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**1.Student Evaluation Surveys**

Students are the principle clients of the education system and surveys of their opinions are one of the most important sources of evidence about quality in higher education. They can provide very useful suggestions for improvement that should be considered in the quality cycle for improvement as applied to individual courses, programs, and institutional planning.

There are a number of general principles that should be followed if student surveys are to be as useful as possible.

* It must be made clear to students that all survey responses are anonymous.
* Course evaluation surveys should be distributed and collected by someone other than the course instructor.
* Surveys should include common questions to enable them to be used for comparisons within departments and colleges and institutions and between institutions. (The use of common questions does not prevent the addition of optional additional questions appropriate for different courses, programs or institutions.)
* Some open ended questions should be included to permit respondents to comment on additional matters of concern.
* In addition to a number of individual items relating to matters considered important, surveys can include one or two summary items that can be used as general quality indicators.
* To be used for benchmarking quality between institutions the surveys should be distributed in similar ways and at similar times and comparisons made between comparable institutions.
* Questions should be consistent over time (normally at least three years) so that valid trend data can be obtained.
* The validity of responses depends on having a reasonable response rate. Normally at least 50% is essential. To encourage participation:
* Surveys should not be overused.
* Use should be made of the responses, and summary reports and indications of action taken in response made available.
* The surveys should not be too long. (a maximum of 20 to 25 items plus a small number of open ended items is usual)

**Recommended Surveys**

Three surveys are recommended:

**1. Course Evaluation Survey (CES)** A course evaluation survey that can be distributed at the end of a course. It is recommended that this survey be distributed in each course once each year and that it be distributed in at least one course taught by each instructor at least once each year. .

The survey does not directly assess the quality of teaching by individual instructors. However the evaluation of the course is seen as a reasonable measure of the quality of teaching in a way that minimizes personal issues that could inhibit responses from students.

The survey asks questions about a number of aspects of each course. The final question is intended to provide a summary question that might be used as a general quality indicator.

**2. Student Experience Survey (SES)** This is intended as a general survey that might be distributed to all students part way through their program—mid way through the second semester of the second year in a four year program is recommended.

The survey deals with the student’s life at the institution including both major elements of the program in which they are enrolled and a number of general items relating to services and facilities. As for the SCE the final question is intended as a summary question that might be used as a general quality indicator.

**3.** **Program Evaluation Survey (PES)** This survey is intended for use at the time students have finished their program and are about to graduate. It is recommended that it be distributed shortly before final year classes are finished so their opinion of the total program at that stage can be assessed.

The questions include a number of items about the program itself together with some items similar to those in the SES that deal with their life as a student at the institution. As for the other surveys the final question is a summary item that might be used as a general quality indicator.

**Response Scale**

It is recommended that each item in the surveys be responded on a five point scale. The recommended scale is:

5 Strongly agree (with the statement)

4 Agree

3 Neutral (or undecided)

2 Disagree

1 Strongly disagree

The numbers shown here are not included on the survey forms. However those numbers should be used for summarizing responses from students and developing average responses to each item.

The survey forms have been prepared in a form that could be used for scanning. However the forms would need to be re-formatted to suit the requirements of any machine scoring system used in an institution.

**Course Evaluation Survey (CES)**

Course Title \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Program\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Semester\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Year\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Feedback from students is very important in trying to improve the quality of courses.**

**This is a confidential survey. Do not write your name or identify yourself in any way. Your responses will be combined with the responses of others in a process that does not allow any individual to be identified and the overall opinions will be used to plan for course improvements.**

