

**INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF SARAJEVO**  
**Internacionalni univerzitet u Sarajevu**

Number: IUS SENAT-11-3152/13

**BOOK OF RULES ON  
EVALUATION OF THE ACADEMIC  
STAFF PROCEDURES AT  
INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF  
SARAJEVO**

Pursuant to Article 112 of the Higher Education Law – Revised Version (“Official Gazette of the Sarajevo Canton”, issue 42/13); and Articles 124 and 188 of the Statute of International University of Sarajevo, number: IUS-SENAT-11-1503/2012 from 10.07.2012, (Revised Version) (**hereinafter: the Statute**), the Senate of International University of Sarajevo (**hereinafter: the Senate**), on its regular session held in Sarajevo on December 06<sup>th</sup> 2013 adopted the following

## **BOOK OF RULES ON EVALUATION OF THE ACADEMIC STAFF PROCEDURES AT INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF SARAJEVO**

### **1. General provisions**

#### **Article 1**

This Book of Rules sets out the procedures on evaluation of the academic staff at International University of Sarajevo (hereinafter: the University), the content of the evaluation form and of the students’ survey form, the method and procedure of conducting the evaluation, the criteria for defining the evaluation score, as well as the appropriate measures to be taken should the academic staff member be continuously negatively evaluated by the University in the period of two years.

The evaluation procedure integrates procedures for systematic evaluation of the academic staff by:

- a) the higher education institution, and
- b) students (in form of a students’ survey).

### **2. The evaluation procedure carried out by the higher education institution**

#### **Article 2**

As a rule, academic personnel will be evaluated based on their work starting from July 1<sup>st</sup> of the previous year until the June 30<sup>th</sup> of the current year. The evaluation procedure of work of the academic staff commences on July 2<sup>nd</sup> and concludes by the end of relevant academic year.

#### **Article 3**

The evaluation procedure must evaluate work of the academic staff in three key areas, as follows:

- Scientific-research work;
- Teaching process and work with students;
- Other activities (defined in the form E-2 and in the score sheet)

The evaluation form (E-2), students’ survey form (E-1) and the score sheet (E-3) are considered as integral part of this Book of Rules.

#### Article 4

Key indicators (criteria) and the scoring system for evaluation of work of the academic staff for each key area, as well as the method of making an overall evaluation of work are defined in the evaluation form (E-2).

This form is common for all type of teaching staff. However, different scale for evaluation will be used for professors, senior assistants and assistants as it is explained below.

Based on the total of accrued points, work of the academic staff members in three key areas is evaluated as one out of five possible grades:

- Excellent work
- Good work
- Satisfactory work
- Poor work
- Very poor work

The total score is calculated from the total number of points accrued by adding points for particular areas multiplied by the weight factor.

Evaluation Scale for Assistant, Associate and Full professors:

80.0 points and above	Excellent Work
60.0 – 79.9 points	Good Work
40.0 – 59.9 points	Satisfactory Work
20.0 – 39.9 points	Poor Work
0.0 – 19.9 points	Very Poor Work

Evaluation Scale for Senior Assistants:

60.0 points and above	Excellent Work
45.0 – 59.9 points	Good Work
30.0 – 44.9 points	Satisfactory Work
15.0 – 29.9 points	Poor Work
0.0 – 14.9 points	Very Poor Work

Evaluation Scale for Assistants:

40.0 points and above	Excellent Work
30.0 – 49.9 points	Good Work
20.0 – 29.9 points	Satisfactory Work

10.0 – 19.9 points	Poor Work
0.0 – 9.9 points	Very Poor Work

### **Article 5**

The evaluation procedure commences by informing a member of the academic staff in writing that the evaluation procedure has commenced and this information is sent by Office for Quality Assurance.

The written information is accompanied by instructions how to fill in the evaluation form.

The Dean provides his/her comments regarding work of the member of the academic staff who is evaluated by using the evaluation form. All necessary forms and documents are collected by the Office of Quality Assurance and sent to Rector's office in individual folders.

