



Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

## **PAQUALITY: Public Administration Education Quality Enhancement Erasmus+ Strategic Partnership KA203**

No – 2018-1-SK01-KA203-046330, Slovakia, 09/2018-08/2021

---

### **Intellectual Output 3:**

#### **Methodological framework for quality improvement of project partners**

### **EVALUATION REPORT**

Programmes under the evaluation within the project are evaluated by selected project partners based on review of their self-evaluation studies against the EAPAA accreditation criteria. Site visits were not included into the project activities; therefore the evaluation statements are limited to the available written information and discussion among project partners during the Project Transnational Meeting held in Ljubljana on November 15, 2019.

#### **Name of the programme:**

**Bachelor of Science in Public Administration  
and**

**Management Master of Science in Public Administration and Management**

**Name of the Institution:** Faculty of National Economy, University of Economics in Bratislava

**Address:** Dolnozemska cesta 1, 852 35 Bratislava

**Country:** Slovakia

#### **Evaluator/s:**

##### **Evaluator/s 1:**

**Name/s:** prof. György HAJNAL

**Name of Institution:** Corvinus University of Budapest

**Country:** Hungary

#### **Reviewers:**

**Name/s:** Miroslav Fečko, Silvia Ručinská

**Name of Institution:** P.J.University, Košice

**Country:** Slovakia

**DATE:** December 2019

*Note: The report expresses an opinion of the the authors. The EC doesn't have responsibility for any utilization of included information.*

## Part 1: Accreditation Criteria

<b>1. Preamble</b>	
1.1 National educational system	Sufficiently described – no comments
1.2 National evaluation system	Sufficiently described – no comments
1.3 Formal exams for entrance to civil service	Sufficiently described – no comments
<b>2. Applicability/Eligibility</b>	
2.1 Domain	Sufficiently described – no comments
2.2 Geography	Sufficiently described – no comments
2.3 Programme longevity	Sufficiently described. However, whether or not the programmes have been running continuously since their establishment should be clarified
2.4 Programme variants and locations	Sufficiently described – no comments
4 Category of accreditation	Sufficiently described – no comments
<b>5. Standards</b>	
5.1 Domain of public administration	No information provided
5.2 Mission of the programme	<p>- Overly lengthy background sections on the history of the institution, on the mission of the Faculty and of the University. These could be substantially shortened or possibly omitted</p> <p>- According to 5.2.4. “The mission of both programs is given in section 5.2.2”. However, sub-section 5.2.2. is titled “Mission Statement / Department”. The three paragraphs that follow do not seem to contain any formal mission statement. In particular, they definitely do not contain two separate mission statements (there should be one for the BA and one for</p>

	<p>the MA programme).</p> <p>Section 5.2 should have highlighted the following: <i>“The programme states clearly its educational philosophy and mission and has an orderly process for developing appropriate strategies and objectives consistent with its mission, resources, and constituencies. From the mission a set of credible educational objectives are formulated. Preferably the programme objectives are translated into competencies and/or learning outcomes which the programme intends to achieve.”</i> These elements are, unfortunately, largely missing.</p>
5.3 Level	<p>The section gives a very – possibly overly – detailed description of intended learning outcomes. However the focus of the presentation is a little bit unclear; linking the enumeration of learning outcomes to the Dublin Descriptors in a more explicit manner could have improved the ease of understanding.</p>
5.4 Practice and internships	<p>Sufficiently described – no comments</p>
5.5.1 Curriculum Content	
5.5.1.1 Core components	<p>Detailed description. Some comments on the BA programme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The translation of ECTS into work hours (p. 20) does not seem to follow the European standards (whereby 1 ECTS involves 30 hours or work hours).</li> <li>- It may be noted that the core curriculum is rather “heavy” on economics subjects, a number of which do not even deal with public sector phenomena (such as Business Economics, World Economics, or Marketing). At the same time, political science and public policy do not figure in the core curriculum, which I consider a serious gap.</li> <li>- I consider a major shortcoming of the BA curriculum that it does not offer any specialisation opportunities. I understand this may be related to the low student numbers – still the issue should be clearly confronted in the SER</li> </ul> <p>Comments for the MA curriculum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Similarly, skewed towards economics. Political institutions/political science and (public) law not covered in core curriculum</li> <li>- The lack of specialisation possibilities is an even bigger problem on the MA level than it was in the BA curriculum. Again, I understand this may be related to the low student numbers – still the issue should be clearly</li> </ul>