**Please respond to the following questions by completely filling a response for each of your answers.**

Do this Do not mark in any of these ways **√** **× •**

Use a pencil or blue/black pen only Do not use red, green or yellow

Make heavy marks that fill in your response Do not use highlighters



* Strongly agree means the statement is true all or almost all of the time and/or very well done.
* Agree means the statement is true most of the time and/or fairly well done.
* True sometimes means something is done about half the time.
* Disagree means something is done poorly or not often done.
* Strongly disagree means something is done very badly or never or very rarely done.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Questions about the start of the course:** |  |
| 1. The course outline (including the knowledge and skills the course was designed to develop) was made clear to me. |  |
| 2. The things I had to do to succeed in the course, including assessment tasks and criteria for assessment, were made clear to me. |  |
| 3. Sources of help for me during the course including faculty office hours and reference material, were made clear to me. |  |
| **Questions about what happened during the course**: |  |
| 4. The conduct of the course and the things I was asked to do were consistent with the course outline. |  |
| 5. My instructor(s) were fully committed to the delivery of the course. (Eg. classes started on time, instructor always present, material well prepared, etc)  6. My instructor(s) had thorough knowledge of the content of the course.  7. My instructor(s) were available during office hours to help me. |  |
| 8. .My instructor(s) were enthusiastic about what they were teaching |  |
| 9 My instructor(s) cared about my progress and were helpful to me. |  |
| 10. Course materials were of up to date and useful. (texts, handouts, references etc.) |  |
| 11. The resources I needed in this course (textbooks, library, computers etc.) were available when I needed them. |  |
| 12. In this course effective use was made of technology to support my learning.  13. .In this course I was encouraged to ask questions and develop my own ideas |  |
| 14. In this course I was inspired to do my best work. |  |
| 15. The things I had to do in this course (class activities, assignments, laboratories etc) were helpful for developing the knowledge and skills the course was intended to teach. |  |
| 16. The amount of work I had to do in this course was reasonable for the credit hours allocated. |  |
| 17. Marks for assignments and tests in this course were given to me within reasonable time. |  |
| 18. Grading of my tests and assignments in this course was fair and reasonable. |  |
| 19. The links between this course and other courses in my total program were made clear to me.  **Evaluation of the Course**  20. What I learned in this course is important and will be useful to me. |  |
| 21. This course helped me to improve my ability to think and solve problems rather than just memorize information. |  |
| 22. This course helped me to develop my skills in working as a member of a team.  23. This course improved my ability to communicate effectively.  **Overall Evaluation** |  |
| 24. Overall, I was satisfied with the quality of this course. |  |
| **Open Ended Items** |  |
| 25. What did you like most about this course?  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | |
| 27. What suggestion(s) do you have to improve this course?  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | |

**Student Experience Survey (SES)**

Program Title \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Semester\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Year\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Feedback from students is very important in trying to improve the quality of learning experiences at higher education institutions.**

**This questionnaire is designed to gather student opinions about their experiences about half way through their program. The items relate to all your experiences so far, not just to one particular course.**

**This is a confidential survey. Do not write your name or identify yourself. Your responses will be combined with the responses of others in a process that does not allow any individual to be identified and the overall opinions will be used to plan for improvements in the quality of educational experiences at your institution.**

**Please respond to the following questions by completely filling a response for each of your answers.**

Do this Do not mark in any of these ways. **√** **×** •

Use a pencil or blue/black pen only Do not use red, green or yellow

Make heavy marks that fill in your response Do not use highlighters

* Strongly agree means the statement is true all or almost all of the time and/or very well done.
* Agree means the statement is true most of the time and/or fairly well done.
* True sometimes means something is done about half the time.
* Disagree means something is done poorly or not often done.
* Strongly disagree means something is done very badly or never or very rarely done.



**Advice and Support**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. It was easy to find information about the institution and its programs before  I enrolled at this institution for the first time. |  |
| 2. When I first started at this institution the orientation program for new students  was helpful for me.  3. There is sufficient opportunity at this institution to obtain advice on my studies  and my future career.  4. Procedures for enrolling in courses are simple and efficient.  **Learning Resources and Facilities**  5. Classrooms (including lecture rooms, laboratories etc.) are attractive and comfortable.  6. Student computing facilities are sufficient for my needs.  7. The library staff are helpful to me when I need assistance. |  |
| 8. I am satisfied with the quality and extent of materials available for me  in the library. |  |
| 9. The library is open at convenient times.  10. Adequate facilities are available for extra curricular activities (including  sporting and recreational activities) |  |
| 11. Adequate facilities are available at this institution for religious observances.  **Learning and Teaching**  12 Most of the faculty with whom I work at this institution are genuinely  interested in my progress.  13. Faculty at this institution are fair in their treatment of students |  |
| 14. My courses and assignments encourage me to investigate new ideas and  express my own opinions. |  |
| 15. As a result of my studies my ability to investigate and solve new and unusual  problems is increasing  16. My ability to effectively communicate the results of investigations I undertake  is improving as a result of my studies.  17. My program of studies is stimulating my interest in further learning.  18. The knowledge and skills I am learning will be valuable for my future career.  19. I am learning to work effectively in group activities.  **Overall Evaluation**  20. Overall I am satisfied with my life as a student at this institution.  **Open Ended Questions** |  |
| 21. What do you like most about studying at this institution?  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** |  |
| 22. What do you dislike most about studying at this institution?  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** |  |
| 23. What suggestions do you have for improvements at this institution?  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** |  |

**Program Evaluation Survey (PES)**

Program Title \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Semester\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Year\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Feedback from students is very important in trying to improve the quality of programs.**

**This questionnaire is designed to gather opinions from final year students about their experiences at the institution throughout their program.**

**This is a confidential survey. Do not write your name or identify yourself. Your responses will be combined with the responses of others in a process that does not allow any individual to be identified and the overall opinions will be used to plan for improvements.**

