



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 CIVIL ENGINEERING,  
UNIVERSITY OF OSIJEK

23 - 24 January, 2008

ZAGREB, January 2008

---

Savska cesta 41/8  
10 000 Zagreb, Croatia  
T + 385 1 6274 830  
F + 385 1 6274 831  
E mail: vpetrov@azvo.hr  
W 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), 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*

#### **Academician Alojz Kralj**

Former rector of the University of Ljubljana and professor at the Faculty of Electrical Engineering in Ljubljana, in retirement. Long-standing associate of the EUA; expert on evaluation of higher education institutions and QA audit.

### *Member of Committee*

#### **Prof. Marinka Drobnič – Košorok, PhD**

Professor at the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, University of Ljubljana, vice chair of the Senate for Evaluation at the Council for Higher Education of the Republic of Slovenia; chair of the Quality Assurance Committee at the University of Ljubljana; internal auditor for ISO 17 025.

### *Member of Committee*

#### **Assistant prof. Aleksandra Deluka- Tibljaš, PhD**

Vice dean for teaching and education at the Faculty of Civil Engineering, University of Rijeka; chair of the Quality Assurance Committee at the University of Rijeka.

### *Member of Committee*

#### **Assistant prof. Duško Pavletić, PhD**

Chairman of the Board for Quality Management and Development at the Faculty of Engineering, University of Rijeka. Lead auditor for ISO 9001:2000 quality management system.

### *Member of Committee*

#### **Krešimir Bašić**

Student at the University of Zagreb, School of Dental Medicine, president of the Students' Union, member of the Quality Assurance Committee at the University of Zagreb.

### *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 are conducted according to the agreed protocol

### **January 23, 2008 – First day**

- 09.00-10.00 Meeting with the management. Subject: Setting up of QA system
- 10.00-12.00 Meeting with the Committee for higher education quality assurance and development, and the representative of QA office  
Subject: Relationship with the University Centre for Higher Education Quality Assurance and Development and the management of the Faculty
- 12.00-13.30 Lunch
- 13.30-16.30 Teaching process – Meeting with teacher representatives from all years  
Analysis of and discussion on documents relating to teaching process

### **January 24, 2008 - Second day**

- 09.00-10.00 Meeting with student representatives from all years
- 10.00-11.00 Meeting with the administrative and technical staff (assistants to the dean)
- 11.00-12.30 Visits to library and laboratories
- 12.30-13.30 Lunch
- 13.30-15.00 Meeting with external stakeholders
- 15.00-16.00 Internal meeting of the Audit Committee – drafting of conclusions and recommendations
- 16.00-16.30 Informing the management on the conclusions and recommendations

## **5. Conclusions of the Audit Committee on a degree of development of QA system at the Institution**

Audit was based on “Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area“, as well as predefined criteria (based on FINHEEC criteria, Add. 1) item 2.1.

*Based on observations, the Committee concludes that quality assurance system at the Faculty of Civil Engineering, University of Osijek, is set and in an initial phase of development, with some elements in a developing phase. It is the opinion of this Committee that the score would have been higher had the Faculty provided an elaborate and transparent vision, mission and strategy as basic documents of quality assurance system.*

### Recommendations:

The Committee finds that quality assurance system should be developed in accordance with ESG and that HRN EN ISO 9001:2002 was a good starting point for introducing the system at the Faculty primarily for managerial and administrative purposes.

We recommend that development of the system should be continued by following the principles of ESG and European good practice.

The Faculty should work towards drafting of strategic documents (mission, vision, strategy) and plans for development, as well as towards establishing itself in comparison with similar institutions in the EHEA, and drafting criteria by which it can measure the progress.

Chair of the Audit Committee:

Sergij Gabršček, PhD

Zagreb, 28 January, 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, December 2007

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 Civil Engineering, University of Osijek, by individual elements.**

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