

International Burch University

**REPORT ON EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC STAFF BY STUDENTS FOR  
FIRST & SECOND SEMESTER IN ACADEMIC 2013-2014**



Prepared by:  
Office for Standardization and  
Quality Assurance

Sarajevo, 2014

## CONTENT

Content.....	2
1. Introduction.....	3
2. Undergraduate degree.....	4
2.1. Department level.....	4
2.2. Faculty level.....	5
3. Master degree.....	6
3.1. Department level.....	6
3.2. Faculty level.....	7
4. PhD degree.....	8
4.1. Department level.....	8
4.2. Faculty level.....	9
5. Results of all three cycles & results in University level.....	10
5.1. Results of Departments of all three cycles.....	10
5.2. Results of Faculties of all three cycles.....	11
6. Conclusion.....	12

## 1. INTRODUCTION

International Burch University conducts evaluation of academic staff by students after each semester in every academic year. This is being done according to „Procedure for Evaluation of Academic Staff by Students“ of International Burch University adopted by Quality Board. Grading is being done in a way that students are evaluating lecturer's performance during the semester by marking it with the grade from 1 (very bad) to 4 (very good). Following questions are being asked:


1. Did the course increase your knowledge and interest in the subject matter
2. During instruction teachers articulation was comprehensible and easy to follow
3. During instruction the teacher has been determinative and effective in class management
4. Extra time has been allocated to students apart from class time
5. Teacher has always been prompt for his classes. He started and ended his classes on time
6. The course content has been taught in an elaborate and comprehensive way
7. The course was conducted in accordance with the specified plan
8. The teacher has always been ready and well prepared to give the lecture
9. The teacher has had a positive attitude in his rapport with the students. His established communication with the students was constructive.
10. Were the methods of evaluating your work fair?
11. Were the textbooks and/or reading materials helpful for understanding the subject matter?

Office for Standardization and Quality Assurance is collecting all results of academic staff considering all faculties and departments at all three cycles of study, and creates report on evaluation of academic staff by students for respective semester and academic year in University level.

Accordingly, this report is Report on Evaluation of Academic Staff by Students for first (fall) and second (spring) semester in academic 2013-2014 in University level. It will briefly present average grade that every department and faculty achieved in first, second and third cycle of studies. Accordingly, ranking of departments and faculties will be done.

## 2. UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE

### 2.1. DEPARTMENT LEVEL




Ranking of departments for Fall semester:

<b>I FALL SEMESTER 2014</b>		
<b>Ranking</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Average Grade</b>
1	Department of Genetics and Bioengineering	3.37
2	Department of Management	3.14
3	Department of Architecture	2.96
4	Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering	2.82
5	Department of Turkish Language and Literature	2.81
6	Department of English Language and Literature	2.75
7	Department of Information Technologies	2.74

Ranking of departments for Spring semester:

<b>II SPRING SEMESTER 2014</b>		
<b>Ranking</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Average Grade</b>
1	Department of Genetics and Bioengineering	2.98
2	Department of Information Technologies	2.93
3	Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering	2.9
4	Department of Management	2.82
5	Department of English Language and Literature	2.77
6	Department of Turkish Language and Literature	2.77
7	Department of Architecture	2.66

## 2.2. FACULTY LEVEL




According to results from Graph 2, it is possible to determine following rankings:

<b>I FALL SEMESTER 2013-2014</b>		
<b>Ranking</b>	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Average Grade</b>
1	Faculty of Engineering & IT	3.14
2	Faculty of Economics & Social Sciences	2.96
3	Education Faculty	2.78

<b>II SPRING SEMESTER 2013-2014</b>		
<b>Ranking</b>	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Average Grade</b>
1	Faculty of Engineering & IT	2.98
2	Faculty of Economics & Social Sciences	2.82
3	Education Faculty	2.77

### 3. MASTER DEGREE

#### 3.1. DEPARTMENT LEVEL




Accordingly, following rankings of Departments can be determined:

<b>I FALL SEMESTER SEMESTER 2014</b>		
<b>Ranking</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Average Grade</b>
1	Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering	3.78
2	Department of Genetics and Bioengineering	3.52
3	Department of English Language and Literature	3.45
4	Department of Information Technologies	3.45
5	Department of Management	3.4
6	Department of Architecture	3.2
7	Department of Turkish Language and Literature	2.95

<b>II SPRING SEMESTER 2014</b>		
<b>Ranking</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Average Grade</b>
1	Department of Genetics and Bioengineering	3.99
2	Department of Architecture	2.94
3	Department of Turkish Language and Literature	2.94
4	Department of English Language and Literature	2.92
5	Department of Management	2.91
6	Department of Information Technologies	2.84

### 3.2. FACULTY LEVEL




According to results from Graph 4, it is possible to determine following rankings:

<b>I FALL SEMESTER 2013-2014</b>		
<b>Ranking</b>	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Average Grade</b>
1	Faculty of Engineering & IT	3.44
2	Faculty of Economics & Social Sciences	3.4
3	Education Faculty	3.23