**Please respond to the following questions by completely filling a response for each of your answers.**

Do this Do not mark in any of these ways. **√** **× •**

Use a pencil or blue/black pen only Do not use red, green or yellow

Make heavy marks that fill in your response Do not use highlighters



* Strongly agree means the statement is true all or almost all of the time and/or very well done.
* Agree means the statement is true most of the time and/or fairly well done.
* True sometimes means something is done about half the time.
* Disagree means something is done poorly or not often done.
* Strongly disagree means something is done very badly or never or very rarely done.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Help and Support for my Learning** |  |
| 1. Adequate academic and career counselling was available for me throughout the program.  2. The instructors were available for consultation and advice when I needed to speak with them.  3. The instructors in the program inspired me to do my best.  4. The instructors in the program gave me helpful feedback on my work.  5. The instructors in the program had thorough knowledge of the content of the courses they taught.  6. The instructors were enthusiastic about the program.  7. The instructors cared about the progress of their students.  **Resources to Support my Learning**    8. Study materials in courses were up to date and useful.  9. Library resources were adequate and available when I needed them.  10. Classroom facilities (for lectures, laboratories, tutorials etc) were of good quality.  11. Student computing facilities were sufficient for my needs. |  |
| 12. Adequate facilities were available for extra curricular activities (including  sporting and recreational activities).  13. Adequate facilities were available for religious observances.  14 Field experience programs (internship, practicum, cooperative training) were effective in developing my skills. (Omit this item if not applicable to your program) |  |
| **Evaluation of my Learning**  15 What I have learned in this program will be valuable for my future. |  |
| 16. The program has helped me to develop sufficient interest to want to continue to keep up to date with new developments in my field of study. |  |
| 17. The program has developed my ability to investigate and solve new problems. |  |
| 18. The program has improved my ability to work effectively in groups. |  |
| 19. The program has improved my skills in communication. |  |
| 20. The program has helped me to develop good basic skills in using technology to investigate issues and communicate results. |  |
| 21. I have developed the knowledge and skills required for my chosen career.  **Overall Evaluation**  22. Overall I was satisfied with the quality of my learning experiences at this institution. |  |
| **Open Ended Items** |  |
| 23. What did you like most about your studies at this institution?  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  24. What did you dislike most about your studies at this institution?  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  25. What suggestions do you have for improvements in your program at this institution?  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | |

**2.Key Performance Indicators**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Standard/Broad Area** | **Key Performance Indicator** | **Level at Which Data is Required** |
| Management of Quality Assurance and Improvement | 1. Students overall evaluation on the quality of their learning experiences at the institution.  (Average rating of the overall quality of their program on a five point scale in an annual survey final year students.) | Program  College  Institution |
|  | 2. Proportion of courses in which student evaluations were conducted during the year. | Program  College  Institution |
|  | 3. Proportion of programs in which there was independent verification within the institution of standards of student achievement during the year. | Program  College  Institution |
|  | 4. Proportion of programs in which there was independent verification of standards of student achievement by people external to the institution during the year. | Program  College  Institution |
| Learning and Teaching | 5. Ratio of students to teaching staff.  (Based on full time equivalents) | Program  College  Institution  Data separately for male and female sections and combined for all. |
|  | 6. Students overall rating on the quality of their courses.  (Average rating of students on a five point scale on overall evaluation of courses.) | Program  College  Institution  Data separately for male and female sections and combined for all. |
|  | 7. Proportion of teaching staff with verified doctoral qualifications. | Program  College  Institution  Data separately for male and female sections and combined for all. |
|  | 8. Percentage of students entering programs who successfully complete first year. | Program  College  Institution  Data separately for male and female sections and combined for all. |
|  | 9. Proportion of students entering undergraduate programs who complete those programs in minimum time. | Program  College  Institution  Data separately for male and female sections and combined for all. |
|  | 10. Proportion of students entering post graduate programs who complete those programs in specified time. | Program  College  Institution  Data separately for male and female sections and combined for all. |
|  | 11. Proportion of graduates from undergraduate programs who within six months of graduation are:   1. employed 2. enrolled in further study 3. not seeking employment or further study | Program  College  Institution  Data separately for male and female sections and combined for all. |
| Student Administration and Support Services | 12. Ratio of students to administrative staff | Institution |
|  | 13. Proportion of total operating funds (other than accommodation and student allowances) allocated to provision of student services. | Institution |
|  | 14. Student evaluation of academic and career counselling. (Average rating on the adequacy of academic and career counselling on a five point scale in an annual survey of final year students. | Institution |
| Learning Resources | 15. Number of book titles held in the library as a proportion of the number of students. |  |
|  | 16. Number of web site subscriptions as a proportion of the number of programs offered. | Institution |
|  | 17. Number of periodical subscriptions as a proportion of the number of programs offered. | Institution |
|  | 18. Student evaluation of library services. (Average rating on adequacy of library services on a five point scale in an annual survey of final year students.) | Institution |
| Facilities and Equipment | 19. Annual expenditure on IT as a proportion of the number of students. | Institution |
|  | 20. Number of accessible computer terminals per student. | Institution  Data separately for male and female sections and combined for all. |
|  | 21. Average overall rating of adequacy of facilities and equipment in a survey of teaching staff. | Institution  Data separately for male and female sections and combined for all. |
|  | 22. Internet bandwidth per user | Institution |
| Financial Planning and Management | 23. Total operating expenditure (other than accommodation and student allowances) per student. | Institution |
| Faculty and Staff Employment Processes | 24. Proportion of teaching staff leaving the institution in the past year for reasons other than age retirement. | College  Institution |
|  | 25. Proportion of teaching staff participating in professional development activities during the past year. | College  Institution |
| Research | 26. Number of refereed publications in the previous year per full time equivalent member of teaching staff. (Publications based on the formula in the Higher Council Bylaw excluding conference presentations) | College  Institution |
|  | 27. Number of citations in refereed journals in the previous year per full time equivalent teaching staff. | College  Institution |
|  | 28. Proportion of full time member of teaching staff with at least one refereed publication during the previous year. | College  Institution |
|  | 29. Number of papers or reports presented at academic conferences during the past year per full time equivalent members of teaching staff . | College  Institution |
|  | 30. Research income from external sources in the past year as a proportion of the number of full time teaching staff members. | College  Institution |
|  | 31. Proportion of total operating funds spent on research. | Institution |
| Community Service | 32. Proportion of full time teaching and other staff actively engaged in community service activities. | College  Institution |
|  | 33. Number of community education programs provided as a proportion of the number of departments. | College  Institution |

