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U SARAJEVO

INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY
OF SARAJEVO

- SENATE -

No: IUS-SEMAT 11-1015/2012
Date: May 24th, 2012

Pursuant to Article 126 of Law on a Higher Education ("Official Gazette of Sarajevo Canton", no 22/10 - Revised text) and the Proposal of IUS QA Office no IUS-02-953/12 from May 14th, 2012, the Senate of the International University of Sarajevo, at its 24th meeting held on May 24th, 2012, brings the following

DECISION
on administering random evaluation in English Language Proficiency

I
With this decision, IUS is establishing a regular instrument of its internal quality assurance system. The purpose of this instrument is to assure the quality and systematic approach to improvements in the defined area.

II
QA Office is authorized to administer detailed evaluations in English Language proficiency.

III
Evaluation is to become a regular, random practice among IUS staff and students, based on a sampling technique that will not create burden on those implementing it. Minimal annual sampling size must be 10% of target group and can be done in several cycles throughout the year.

IV
QA Office is authorized to suggest teams, coordinate the activities and devise measures for improvement in accordance to the Regulation on administering random evaluation in English Language Proficiency. QA Office is to provide reports on this activity regularly to IUS Rector, those who were evaluated and their direct supervisor.

QA Office reports may, in special circumstances, serve as a basis for measures of improvement and other legal procedures in accordance with the Statute and General Acts.

V
This decision becomes effective as of the day it was rendered.

Deliver to:
- 1x QA Office
- 1x Senate
- 1x a/a

[Signature]
Prof. Dr. Ozren Ćinar

Hrasnička cesta 15, 71000 Sarajevo; Tel.: +387 33 957 100; Fax.: +387 33 957 105; www.ius.edu.ba
e-mail: info@ius.edu.ba; ID: 4200877730003, UFI - 1656/03, Porezni djelovodni broj: 01704418
Pursuant to Article 126 of Law on a Higher Education ("Official Gazette of Sarajevo Canton"; no 22/10 - Revised text) and the Proposal of IUS QA Office no IUS-92-933/12 from May 14th, 2012, the Senate of the International University of Sarajevo, at its 24th meeting held on May 24th, 2012, brings the following

DECISION on adopting of the Guidelines for administering random evaluation in English Language Proficiency

I

The Guidelines for administering random evaluation in English Language Proficiency at the International University of Sarajevo is hereby adopted.

II

The Guidelines are attached to this Decision and represent its integral part.

III

This decision becomes effective as of the day it was rendered.

Deliver to:
- 1x QA Office
- 1x Senate
- 1x a/a

Prof. Dr. Ozel Cinar

Rector
GUIDELINES for administering random evaluation in English Language Proficiency at the International University of Sarajevo

1. QA Office will suggest and IUS Senate will approve an annual team for English Language proficiency evaluation. The Team for evaluation will consist of IUS staff. Only in the case that IUS cannot provide sufficient number of members for this team, it may consist of external members. All the costs borne from such an activity are to be paid by IUS and deducted from QA Office annual budget.

2. The Team will formulate levels, favorably in accordance to the existing international standards and testing methods, and define in detail all the instruments, tests and evaluation methods to be used. This activity is to be done in cooperation with QA Office and is to be approved by QA Office Manager.

3. QA Office is obliged to define as broad as possible target groups and in case of small target groups, evaluation must cover all the members. Target groups that are not considered small are (IUS staff, academic staff, non-academic staff, FENS, FASS, FBA, ELS, students). After defining target groups, a decision is to be communicated and all the members informed.

4. QA Office must ensure random sampling technique to be used and all the target members are to be informed of and invited to attend the selection of random sample through regular communication channels at IUS. QA Office is to perform this activity even if no target group members appear, having provided that at least three IUS employees attend the event and sign the record.

5. This instrument for administering random evaluation in English Language Proficiency can be used by IUS managers, namely Rector and Deans in a limited capacity so it would limit each of them to request for only one targeted evaluation a year.

6. QA Office in cooperation with the Team and selected members will arrange the evaluation process at least seven days in advance. Failure to appear at the scheduled evaluation will grant the individual additional option to arrange for another evaluation within two weeks. Failure to arrange or attend this second evaluation grants the Team authority to perform evaluation as desired, not later than a week after the second evaluation attempt was not successful.

7. The Team is to work independently and to produce evaluation results, within two working days after the evaluation is completed. Apart from the overall evaluation and level, the results must contain identified areas for improvement. The evaluation results are to be produced in three copies and delivered to the evaluated individual and QA Office.
8. The results of Team's evaluation are not disputable. In case the evaluated individual is not satisfied with the evaluation, he/she is to respond within three days after the receipt of the evaluation results and to send a letter directly to QA Office (securing a proof that it has been delivered/received by QA Office). In case an individual believes that his/her level of proficiency is higher than evaluated, he/she is to provide an external evaluation only from the institutions/tests recognized internationally and approved by QA Office. This external evaluation results are to be provided within two months.

