



agencija za znanost i visoko obrazovanje

azvo

CARDS 2003 Project “Furtherance of the Agency for Science and Higher Education in its Quality Assurance Role and the Development of a Supporting Information System”



## SUMMARY OF QUALITY ASSURANCE AUDIT REPORT

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING,  
UNIVERSITY OF RIJEKA  
February 26 – 27, 2008

ZAGREB, February 2008

---

Savska cesta 41/8  
10 000 Zagreb, Croatia  
T + 385 1 6274 800  
F + 385 1 6274 801  
E mail: [jhavranek@azvo.hr](mailto:jhavranek@azvo.hr)  
W [www.azvo.hr](http://www.azvo.hr)



## **Introduction**

In accordance with “Education Sector Development Plan 2005–2010” by Croatian Ministry of Science, Education and Sport, and “Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG)” by E4 (ENQA, EUA, EURASHE and ESIB), during 2007 ASHE's Quality Assurance Department designed a model of QA audit of Croatian higher education institutions, in cooperation with consultants on CARDS 2003 Project, “Furtherance of the Agency for Science and Higher Education in its Quality Assurance Role and the Development of a Supporting Information System”. This collaboration included a number of consultations on development of audit model as well as joint seminars for representatives of academic community and other stakeholders in higher education.

Consultants' proposal to launch a pilot project of QA audit of 3 higher education institutions within the CARDS 2003 Project was adopted by the Management Board of ASHE on July 17, 2007, and Ministry of Science, Education and Sport gave its consent on September 6, 2007. By the end of 2007, extensive preparations have been made for carrying out of the audit process.

With support from CARDS project, ASHE's Quality Assurance Department held a series of seminars educating the first generation of experts for QA audit and establishing a national body of experts, comprising members of academic community from all Croatian universities, student representatives and representatives of the business community.

Universities submitted their proposals of institutions to be audited within the pilot project and ASHE outlined the procedures and signed an agreement on audit with every institution individually.

Višnja Petrović

Head of QA Department

Agency for Science and Higher Education

## **Audit Committee**

### *Chair*

**Sergij Gabršček, PhD**

Team leader of CARDS 2003 project „Furtherance of the Agency for Science and Higher Education in its Quality Assurance Role and the Development of a Supporting Information System“, expert on evaluation of higher education institutions and QA audit.

### *Member of Committee*

Assistant Prof. **Bogomir Mihevc, PhD**

Independent advisor for quality assurance and development of teaching and R&D at the quality assurance and student support centre, University of Ljubljana.

### *Member of Committee*

Prof. **Jasna Helena Mencer, PhD**

Professor at the University of Zagreb, rector of the University of Zagreb (2002-2006), member of the *Institutional Evaluation Programme (IEP) of European University Association (EUA)*, associate of *Hungarian Accreditation Committee (HAC)*.

### *Member of Committee*

Prof. **Bruno Saftić, PhD**

Professor at the University of Zagreb, Faculty of Mining, Geology and Petroleum Engineering, ASHE expert on audit of quality assurance systems at HEIs, member of the University Council for Quality Assurance as a representative of the Natural Sciences Council.

### *Member of Committee*

**Romana Vidić, BSc** – representative of the business community (SMS Split), ASHE expert on audit of quality assurance systems at HEIs.

### *Member of Committee*

**Šime Višić**

Student at the University of Zagreb, Faculty of Organization and Informatics, Varaždin, Chairman of the Students' Union Assembly at the University of Zagreb, member of the University Council, ASHE expert on audit of quality assurance systems at HEIs.

### *Member of Committee*

**Vesna Dodiković Jurković, PhD**

Representative of ASHE, expert on quality assurance and Internal Quality Risk Manager/Auditor for ISO 9001.

## 2.5. Visit of the Audit Committee

According to its obligations set out by the Agreement, ASHE submitted the protocol of the visit of Audit Committee.

Site visit and audit procedure were conducted according to the agreed protocol.