National Commission for Academic Accreditation & Assessment

**3.Explanatory Notes on Key Performance Indicators**

The key performance indicators specified by the NCAAA are intended to provide specific quantifiable data that can be used to help monitor the quality of the total system of higher education in the Kingdom, and can be used by institutions to assist in evaluations of quality. An important element of within-institution evaluations is capacity to make comparisons with other institutions selected for benchmarking purposes or with overall national data.

To be useful for these purposes the data must be measured in consistent ways over time, and by different institutions and sections within them.

The indicators provide important evidence but are usually not complete proof of quality. In most cases they must be considered together with other evidence and interpreted in the light of specific circumstances. For example if completion rates in a program are very high this may be the result of excellent teaching, or it could be a result of poor standards of assessment. The completion rates should be considered together with other evidence that demonstrates that students are achieving high standards in their work and that the grades they receive are appropriate. It is also important to consider trends in data. A particular number may be a significant improvement over past results and should be considered a positive result, but if the same figure represents a decline it may be a matter of concern.

When using KPIs for benchmarking purposes it is important to make appropriate comparisons. Employment outcomes are likely to vary for different fields of study, regional location and changing economic conditions over time. Some institutions will offer a wide range of programs and others will be more specialized. Some will have a significant role in research and others will not. It is important to compare like with like as well as interpreting the evidence appropriately.

**Key Performance Indicators Selected by the NCAAA**.

Key Performance Indicators have been specified in some but not all of the 11 standards specified by the NCAAA. This does not imply that the other standards are not important. They are. The indicators that have been specified are a selection of items that the NCAAA believes may be particularly useful for higher education institutions for benchmarking and would provide an overview of the quality of the system as a whole. Institutions are encouraged to specify additional indicators that they believe will be useful for their own quality assurance purposes and appropriate for their mission, objectives and stage of development.

**Levels at Which Data are Required**.

For most of the indicators data are required at the levels of individual departments, of colleges, and of institutions as a whole. In a number of cases the data is sought separately for male and female sections, as well as for male and female sections combined. Where several programs are offered within a single department institutions are encouraged to develop data for those individual programs as well as for the department as a whole.

To aggregate data from individual courses to the level of a department (or program) the result should be an average of the overall results for each course, not an average of all the individual student results in those courses. For example if there were five courses with average ratings of 4.0, 2.5, 4.0, 4.5, 3.0 the aggregated average result would be 3.6 (the average of those numbers) regardless of the number of students in each course. Similarly when results for departments are aggregated to the level of a college the figure should be the average of the departments without any weighting for numbers of students or of courses offered. When colleges are combined for an institution as a whole the result should be an average for all the colleges.

When figures for male and female sections are combined to provide a total figure for a program or department, a college or an institution the total figures should be provided separately for male and female sections and as well as a combined figure for the two sections together at each of these levels..

**Response Rates for Surveys and Academic Units (programs, departments or colleges)**

Every effort should be made to obtain a high response rate to student and staff surveys. Response rates of less than 50% should not be considered sufficient to provide valid data.