9. QA Office is to study the evaluation results and propose improvement measures on individual or institutional level. Nevertheless, QA Office is to produce a feedback to the evaluated individual not later than thirty days after the evaluation results are received.

10. All those individuals that were to implement the improvement measures are subject to re-evaluation. Even though IUS might offer some of its resources and capacities, the individual will be fully responsible for the actual improvements achieved.

11. QA Office will provide clear instructions to the Team and will guide its activities within the scope of internal quality assurance process.
SENATE:

No: IUS-SENAT 11-1017/2012
Date: May 24th, 2012

Pursuant to Article 126 of Law on a Higher Education (“Official Gazette of Sarajevo Canton”), no 22/10 - Revised text and the Proposal of IUS QA Office no IUS-02-933/12 from May 14th, 2012, the Senate of the International University of Sarajevo, at its 24th meeting held on May 24th, 2012, brings the following

DECISION

on appointment of the Annual Team for English Language Proficiency Evaluation for 2012

I

IUS Senate establishes the Annual Team for English Language Proficiency Evaluation as a part of its internal quality assurance system.

The following IUS employees are appointed as members of the Annual Team for English Language Proficiency Evaluation for 2012:

6. Barbara Ann Brown (Chair)
7. Tarik Basdjak
8. Ervin Kovačević
9. Hital Karić
10. Azra Radalić

II

The Team will work in close cooperation with the IUS QA Office and in accordance with the IUS Senate Decision no IUS-SENAT-1015/12, dated May 24th, 2012, and the Guidelines on administering random evaluation in English Language proficiency no IUS-SENAT-1016/12, dated May 24th, 2012.

QA Office is authorized to guide the work of the Team in all the issues not regulated in the above mentioned documents.

III

It is expected that the Team will respect the highest academic standards, particularly paying attention to impartiality, confidentiality, integrity, objectivity and fair judgment.

Team Chair is authorized to manage the work of the Team and all members are required to state for each particular evaluation if they have any personal or any other conflict of interests that would jeopardize any of the above mentioned standards.

IV

This decision becomes effective as of the day it was rendered.

Delivered to:
- 1x QA Office
- 1x Senate
- 1x IUS

Hrasnička cesta 15, 71000 Sarajevo; Tel.: +387 33 957 100; Fax.: +387 33 957 105; www.ius.edu.ba
E-mail: info@ius.edu.ba; ID: 4200877730003, UFI: - 1005/03, Porezni djelovodni broj: 01704418
2 October 2012
Reference Number: IUS.02-2118/12

Pursuant to IUS Senate Decision number IUS-SENAT 11-1017/12 dated 24 May 2012, English Language Proficiency Evaluation Team on its regular session held on 2 October 2012 have adopted the following:

Regulation on Implementation of English Language Proficiency Evaluation at IUS
(Revised version)

A) Desired Levels of Proficiency and Definition of Employment Ranks

1) Employees at IUS have been placed in three categories:

2) Desired levels of proficiency have been determined based upon NATO International Staff English Language Equivalencies.¹

3) The following ranks and desired proficiency levels² have been determined by the team:
   - Academic Staff – Professors, Teaching Staff, Assistants: 75.80 (C1);
   - Other Staff – Managers in all departments: 65-75 (B2);
   - Clerical Staff – Administrative Assistants in all departments: 45-55 (A2).

4) Members of the team will determine if IUS faculty and staff fulfills the relevant language proficiency criteria.

5) The IUS Proficiency Chart indicates the credentials required for IUS faculty and staff to be considered proficient.³

6) The team will develop and use forms⁴ to evaluate both written and oral skills.

7) Three copies of the team’s evaluation will be prepared. One will be given to the participant, and two copies will be given to the IUS QA office.

8) Those who have undergone evaluation by the IUS English Language Proficiency Team will be exempt from evaluations for a period of five years.

¹ Attachment #1 is part of this Regulation.
² Attachment #2 is part of this Regulation.
³ If the interviewee has graduated more than 10 years ago, and the person has not been using English consistently since her graduation in research and teaching, then the person will be evaluated according to Criterion 2.
⁴ Attachment #3 is part of this Regulation.
B) Team Members Responsibilities

1) Each team member will attend all meetings and perform assigned tasks related to the evaluation process;

2) Team members will be excluded from the following duties:
   1. Tutoring those who do not have desired levels established by the Team;
   2. Teaching language classes to those who do not have desired levels established by the team.