<b>II SPRING SEMESTER 2013-2014</b>		
<b>Ranking</b>	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Average Grade</b>
1	Faculty of Engineering & IT	2.96
2	Education Faculty	2.96
3	Faculty of Economics & Social Sciences	2.91

## 4. PhD DEGREE

### 4.1. DEPARTMENT LEVEL




According to information from Graph 5, following rankings can be determined:

<b>I FALL SEMESTER 2014</b>		
<b>Ranking</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Average Grade</b>
1	Department of Management	3.67
2	Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering	3.1
3	Department of Genetics and Bioengineering	3.1
4	Department of English Language and Literature	2.67
5	Department of Information Technologies	2.36
6	Department of Turkish Language and Literature	2.12

<b>II SPRING SEMESTER 2014</b>		
<b>Ranking</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Average Grade</b>
1	Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering	3.51
2	Department of English Language and Literature	2.97
3	Department of Turkish Language and Literature	2.93
4	Department of Information Technologies	2.93
5	Department of Management	2.79
6	Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering	3.51
7	Department of Genetics and Bioengineering	3.51



4.2. *FACULTY LEVEL*



Accordingly, following rankings can be determined:


<b>I FALL SEMESTER 2013-2014</b>		
<b>Ranking</b>	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Average Grade</b>
1	Faculty of Economics & Social Sciences	3.67
2	Faculty of Engineering & IT	2.73
3	Education Faculty	2.5

<b>II SPRING SEMESTER 2013-2014</b>		
<b>Ranking</b>	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Average Grade</b>
1	Education Faculty	2.97
2	Faculty of Engineering & IT	2.94
3	Faculty of Economics & Social Sciences	2.79

## 5. RESULTS OF ALL THREE CYCLES & RESULTS IN UNIVERSITY LEVEL

### 5.1. RESULTS OF DEPARTMENTS OF ALL THREE CYCLES

DEPARTMENT	UNDERGRADUATE		MASTER		DOCTORATE		TOTAL
	FALL SEMESTER	SPRING SEMESTER	FALL SEMESTER	SPRING SEMESTER	FALL SEMESTER	SPRING SEMESTER	
Department of Management	3.14	2.82	3.4	2.91	3.67	2.79	3.12
Department of English Language and Literature	2.75	2.77	3.45	2.92	2.67	2.97	2.92
Department of Turkish Language and Literature	2.81	2.77	2.95	2.94	2.12	2.93	2.75
Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering	2.82	2.9	3.78	-	3.1	3.51	3.22
Department of Genetics and Bioengineering	3.37	2.98	3.52	3.99	3.1	2.51	3.25
Department of Architecture	2.96	2.66	3.2	2.94	-	-	2.94
Department of Information Technologies	2.74	2.93	3.45	2.84	2.36	2.93	2.88




Based on results from previous table and graph 7, it is possible to prepare following ranking of departments in University level:

<b>RANKING</b>	<b>DEPARTMENT</b>	<b>GRADE</b>
1	Department of Genetics and Bioengineering	3.25
2	Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering	3.22
3	Department of Management	3.12
4	Department of Architecture	2.94
5	Department of English Language and Literature	2.92
6	Department of Information Technologies	2.88
7	Department of Turkish Language and Literature	2.75

## 5.2. RESULTS OF FACULTIES OF ALL THREE CYCLES

<b>FACULTY</b>	<b>UNDERGRADUATE</b>		<b>MASTER</b>		<b>DOCTORATE</b>		<b>TOTAL</b>
	<b>FALL SEMESTER</b>	<b>SPRING SEMESTER</b>	<b>FALL SEMESTER</b>	<b>SPRING SEMESTER</b>	<b>FALL SEMESTER</b>	<b>SPRING SEMESTER</b>	
Faculty of Engineering & IT	3.14	2.82	3.4	2.91	3.67	2.79	3.12
Faculty of Economics & Social Sciences	2.96	2.98	3.44	2.96	2.73	2.94	3.00
Education Faculty	2.78	2.77	3.23	2.96	2.5	2.97	2.87



Based on results from previous table and graph 7, it is possible to prepare following ranking of faculties in University level:

<b>RANKING</b>	<b>FACULTY</b>	<b>GRADE</b>
1	Faculty of Engineering & IT	3.12
2	Faculty of Economics & Social Sciences	3.00
3	Education Faculty	2.87

Average grade of teaching staff at International Burch University is 3.0.

## **6. CONCLUSION**

This report presented situation of quality of teaching process regarding both semesters in academic 2013-2014. The purpose is to have big picture of quality of teaching process, and to be able to compare results over years and monitor the progress. The report presented results through tables and graphs, but also conducted rankings of departments & faculties per all three cycles individually, and all together in order to come to result in University level. Considering overall grade in university level having value 3.0, it is possible to conclude that situation when it comes to quality of teaching process in the level of International Burch University is good and that students are satisfied with the process. However, when having in mind that measuring scale is within range from 1 to 4, it is obvious that still there is space for improvement.

Approved by:

---

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Günay KARLI

Vice Rector for Education and Student Affairs