When department or program results are combined to provide a college level result at least 75% of programs at the level concerned (E.g. Bachelor degrees) should be included. When college level results are combined to provide an institutional result, at least 75% of colleges should be included.

(Note that where random sampling of populations of students or staff is used these response rates relate to the response rate in the sample, not to the total population)

**Comments on Particular Indicators**

1. **Students overall evaluation on the quality of their learning experiences at the institution**.

The average of rating of the overall quality of their programs on a five point scale in a survey of final year students. This indicator requires distribution of a survey to final year students, normally in the final month of classes. At this stage they would be able to reflect on and evaluate a number of aspects of their program and their views should assist with the institution’s self-evaluations and planning for improvement. This indicator is the average response of all students that complete the survey in sections of the institution and for the institution as a whole. The survey item for this indicator is taken from the NCAAA Program Evaluation Survey (PES). Students are asked to respond to the statement:

*“Overall I was satisfied with the quality of my learning experiences at this institution.”*

by indicating on a five point scale whether they strongly agree, agree, believe the statement was true sometimes (about half the time), disagree or strongly disagree.

The average response on this five point scale and the proportion of students in each section responding to this item should be recorded for male and female sections for each program, each college, and for the institution as a whole.

1. **Proportion of courses in which student evaluations were conducted during the year.**

The proportion of courses in which student evaluations are carried out is an indicator of the extent to which quality assurance processes have been implemented.

This indicator should be calculated at three levels within an institution, the percentage of all courses offered by each department, the percentage of all courses offered within a college, and the percentage of all courses offered within a total institution. If courses are offered in male and female sections the percentages should be calculated for each section, and the results aggregated to give overall figures for departments, colleges and the institution.

If courses are taught by several different instructors student evaluations might be used in the classes taught by some instructors and not in others. In that situation a fractional figure should be used. For example if a course is taught by four different instructors in different classes and evaluations are conducted in two of those classes a .5 figure should be used for that course.

1. **Proportion of departments in which there was independent verification of standards of student achievement through internal processes during the past year.**

This indicator reports on the proportion of departments in which internal institutional processes have been established and followed to verify standards of student achievement. Such processes frequently involve blind second marking of a sample of papers, assignments or tests by another member of teaching staff within the department or from another department, but may make use of other procedures if appropriate. To be counted as satisfying this requirement, adequate processes must have been used in the most recent academic year in at least 50% of courses offered by the department.

Data should be recorded for male and female sections as well as being combined for each college as a whole. If these processes are followed in either a male or female section but not in both sections a .5 result should be recorded for the department concerned.

1. **Proportion of departments verifying achievement standards through external processes during the past three years.**

This indicator reports on the proportion of departments in which standards of student achievement are verified by appropriate external verification processes. Examples of external processes include a visit and review by experienced faculty from another institution of student tests and assignments together with samples of student work and grades assigned, or blind remarking of samples of work by faculty in another KSA or international institution.

To be counted as satisfying this requirement, adequate processes must have been used within the past three years in at least 50% of courses offered by the department.

Data should be recorded for male and female sections as well as being combined for each college as a whole. If these processes are followed in either a male or female section but not in both sections a .5 result should be recorded for the department concerned.

1. **Ratio of students to teaching staff.**

Number of students enrolled divided by the number of teaching staff. Where students are enrolled part time or in distance education courses the number should be based on full time equivalences. (If a full time course load in credit hours has been defined by the institution, department or program that number of credit hours should be used in specifying full time equivalence. If a full time load has not been defined 15 credit hours in a semester should be taken as a notional full time load in calculating this indicator.

The number of teaching staff should include tutors, lecturers, and assistant, associate and full professors whether involved with teaching, research or both teaching and research. The number should not include research, teaching or laboratory assistants or postgraduate students who assist with teaching responsibilities. The number should not include visiting staff with appointments of less than three months duration. Academic staff who are responsible for overseeing the planning and delivery of teaching programs (eg. head of department for a department, dean for a college, rector and vice rectors for a university) should be included in the number for the organizational unit with which they are associated.

Part time teaching staff should be included on a full time equivalent basis by calculating the number of credit hours taught as a proportion of full time teaching load for each person’s level of appointment.

Data should be recorded for male and female sections, with combined data as well for each department, college and the institution as a whole.

1. **Students overall rating of the quality of their course.**

The average of rating of the overall quality of their course on a five point scale in a survey administered within the last two weeks of a course. This indicator requires distribution of a confidential anonymous survey to students, normally within the final two weeks of classes. At this stage they would be able to reflect on and evaluate a number of aspects of their course and their views should assist individual instructors and departments with their self-evaluations and planning for improvement. The aggregate ratings for each section and each department and college and the institution as a whole will give one important perspective on the overall quality of teaching and whether or not that quality is improving. A minimum response rate for individual courses of 50% is required, and average responses for sections, departments, colleges and institutions must be based on at least a 50% sample. The survey item for this indicator is taken from the NCAAA Course Evaluation Survey (CES).