C) Staff Evaluation: Methods and Procedures

1. Evaluation of Academic Staff

Writing will be evaluated according to clarity, correct vocabulary, and sound grammatical structure. Speaking and oral communication skills will be evaluated based on clarity, fluency and accuracy. The academic staff member must fulfill at least one of the following conditions to be deemed “proficient” in English:

Condition (1): If the staff credentials are listed in the Proficiency Chart, then they are considered to be proficient (reading Exemptions in attachment #1);

Condition (2): A successful evaluation of their written and spoken communication English skills must take place using the following procedure:

   A. Evaluation of Writing: Academic Staff will be asked to submit a writing sample in English. The writing sample can be (a) an academic paper they have submitted for publication in the past five years, or (b) a summary of conference proceedings in English from a conference they have attended in the past five years, or (c) a copy of their curriculum vitae (CV) in English, or (d) a written response to a set of questions relating to their academic area of expertise. These questions will be formulated by the Team and will be specifically crafted for the academic staff member under evaluation. The questions will be delivered through a private e-mail and the academic staff member under evaluation will have a week to formulate a written response to the questions in English. The answers will be considered as a writing sample submitted by the academic staff member. All writing samples must be at least 300 words in length.

   B. Evaluation of Speaking/Oral Communication Skills: After completing the writing evaluation above, the team has a maximum period of six weeks to conduct an oral evaluation of the academic staff member. The evaluation may take one of the following two formats:
a) The academic staff member under evaluation may be observed during a classroom lecture session by two members of the team to assess if their oral presentation skills in English are adequate to the defined proficiency level.

b) The team may conduct a short 10-15 minute interview with the academic staff member asking three to five questions regarding their academic area of expertise, their research interests, their career plans, conferences they have attended in the past, their experience in BH or a story from their country of origin, or any relevant question that displays their basic ability of self expression, listening comprehension, and comfort-level with communication in English. The interview must be recorded.

- The academic staff will be free to choose from one of the two speaking evaluation methods mentioned above (a) or (b)). Once the academic staff member has chosen the method by which they will be evaluated, the evaluation team will arrange a date and place for the evaluation to take place. If the academic staff member does not choose the method of evaluation by the given deadline, the team will choose the method of evaluation. The team will inform the academic staff member at least one week in advance of the scheduled evaluation.

2. Evaluation of Managerial Staff

Writing and speaking will be evaluated based on clarity of speech, fluency and accuracy. Members of the team will determine if the managerial staff member fulfills the relevant language proficiency criteria. As part of their work, managers must be able to read, write and communicate clearly through spoken English to academic staff members, students and their families. The staff member will be deemed “proficient” in English:

Condition (1): The staff credentials are listed in the Proficiency Chart, then they are considered to be proficient in English” (leading Exemptions in attachment #1);

Condition (2): If a successful evaluation of their written and spoken communication in English skills takes place using the following procedure:

A. Evaluation of Writing: Managerial Staff will be asked to submit a writing sample in English. The writing sample can be (a) a copy of their curriculum vitae (CV) in English, or (b) any official document prepared in relation to basic employment duties, or (c) a written response to a set of questions relating to their professional experience, goals and position at IUS as well as other appropriate assessment questions. These questions will be formulated by the team and will be specifically

---

a) If the interviewee has graduated more than 10 years ago, and the person has not been using English consistently since his/her graduation in research and teaching, then the person will be evaluated according to Condition 2.
crafted according to type of position held by the manager and the nature of their responsibilities at IUS. The questions will be delivered through a private e-mail and the staff member under evaluation will have a week to formulate a written response to the questions in English. The answers will be considered as a writing sample submitted by the managerial staff member. All writing samples must be at least 200 words in length.

B. Evaluation of Speaking/Oral Communication Skills: After completing the writing evaluation above, the team has a maximum period of six weeks to conduct an oral evaluation of the managerial staff member. The team will conduct a short interview with the managerial staff member. They will ask the staff member three to five questions that will display their basic ability to communicate in English, their listening comprehension skills and ability to understand and maintain a verbal discussion in English. The interview will help determine their general comfort-level with the language. A general example of these questions would be: “What are you required to do each week?” or “What is most challenging aspect of dealing with students?” or “What do you think would make your job easier?” etc. The interview must be recorded.

Once the staff member’s writing sample has been evaluated, which should be completed within seven days of submission, the team will arrange a date and place for the interview to take place. The team will inform the staff member at least one week in advance of the scheduled evaluation/interview.