Rector's Office processes the information and sets out the score. Then, the results are sent to Faculties for individual objections to the scores. Academic staff has 10 work days to make written objections if there is any missing document or missed contribution points in their scores.

Following the settlements of all complaints and objections, the final scores are sent by Rector's Office to the Deans and to the Office for Quality Assurance for their records.

Based on the processed data and given score, the Dean of the Faculty makes a Decision on work of the employee.

A member of the academic staff can lodge a complaint against the Dean's Decision to the University Rector within 10 work days from the date of its receipt.

The final Decision on work of the employee is delivered to:

- a) the employee
- b) the employee's personal file
- c) the Dean of the Faculty

### **Article 6**

Scores *Poor work* or *Very poor work* are considered unsatisfactory (negative).

### **3. Students' survey**

#### **Article 7**

Each semester, the University carries out the procedure in which work of the academic staff is evaluated by students, in form of a students' survey.

The students' survey makes an integral part of the comprehensive evaluation procedure, where the students evaluate at least the following: the quality of the teaching and an interactive relationship between the students and the teacher; fairness in communication; attitude of the teaching staff towards the students during the teaching process and in the

assessments; accessibility of the reference materials which the staff referred the students to; the subject teacher's attendance in the teaching process; and other elements.

The evaluation is carried out at the end of the semester, however obligatorily prior to the final examination period.

### **Article 8**

Results of the students' survey are expressed with an average score, so that the achieved points are included in the total sum of the points in the proportion set out by the particular criteria in the evaluation form which accompanies this Book of Rules.

In order to increase the reliability of the student surveys, each student response will be multiplied by the student's CGPA in the system and then the weighted average of the responses will be calculated in a way that the resulting number will be between 1 and 5 (For students those are in their first semester, this weight will not be applied).

Finally, this result will be transformed to a number between 1 and 125 by using a cubic function. If there is no CGPA available or if there are technical problems in using the above mentioned method, ordinary student survey result average (a number between 1 and 5) is used for the calculations together with the cubic function method.

Scores used for evaluation of the academic staff based on the affirmative statements are as follows:

5	=	I strongly agree
4	=	I agree
3	=	I neither agree nor disagree
2	=	I disagree
1	=	I strongly disagree

Scores used for evaluation of the academic staff based on the negative statements are as follows:

1	=	I strongly agree
2	=	I agree
3	=	I neither agree nor disagree
4	=	I disagree
5	=	I strongly disagree

### **Article 9**

In circumstances where, based on the students' survey, the weighted average score of the quality of the teacher's or assistant's work is below 3.5, it is required that additional improvement measures be taken.

## **Article 10**

It is established that no minimum number of the survey participants is required for the evaluation of the teacher's or assistant's work by the students through the students' survey in order to consider the survey relevant.

In case that fewer than five participants are present at the evaluation, and the evaluation result is shown as unsatisfactory, then the result is not taken into account.

### **4. Administrator Evaluation**

#### **Article 11**

At the end of Spring semester Deans (Rector) for faculty members (Deans and Vice Rectors) provide their administrator evaluation scores to the Rector's Office. This score ranges from 0 to 50, where 50 represents the highest performance level. This score is composed of following subsections:

- 1) Attendance of the employee for classes, office hours and other duties
- 2) Complaints and Compliments about the employee
- 3) Attitude towards supervisors and Compliance
- 4) Contribution to the Faculty and IUS
- 5) Overall assessment of the employee by the Dean (Rector)

Each subsection is scored between 0 and 10.

### **5. Adopting the final collective Reports on the conducted evaluation**

#### **Article 12**

The evaluation is concluded by producing the final collective Report on the concluded evaluation.

The collective Reports on the concluded evaluation referred to in the preceding Clause are discussed at the Faculty Councils and then forwarded to the Senate for their adoption.

The evaluation results are taken into consideration when selecting teachers into higher titles, or when offering to continue the employment contract, or the work permit for foreign citizens.