Students are asked to respond to the statement:

*“Overall I was satisfied with the quality of this course”*

by indicating on a five point scale whether they strongly agree, agree, believe the statement was true sometimes (about half the time), disagree or strongly disagree.

The individual course results for this and other items in the survey should be used within the department for quality assurance purposes. Aggregated responses on this item and the proportion of students in each section responding to it should be recorded for male and female sections for each department, each college, and for the institution as a whole. Trends in these aggregated responses should be used to monitor performance over time.

1. **Proportion of teaching staff with verified doctoral qualifications.**

This is the number of teaching staff with doctoral qualifications as a percentage of the total number of teaching staff. All teaching staff must be included in the ratio including staff working as tutors in distance education programs. When calculating this ratio the same definition of teaching staff as described in item 5 should be used. The ratio should be calculated for male and female sections, for each department, for each college, and for the institution as a whole.

To qualify as a verified doctoral qualification the degree must be from an institution recognized for the granting of doctoral degrees by the Ministry of Higher Education. The legitimacy of the qualification must have been verified by inspection of the transcript issued by the awarding institution.

Data should be provided for male and female sections and for for each department, each college, and for the institution as a whole.

1. **Proportion of full time undergraduate students who successfully complete the first year of their program in their first academic year**.

The number of students who successfully complete all requirements for the first year of their program within the first academic year as a percentage of the number that registered and commenced classes at the beginning of the year. Credit hour requirements may vary for different programs. This ratio should be based on the specific requirements for each program, not on a set number of credit hours applied to different programs.

In situations in which students undertake a number of general department courses in the first year and enter more specialized programs at a later stage this figure should be provided for the department.

This ratio does not include students in a preparatory year program.

The ratio should be calculated for male and female sections, for each department, for each college, and for the institution as a whole.

1. **Course completion rate for**
2. **Full Time Students**
3. **Part Time Students**
4. **Distance Education Students**

The percent of students in each category who successfully complete the course or courses in which they commenced studies within the year. Te second category includes students enrolled on a part time basis in on campus programs. The third category includes all students enrolled distance education programs whether part time or full time. The definition of a full time student may vary for different programs and years of study. It would normally be at least 15 credit hours for undergraduate students and the minimum number to be classed as full time for the purposes of this indicator is 12 credit hours. If students enroll and commence studies in several courses, they must complete and pass all of those courses to be counted as successful completers.

To be counted as having “commenced studies” a student must have been formally enrolled in the course or courses concerned, and to have attended initial classes or for distance education students been sent the initial set of materials related to the course.

This ratio does not include students participating in Intesab arrangements, unless they are enrolled in particular courses as part of that program.

The ratio should be calculated for male and female sections, for each department, for each college, and for the institution as a whole.

1. **Proportion of full time students commencing undergraduate programs who complete those programs in minimum time.**

The percent of students who commence undergraduate programs who successfully complete those programs within the time specified for each program. Eg. within four years for a four year program (normally 120 to 135 credit hours) or within five years for a five year program (normally 150 to 168 credit hours).

Preparatory year programs are not considered in this item.

The ratio should be calculated for male and female sections, for each department, for each college, and for the institution as a whole.

1. **Apparent completion rate for undergraduate programs.**

The number of students completing undergraduate programs as a proportion of the number commencing each program x years previously. Eg. the number of students completing a four year program in the 2010-11 academic year as a percent of the number commencing that program at the beginning of the 2007-8 academic year.

Preparatory year programs are not considered in this item.

For programs for which the first or first and second year studies are general preparations with students joining specialized programs after that time (for example in business programs) the figures should be combined for the group of programs involved.

The ratio should be calculated for male and female sections, for each program or department, for each college, and for the institution as a whole.

1. **Proportion of students who complete postgraduate programs in minimum time.**

The percent of students who commence postgraduate programs who successfully complete those programs within the minimum time specified for each program. For example a master degree program may have an expected minimum time of one or two years, and a doctoral program may have an expected minimum time of three or four years.

The ratio should be calculated for male and female sections, for each program or department, for each college, and for the institution as a whole.

1. **Proportions of graduates from undergraduate programs who within six months of graduation are:**
2. **employed**
3. **enrolled in further study**
4. **not seeking employment or further study**

The percentage of graduates in each of these categories using data from an annual survey of graduates conducted six months after graduation. A response rate of at least 50% is required for the survey results to be considered valid.

The ratio should be calculated for male and female sections, for each program, for each college, and for the institution as a whole.