3. Evaluation of Clerical Staff

Clerical staff are expected to conduct simple administrative tasks in English. They should have the basic ability to communicate verbally and understand commands and simple questions in English. The focus will be on evaluating speaking and oral communication skills. The staff member will be deemed “proficient” if they fulfil at least one of the following conditions:

Condition (1): If the staff credentials are listed in the Proficiency Chart, then they are considered to be proficient in English⁴ (reading Exemptions in attachment #1);
Condition (2): If they undergo a successful evaluation of their written and spoken English skills using the following procedure

A. Evaluation of Writing: Clerical Staff will be asked to submit a writing sample in English. The writing sample can be a written response to a set of questions relating to their professional experience, goals and position at IUS as well as other

⁴ If the interviewee has graduated more than 10 years ago, and the person has not been using English consistently since his/her graduation in research and teaching, then the person will be evaluated according to Condition 2.
appropriate assessment questions. These questions will be formulated by the
Team and will be specifically oriented according to type of position held by the
staff member and the nature of their responsibilities at IUS. The questions will be
delivered through a private e-mail and the staff member under evaluation will
have a week to formulate a written response to the questions in English. The
answers will be considered as a writing sample submitted by the clerical staff
member. All writing samples must be between 100-150 words in length.

8. Evaluation of Speaking/Oral Communication Skills: The team will conduct a
short interview with the clerical staff member. They will ask the staff member
two to ten questions that will display their basic ability to communicate in
English, their ability to understand and use key phrases and greetings in English,
and the ability to communicate their intentions or demands. The interview will
help determine their general comfort-level with the language and if their level of
competency allows them to carry on with their day to day tasks. A general
example of these questions would be: “What is your name?” or “What did you do
last weekend?”, or “What is your favorite part of IUS?”, or “What is your favorite sports
team?” etc. The interview must be recorded.

* The evaluation team will arrange a date and place for the interview to take place.
The team will inform the staff member at least one week in advance of the
scheduled evaluation interview.

Team Members:

Dr. Barbara Brown
Hilal Kario
Ervin Kostovcic
Azra Bashadin
QA Officer Manager:
Enel Dolic
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill Group</th>
<th>Skills Description</th>
<th>Language Level</th>
<th>Proficiency Level</th>
<th>Required Courses</th>
<th>GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic and Teaching Skill</td>
<td>Interpret and analyze complex and multifaceted information from sources in multiple languages.</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>English (Second Language)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Skill</td>
<td>Manage and communicate business information in English.</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>English (Second Language)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Skill</td>
<td>Adapt and effectively present ideas and solutions in a diverse and multicultural context.</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>English (Second Language)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Listening</strong></td>
<td>Can recognize familiar words and very simple phrases concerning themselves, familiar and daily concrete situations, when spoken slowly and clearly.</td>
<td>Can understand phrases and simple sentences concerning familiar themes, daily concrete situations, names, localities, family, etc., spoken slowly and clearly.</td>
<td>Can understand a number of clear standard speech and occasional simple sentences spoken clearly, when context or visual clues permit.</td>
<td>Can understand extended speech, provided it is clear and spoken slowly and clearly.</td>
<td>Can understand extended speech, provided it is quite slow and clearly spoken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading</strong></td>
<td>Can understand familiar names, words and very simple sentences, for example announcements and notices in catalogues.</td>
<td>Can understand very short, simple sentences. Can provide information in simple everyday material such as advertisements, notices, menus and short familiar letters.</td>
<td>Can understand potential students' ability of high frequency everyday or informal language. Can understand descriptions of events, feelings and others in personal letters.</td>
<td>Can understand long and complex technical and literary texts, appreciating dimensions of style.</td>
<td>Can read and understand scientific and technical literature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaking</strong></td>
<td>Can interact in a simple way with other people in situations which are familiar to them, e.g. when they are shopping. Can answer simple questions in these situations.</td>
<td>Can communicate in simple and direct exchange of information about familiar persons and activities. Can understand very short, simple sentences, even though they are not fully understood.</td>
<td>Can interact with a degree of fluency and spontaneity that makes clear interaction with native speakers possible. Can express an active or passive interest in everyday life (e.g. family, home, work, etc.).</td>
<td>Can express ideas and opinions with precision and relate their contribution clearly to those of other speakers.</td>
<td>Can express an active or passive interest in everyday life (e.g. family, home, work, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Writing</strong></td>
<td>Can write a short, simple personal letter, for example, thank you notes. Can write in familiar, simple, personal or routine contexts.</td>
<td>Can write short, simple, personal letters, e.g. notes, short, personal or routine contexts.</td>
<td>Can write clear, short, direct, personal letters describing personal experiences and preferences.</td>
<td>Can write clear, short, direct, personal letters describing personal experiences and preferences.</td>
<td>Can write clear, short, direct, personal letters describing personal experiences and preferences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ENGLISH LANGUAGE EVALUATION FORM
for IUS STAFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMPLOYEE:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name-Surname</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at IUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Evaluation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Fits into the Proficiency Chart</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which category in the chart?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Evaluation of Written and Spoken English:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Written:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of the written work:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency level of the written work:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Spoken:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Evaluation of Speaking/Oral Communication Skills:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Class observation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Observation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation Report / Areas for Improvement:

Team member: ........................................

Team member: ........................................

Date: ........................................