	<p>confronted in the SER</p> <p>It is somewhat strange that the curriculum information is provided twice (once in a table format and once as flowing text).</p>
5.5.1.2 Other Components	See above
5.5.1.3 Structure and didactics of the programme	<p>Possibly in error, this sub-section describes the procedures for students' assessment of instruction. The structure and didactics (i.e., whether "<i>the programme is coherent in its contents. The didactic concept is in line with the aims and objectives of the programme. The teaching methods correspond to the didactic philosophy of the programme</i>") is, unfortunately, not discussed at all.</p> <p>Regarding the assessment of teaching quality by the students: it is very disturbing and totally not understandable that the Department in charge of the curriculum design and delivery does not have access to assessment data.</p>
5.5.1.4 Intake	<p>This section is very under-developed (two sentences). I'd be curious.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- How competitive the BA entry exams are;</li> <li>- What the admission exam entails and how it differs from the National Comparative Exams;</li> <li>- Why these separate options for entry examination exist and how they related to one another</li> <li>- For the MA entry exam, it is highly problematic that – according to the text – no entry requirements (apart from having a BA degree) are set. The possible heterogeneity of student intake resulting from this needs to be addressed explicitly – in the curriculum and program design, in program management, and in the SER itself.</li> </ul>
5.5.2 Length	No particular comments.
5.5.3 Results	Data for the MA programme describing the achievement of intended learning outcomes are presented. It is not clear however which time period the data refers to, who did the assessment and why (is it part of a regular data collection or happened for the sake of the SER?), and – importantly – what happened with those students not meeting the minimum requirements.
5.6 Quality Improvement and Innovation	

5.6.1 Programme accomplishment	No information provided (would be essential!)
5.6.2 Curriculum Development	No information provided (would be essential!)
5.6.3 External Reviews	No comment
5.7 Student Assessment	<p>Some comments and additional information need:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Some statistics on grading (esp. the proportion of minimum and maximum grades) would be nice</li> <li>- Thesis evaluation is problematic in some respects (thus is in need of supervision or justification). So is the fact that the second reviewer is selected by the thesis supervisor; that thesis assessment do not play a clear role in the result of the thesis defense.</li> <li>- There is a text part here titled "Organization and management". It was presumably intended for the next section (?).</li> </ul>
5.8 Programme Jurisdiction	<p>The first paragraph describes the highly unusual situation that the programme curriculum is prescribed, on course level, by the Ministry of Education thus the programme management has no or only minimal discretion to change it. This circumstance creates a hardly manageable situation as it deprives the programme owner (Department) of most of its means to adjust its programme to external or internal changes. This situation needs to be addressed very clearly and with great care.</p> <p>In particular, the current description suggests that the actual room of manoeuvre of the Department (or Faculty) in modifying the curriculum is zero. This is a very strong claim. The extent, to which existing legal regulations specify individual courses (i.e., what elements should be included in each individual course) should be specified. I guess ministry guidelines do not reach the level of week-by-week curricula. If so, some room for manoeuvre is still left for the programme management to design of the programme/courses.</p>
5.9.1 Faculty nucleus	No comment
5.9.2 Faculty qualifications	Much of the information/data are missing or incomplete. It is not possible to assess the adequacy of the faculty qualifications (in particular, research and publication credentials, international embeddedness and visibility) on

	<p>the basis of the data provided in this section. I emphasise that frequently this is a crucial bottleneck in EAPAA accreditations.</p> <p>The quality of instruction section should contain the information on student satisfactions surveys currently provided in 5.5.1.3.</p>
5.9.3 Diversity: gender and minorities	<p>HRM functions should be clarified here (at the latest): who decides about hiring, firing and promotion? Therefore, who is in charge of gender and minority balance? The current gender balance is very skewed – who should take steps to correct it?</p> <p>No data are provided about balance in terms of minorities.</p>
5.10 Admission of Students	<p>The information is not fully in line with the details provided in 5.5.1.4. The two sub-sections, jointly, should give a proper picture of the process and the criteria as well as the results of the selection procedures for both programmes (MA and BA).</p>
5.11 Supportive Services and Facilities	<p>I understand the dire situation described in this section. The budget and, in particular, the library resources nevertheless make it difficult to assume that teaching and research can be pursued up to EAPAA standards.</p>
5.12 Student Services	<p>Data incomplete (esp. attrition would be relevant)</p>
5.13 Public Relations	<p>Not entirely clear:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- what the role of the Department is in communicating with external constituents;</li> <li>- through what channels and platforms this communication happens</li> <li>- how communication with current students is run.</li> </ul>
<b>6 Additional Criteria</b>	<p>NA</p>

## Part 2: Conclusions and recommendations

For specific detailed comments see above.