### **6. Definition of the improvement measures and activities**

#### **Article 13**

Improvement measures and activities are activities of temporary nature which are carried out from the moment of delivery the final decision which states the total

unsatisfactory score, until a satisfactory level of the quality of work of the academic staff member is achieved, or until the conclusion of the following evaluation cycle, at latest.

In case where the improvement measures and activities are taken, the students' survey can be conducted even prior to the end of the semester, with the Dean's written approval and the students' agreement.

## **7. The procedure for implementation of the improvement measures and activities**

### **Article 14**

The Dean requests a written explanation from the teacher who had been evaluated with an unsatisfactory score as well as in case from the Article 9, within 10 days from the date of delivery of the Decision or results.

In the explanation, the evaluated member of the academic staff is required to refer to the set indicators (criteria) and provide his/her suggestion for improvement through the improvement measures, by which the academic staff member is provided with another opportunity to improve his/her quality of work until the next evaluation.

Having received the explanation provided by the evaluated member of the academic staff, the Dean then makes a written decision which requires completion of one or more of the following improvement measures and actions:

1. realization of the suggestion for improvement provided by the evaluated member of the academic staff;
2. obligation that the member of the academic staff attend professional development activities;
3. deciding on the co-worker or assigning another person to carry out teaching activities in the following semester, based on the proposal of the main study program or the Faculty Council; and
4. other measures which the Dean, upon the Faculty Council approval, finds reasonable.

With the decision referred to in the preceding Clause, the Dean warns the member of the academic staff of the consequences should the implemented improvement measures be unsatisfactory, and sets the timeframe within which the member of the academic staff is required to provide reports on the progress in view of realization of the required improvement measures and activities.

### **Article 15**

In case that based on the reports to be delivered in accordance with the preceding Clause the member of the academic staff receives negative scores on two consecutive occasions regarding his/her progress in the realization of the required improvement measures and activities, or if it becomes evident that the employee does not fulfill his/her obligation to

abide by the required measures and activities in a timely manner, or if he/she fails to abide by them, then the Dean informs in writing the Rector thereof, and the Rector is authorized to decide on the employment status of the employee, in accordance with the Book of Rules and other by-laws.

## **8. Results of the conducted evaluation of the academic staff**

### **Article 16**

The information about the results of the evaluation of the academic staff is delivered to the Office for Quality Assurance of IUS, which is required to analyze the information jointly with the Faculty Teams for Quality Assurance and use such information in activities regarding self-evaluation and the evaluation of the University.

## **9. Termination of the employment**

### **Article 17**

Should the implementation of the improvement measures and activities referred to in Articles 12, 13, and 14 of this Book of Rules fail to achieve the desirable outcome, or should two consecutive evaluation results be unsatisfactory in total, as in case referred to in Article 14 of the Book of Rules, then the Rector is authorized to terminate the employment contract with the member of the academic staff.

The member of the academic staff has the right to appeal against the decision on the termination of the employment contract to the Board of Trustees within 10 (ten) days from the date of delivery of the decision.

### **Article 18**

When this Book of Rules enters into force, then the Book of Rules on the Evaluation of the Academic Staff Procedures at the International University of Sarajevo, ref. IUS - SENAT-11-924/13, comes out of the force.

## **Article 19**

The Book of Rules enters into force on the day of its adoption and shall be implemented from the date it has been posted on the notice board at the University and on the University website.

### **PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE**

*Prof. Dr Yücel OĞURLU*

---

### **CONFIRMATION ON ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE BOOK OF RULES**

A copy of this Book of Rules was posted on the notice board at International University of Sarajevo on \_\_\_\_\_ 2013 at \_\_\_\_\_ o'clock;

A copy of this Book of Rules was published by posting it on the International University of Sarajevo website on \_\_\_\_\_ 2013 at \_\_\_\_\_ o'clock.

### **PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE**

*Prof. Dr Yücel OĞURLU*

*Confirmation on the consent:*

### **PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

*Prof. Dr Hasan Zuhuri SARIKAYA*