### *The Protocol*

#### February 26, 2008 - First day

- 9.00-11.30 Meeting with the management. Subject: Setting up of QA system  
Meeting with the committee for higher education quality assurance and development, and the representative of QA office
- 11.30-12.30 Meeting with representatives of students from all years (2 representatives for every year)
- 12.30-14.00 Afternoon break
- 14.00-15.30 Meeting with teacher representatives from all years
- 15.30-16.30 Meeting with external stakeholders (representatives of local community, business community, media)

#### February 27, 2008 – Second day

- 09.30-10.30 Meeting with the administrative and technical staff (assistants to the dean)
- 10.30-11.30 Visits to library, laboratories and workshops
- 11.30-12.30 Internal meeting of the Audit Committee - drafting of observations
- 12.30-14.00 Afternoon break
- 14.00-16.00 Internal meeting of the Audit Committee - drafting of conclusions and recommendations
- 16.00-17.00 Informing the management on the conclusions and recommendations

## **5. Conclusions of the Audit Committee on a degree of development of QA system at the Faculty of Engineering, University of Rijeka**

The Committee compared the existing QA system at the Faculty of Engineering with ESG standards and reached its decision on a degree of development of QA system at the institution.

*Quality assurance system is in a developing phase, moving onto advanced phase, which is evident in many significant elements of the QA system. The Faculty should take into consideration all the observations and recommendations of the Audit Committee. All relevant documents should be transparent, i.e. published on Faculty web-site.*

Add. 1. is an integral part of this report – a table with categorizations of a degree of development by individual elements of the institution's QA system.


Chair of the Audit Committee:

Sergij Gabršček, PhD

Zagreb, 3 March, 2008

## AUDIT CRITERIA FOR ASSESSING A DEGREE OF DEVELOPMENT OF QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEMS

Audit goals	Preliminary phase	Initial phase	Developing phase	Advanced phase
1. Objectives, overall structure and internal cohesion of the quality assurance system	HEI has no QA procedures for its activities.	QA procedures exist for some activities, but are neither organised nor interconnected.	QA covers many of the activities of HEI and QA procedures make a cohesive QA system.	QA covers all or nearly all activities and QA procedures make a dynamic unity of QA system.
2. Documentation, including quality policy, and definition of procedures and responsibilities of all the stakeholders	Quality policy, procedures, stakeholders and responsibilities are not defined or documented.	Definition and documentation of responsibilities and procedures included in QAS are not adequate. Procedures are not adequately organized.	Procedures, stakeholders and responsibilities are defined clearly and comprehensively. Documentation is easily available. QAS is well-organized.	Procedures and distribution of activities are in accordance with documentation. QAS is well-organized and supports QA.
3. Comprehensiveness of QA	There is no QA in the activities and processes relating to the basic mission.	QA system covers isolated activities and processes mainly relating to educational levels.	QA system covers many activities and processes relating to the mission.	QA system covers procedures and activities related to the mission.
3. a) Study programmes	There is no QA of study programmes.	QA covers some isolated aspects of planning, implementation and evaluation of study programmes.	QA system covers several aspects of planning, implementation and evaluation of study programmes.	QA covers all major aspects of planning, implementation and evaluation of study programmes.
3. b) Research / R&D	There is no QA in research / R&D.	QA system covers certain isolated aspects of research / R&D.	QA covers several aspects of research / R&D.	QA covers all major aspects of research / R&D.
3. c) Interaction with, and impact on society; contribution to regional development	There is no QA relating to interaction with society and impact on society, or to regional development.	QA covers some isolated aspects of interaction with society, impact on society, and of regional development.	QA covers several aspects of interaction with society, impact on society, and of regional development.	QA covers all major aspects of interaction with society, impact on society, and of regional development.
3. d) Support and other services	There is no QA for support and services.	QA covers some aspects of support and other services.	QA covers several aspects of support and other services	QA covers all major aspects of support and other services.
3. e) Professional development of staff	QA does not cover professional development of staff	QA covers some aspects of the professional development of staff.	QA covers several aspects of the professional development of staff.	QA covers all major aspects of the professional development of staff.
4. Participation of staff, students and external stakeholders in QA	Staff, students and external stakeholders do not take part in	Some of the following groups are excluded from QA: - students	All the stakeholders take an active part in QA.	External stakeholders take an important part in audit process.