1. **Ratio of administrative and support service staff to students.**

This ratio should be expressed as a fractional number. For example if there are 50 administrative and support service staff and 400 students the ratio would be .125 administrative staff per student.

In calculating this ratio the formula described in item 5 for the number of students should be used.

The number of administrative and support service staff should include secretaries and office staff, staff involved in financial, management, IT and other similar services, technical and laboratory assistants, library staff, student counselors who are not teaching and classified as teaching staff, and public relations staff. The number does not include drivers, catering staff, maintenance workers or others involved with maintenance of buildings and grounds.

Figures should be provided for the institution as a whole, for male and female sections, and for any different campuses. Where preparatory programs are offered by the institution these staff and students should be included.

1. **Proportion of total operating funds (other than accommodation and student allowances) allocated to provision of student services.**

This item should be expressed as a percentage of the total operating funds available to the institution that is allocated to student counseling, student admissions processing and student records, medical services and student welfare programs. The figure should not include the academic counseling that is carried out by faculty members within teaching departments of colleges as part of the instructional process.

Figures should be provided for the institution as a whole, for male and female sections, and for any different campuses. Where preparatory programs are offered by the institution these staff and students should be included.

1. **Student evaluation of academic and career counseling. (Average rating on the adequacy of academic and career counseling on a five point scale in an annual survey of final year students)**

The average of rating of the overall quality of their programs on a five point scale in a survey of final year students. This indicator requires distribution of a survey to final year students, normally in the final month of classes. At this stage they would be able to reflect on and evaluate a number of aspects of their program and their views should assist with the institution’s self-evaluations and planning for improvement. This indicator is the average response of all students that complete the survey in sections of the institution and for the institution as a whole. The survey item for this indicator is taken from the NCAAA Program Evaluation Survey (PES).

Students are asked to respond to the statement:

*“Adequate academic and career counselling was available to me throughout my program.”*

by indicating on a five point scale whether they strongly agree, agree, believe the statement was true sometimes (about half the time), disagree or strongly disagree.

The average response on this five point scale and the proportion of students in each section responding to this item should be recorded for male and female sections for each program, each college, and for the institution as a whole.

1. **Ratio of book titles held in the library to the number of students.**

This item is the number of separate book titles to the number of students. For example if there are 10,000 separate titles and 2000 students the figure would be 5.0. If there are multiple copies of particular books they only count as one title.

Figures should be provided for books available on site for separate sections or campuses as well as for the institution as a whole.

1. **Number of website subscriptions as a proportion of the number of programs offered.**

This item should include the number of academic and related websites to which the institution has subscriptions that make documents and materials available to students and teaching staff divided by the number of separate programs offered. For example if there are 100 website subscriptions and 70 programs the figure would be 1.43 subscriptions per program.

The item assumes that access to the websites is available to all sections and campuses. If this is not the case the ratio should be calculated for each section and campus as well as for the institution as a whole.

1. **Number of periodical subscriptions as a proportion of the number of programs offered.**

This item should include the number of academic journals to which the institution has subscriptions and that are available available to students and teaching staff. The number should be expressed as a ratio divided by the number of separate programs offered. For example if there are 85 journal subscriptions and 70 programs the figure would be 1.21 subscriptions per program.

The item assumes that access to the journals is available to all sections and campuses. If this is not the case the ratio should be calculated for each section and campus as well as for the institution as a whole.

1. **Student evaluation of library services. (Average rating on adequacy of library services on a five point scale in an annual survey of final year students.)**

The average of rating of library services on a five point scale in a survey of final year students. This indicator requires distribution of a survey to final year students, normally in the final month of classes. At this stage they would be able to reflect on and evaluate a number of aspects of their program and their views should assist with the institution’s self-evaluations and planning for improvement. This indicator is the average response of all students that complete the survey in sections of the institution in the institution as a whole. The survey item for this indicator is taken from the NCAAA Program Evaluation Survey (PES).

Students are asked to respond to the statement:

*“Library resources were adequate and available to me when I needed them.”*

by indicating on a five point scale whether they strongly agree, agree, believe the statement was true sometimes (about half the time), disagree or strongly disagree.

The average response on this five point scale and the proportion of students in each section responding to this item should be recorded for male and female sections and for the institution as a whole.

1. **Annual expenditure on IT as a proportion of total operating expenditure.**

This item should be expressed as a percentage of the total operating funds available to the institution that is allocated to IT. The figure should include expenditure on both equipment and software and the cost of any services that are outsourced to other service providers. Costs of staff who are employed to provide assistance with maintenance and advice on IT services should be included. However the data should not include the costs of organizational units carrying out statistical analyses and report preparation. Figures should be provided for the institution as a whole.

