorship for nursing students is recommended by panel members.*

**Criterion 5. Means and Facilities**

**Indicator 5.1 Material Aspects**

Assessment criteria:

Housing and facilities are adequate to realize the program. Teaching tolls are adequate for introducing new teaching methodologies and for introducing innovations in teaching process.

* Policy on premises and facilities;
* Size and quality (= degree to which they are geared to the objectives of the study program) of lecture halls;
* Practical rooms and laboratories;
* Library facilities; books and periodicals;
* Self-study centers;
* Computer facilities;
* Study program-related research infrastructure;
* Student and teacher facilities;
* Accessibility of the facilities;
* Size of the available financial resources.

**The opinion of the assessment panel:**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination of and on the consideration of the following:

*Faculty poses own building and well developed structure that will be supplemented with the modern equipment for teaching over the next few months. Faculty management is currenly contemplating the transfer of the school to new location.*

*The quantity of books in the library is limited, many books are out of date.*

**Opinion on Criterion 5, Means and Facilities:**

Based on the opinions of:

Indicator 5.1, material aspects

*The quantity of books in the library is limited, many books are out of date, so the library fond should be renewed for next academic year.*

**Criterion 6. Internal Quality Control**

**Indicator 6.1 Evaluation Results**

Assessment criteria:

The course is being evaluated periodically through usage of different testable targets. Systematic measures to follow up on the teaching process are introduced. Quality structures are established and the quality of teaching within the study program is permanently monitored.

* Description of the quality policy and of the approach of the internal quality assurance;
* Existence of quality structures;
* Depersonalized summary of the measured results of the study program;
* Dynamics of evaluation procedures;
* Usage of results obtained during evaluation process.

**The opinion of the assessment panel:**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination of and on the consideration of the following:

*Structure necessary for quality control exist at the university level but not on the faculty level (IPA project 2011.2015). Permanently monitoring of teaching process is needed. The existence of quality structures as well as the dynamics of evaluation procedures is well described, although the approach to the internal quality assurance is little explained. There is no summary of measured results of the study program. The usage of the results of evaluation process is formal, but not used for the improvement of the teaching process. Quality assurance is provided every two years.*

**Indicator 6.2 Measures for Improvement**

Assessment criteria:

The results of evaluation are the starting point for a strategic and operational approach in the introduction, the improvement and the development of demonstrable measures necessary for the realization of the educational objectives. Improvement measures are based on threats and weaknesses noticed during the evaluation process.

* Degree to which past targets were achieved;
* Degree to which the targets for the future are well founded;
* Improvement actions in the study program (allocation of resources, designation of responsibilities and powers, planning and monitoring project management);
* Special attention for the response to findings and recommendations of the former assessment visit and results of student evaluations.

**The opinion of the assessment panel:**

The assessment panel formed an opinion based on the determination of and on the consideration of the following:

*Previous self assessment measures have taken in consideration and have not been used in full extent for the improvement of different aspects of educational process.*

*Some weak points from the former assessment in educational process were recognized but did not find an improvement action in the study program. A strategic approach for a periodically systematic students’ evaluation with well defined aims and planned usage of the results in order to improve teaching process should be implemented. The results and the consequences out of the results should be made transparent to all groups of the faculty. There should be improvement actions in the study program such as allocation of resources and designation of responsibilities. Monitor visits of project outcome were set up on several occasions during last two years. The targets for future are not clearly founded.*

**Opinion on Criterion 6, Internal Quality Control:**

Based on the opinions of:

Indicator 6.1, evaluation results:

Indicator 6.2, measures for improvement:

*The summary of measured results of the study program has to be provided. The usage of the results should be used for the improvement of the teaching process. Quality assurance need to be provided every year.There should be improvement actions in the study program such as allocation of resources, designation of responsibilities, etc.*

**Global Opinion**

The assessment panel based its opinion and its motivation on the following sources:

* The study programme’s self-evaluation report (SER) and its appendices, the conducted interviews with all parties concerned,
* The available documents during the assessment visit,
* The requested documents,
* The study program’s reaction on the assessment report.

Based on the opinions of:

Criterion 1, educational objectives and learning outcomes:

Criterion 2, curriculum:

Criterion 3, staff:

Criterion 4, students:,

Criterion 5, means and facilities:

Criterion 6, internal quality control:

the assessment panel holds the opinion that there is a **fair quality** present in the study program.

**Overview of the Opinions**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Indicator Score | Criterion Score |
| Criterion 1: Educational Objectives and Learning Outcomes | | 7 |
| Indicator 1.1 Level and Orientation | 7 |  |
| Indicator 1.2 Domain Specific demands | 7 |
| Criterion 2: Curriculum | | 6.5 |
| Indicator 2.1 Correspondence between Objectives and the Content of the Programme | 6 |  |
| Indicator 2.2 Demands Professional and Academic Alignment | 6 |
| Indicator 2.3 Coherence Programme | 6 |
| Indicator 2.4 Workload | 6 |
| Indicator 2.5 Coherence of the Organization of the Learning Process and Contents | 7 |
| Indicator 2.6 Master’s Thesis | 7 |
| Criterion 3: Staff | | 6 |
| Indicator 3.1 Quality of Staff | 6 |  |
| Indicator 3.2 Demands Professional/Academic Alignment | 6 |
| Indicator 3.3 Quantity of Staff | 6 |
| Criterion 4: Students | | 7 |
| Indicator 4.1 Assessment and Testing | 7 |  |
| Indicator 4.2 Practical training | 7 |
| Indicator 4.3 Condition of Admission | 1o |
| Indicator 4.4 Student Involvement in the Improvement of the Teaching/Learning Processes | 6 |
| Indicator 4.5 Measures for promoting Mobility, Including the Mutual recognition of Credits | 6 |
| Indicator 4.6 Coaching of Students | 6 |
| Indicator 4.7 Information, Consultation and Complaining System | 6 |
| Criterion 5: Means and Facilities |  | 7 |
| Indicator 5.1 Material Aspects | 7 |  |
| Criterion 6: Internal Quality Control | |  |
| Indicator 6.1 Evaluation Results | 7 |  |
| Indicator 6.2 Measures for Improvement | 7 |
|  |  |
|  | |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |

The opinions are applicable to: University of Montenegro, study program of Nursing, High Medical school Berane.

Site visit schedule

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Date 06.10.2016** | **University of Montenegro** | Activities |
| 09:00-09:30 | Study program | Meeting with self assessment team |
| 09:30-10:00 | Study program | Meeting management |
| 10:00-11:00 | Study program | Meeting academic staff |
| 11:00-11:30 | Study program | Coffee break |
| 11:30-12:00 | Study program | Meeting students |
| 12:00-13:00 | Study program | Meeting representatives of administration |
| 13:00-14:00 | Study program | Program tour |
| 14:00-15:00 | Study program | Lunch break |
| 15.00-15.30 | Study program | Oral report |