	QA.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- teachers</li> <li>- support services staff</li> <li>- researchers</li> <li>- administrative staff</li> <li>- management</li> <li>- external stakeholders</li> </ul>		Different staff groups are committed to and active in practical QA. Participation is based on common and shared values, and culture based on trust and equality.
5. Relationship between QAS and management	There are no links between management and QA.	Procedures and processes of QAS are separate from other procedures. Relationship between the management and QAS is inadequate.	QAS guides all operations. QAS information is used for system development. There is a clear relationship between QAS and management, monitoring process and development.	QAS is an integral part of operations, providing direction for all operations. Management is committed to development of QAS and takes responsibility for it. There are evidence on systematic use of information in managing, monitoring and development. QAS information provides an overall view of quality of education and other activities at the institution.
6. Relevance of, and access to quality assurance information	QA does not cater for internal stakeholders and information is not communicated within the institution.	There is no systematic processing of information. Information is not available to internal stakeholders.	QAS activities and key results are available to all internal stakeholders. QAS produces information that is relevant to internal stakeholders.	QAS is entirely transparent. There is an active internal communication relating to the QA. Information is systematically provided to all the stakeholders. Relevance of information to internal stakeholders is an important consideration in planning and continuous development of QAS.
7. Relevance and availability of QA information for external stakeholders	QA does not cater for external stakeholders and information is not communicated within the institution.	External stakeholders are insufficiently involved in planning and development of QAS. Information is not provided to external stakeholders on regular basis.	External stakeholders are clearly defined and their input is taken with due regard. Information on activities and key results of QAS is available to all the main external stakeholders.	External communication relating to QA is active and information is systematically communicated and targeted to different external stakeholders. The external

				stakeholders are provided with all the relevant information for planning and development of QAS.
8. Efficiency of QA procedures and structures and their effect on the development of activities	QA procedures are unable to identify sub-standard quality.	QA aims at maintaining the present level of quality. Sub-standard quality is adequately identified.	QA procedures stimulate development of activities and generate change. Sub-standard quality is efficiently identified.	Special attention is paid to methods and structures conducive to new ideas and their implementation. The operational culture encourages innovation. Sub-standard quality is efficiently identified.
9. Use of information produced by QA system as a tool for quality management and enhancement in education and other activities	Information relating to QA is not used as a tool for quality management and enhancement in education or other activities.	Use of QA information is sporadic. Information is collected with no specific purpose.	QA information is used as a tool in quality management and enhancement relating to education and other activities. Feedback is used for QA purposes.	The use of information is systematic. There is ample evidence of its effective use in the development of education and other activities.
10. Monitoring, evaluation and continuous development of QA system	There is no overall view of QA activities; they are not monitored or developed.	Institution has some idea on overall performance of QA system, but its activities are scarcely monitored and development of QAS is not planned.	Institution monitors performance of QAS and is mostly aware of main effects and outcomes. Development of QA system is planned and documented.	Institution monitors performance of QAS and is aware of its effects and outcomes. Development of QAS is planned and documented, and institute can easily demonstrate its effectiveness.

Zagreb, February 2008.

References: [http://www.kka.fi/files/102/KKA\\_406.pdf](http://www.kka.fi/files/102/KKA_406.pdf)

Abbreviations:

QA Quality Assurance

QAS Quality Assurance System

R&D Research and Development

**Degree of development of QA System at the Faculty of Engineering, University of Rijeka, by individual elements.**

**Decisions of the Audit Committee are highlighted.**