1. **Number of accessible computer terminals for students per student.**

This item should show the number of computer terminals to which students have access including those in libraries and in computing or IT centers. It should not include research equipment in laboratories or research centers to which students have limited or no access. The number should be expressed as a ratio of terminals to students. For example if there are 250 terminals and 1200 students the ratio would be .208 terminals per student.

Figures should be provided for each section or campus as well as for the institution as a whole.

1. **Average overall rating of adequacy of facilities and equipment in a survey of teaching staff.**

The mean response on a five point scale to a survey question distributed to all teaching staff. The recommended question is:

*“ Overall I was satisfied with the adequacy of facilities and equipment available to me for my teaching and research requirements”*

Teaching staff should be asked to indicate on a five point scale whether they strongly agree, agree, believe the statement was true sometimes (about half the time), disagree or strongly disagree.

Data should be provided for male and female sections and different campuses where applicable, for each department, each college and the institution as a whole.

1. **Internet bandwidth per user.**
2. **Total operating expenditure (other than accommodation and student allowances) per student.**

Total operating expenditure for the institution in the most recent financial year divided by the total number of equivalent full time students enrolled. In calculating the full time student equivalent number the formula used in item 5 above should be used.

1. **Proportion of teaching staff leaving the institution in the past year for reasons other than age retirement.**

The number of teaching staff who left the institution in the most recent twelve month period (September 1 to August 31) for reasons other than age retirement as a proportion of the total number of teaching staff employed by the institution. In calculating the number of teaching staff the formula used in item 5 above should be used. For example if 25 teaching staff left for other employment or other reasons out of a total staff number of 600 the ratio would be .042. This ratio should be shown for male and female sections and for different campuses as well as for the institution as a whole.

1. **Proportion of teaching staff participating in professional development activities during the past year.**

The number of teaching staff participating in at least one full day (or equivalent) of professional development activity during the past twelve months (September 1 to August 31) as a proportion of the total number of teaching staff. The same definition of teaching staff as in item 5 and other items should be used for this calculation.

The ratio should be shown for each section and campus, and for each department, college and the institution as a whole.

1. **Number of refereed publications in the previous three years per full time equivalent member of teaching staff.**

The number of journal articles published in highly regarded academic journals within the past three years (September 1 to August 31) divided buy the number of equivalent full time members of teaching staff. The same definition of full time equivalent teaching staff should be used for this ratio.

To be counted in this ratio articles should have been published in one of the journals recognized in one of the following journal publication databases, the ISI Science Citation Index Expanded (SCI-E) data base, the Scopus data base or the Thompson Reuters data base. The MHE is preparing a list of recognized academic journals and when that list is published any additional journals in that list should also be included.

If a member of teaching staff was a joint author of a publication (two or more authors) the publication should count as .5 of a publication. However double counting within a department, college or institution should be avoided. If two or more authors were from the same department it would count as one publication for the department and this would apply at college or institutional level as well. However if an article was published by multiple authors from several institutions it would be counted as .5 of a publication from each.

Data on this item should be provided for male and female sections and for departments, colleges and the institution as a whole.

1. **Number of citations in refereed journals per full time equivalent teaching staff.**

Citation rates for publications by staff in higher education institutions can be obtained from the major journal publication databases. These show the number of times publications by staff at an institution are cited in other publications. It is an indicator that is widely used as a measure of research impact.

Data should be provided for male and female sections as well as for fields of study as defined by the publication database selected by the institution for this item.

1. **Proportion of full time members of teaching staff with at least one refereed publication during the previous year.**

For this item the actual number of full time teaching staff should be used rather than the full time equivalent number that includes both full time and part time staff. The definition of teaching staff still includes tutors, lecturers, and assistant, associate and full professors whether involved with teaching, research or both teaching and research. The number should not include research, teaching or laboratory assistants or postgraduate students who assist with teaching responsibilities. The number should not include visiting staff with appointments of less than three months duration. Academic staff who are responsible for overseeing the planning and delivery of teaching programs (eg. head of department for a department, dean for a college, rector and vice rectors for a university) should be included in the number for the organizational unit with which they are associated.

For this item a person should be accepted as having published if he or she was a sole author, or one of several joint authors.

To be included as a refereed publication for the purposes of this item publication should have been in one of the journals listed in the major journal databases (see item 28).

Publications that have been accepted for publication should not be included until they are actually published and the past year referred to in this item is the year from September 1 to August 31.

This data should be provided for each section, and for each department, each college and the institution as a whole.

1. **Number of papers or reports presented at academic conferences during the past year per full time member of teaching staff.**

The number of conference papers or reports presented at academic conferences. The presentation could be either an individually invited contribution, or one selected following a general invitation to submit papers.

The number of presentations should be divided by the number of full time members of teaching staff calculated as in item 30 to give a ratio of presentations to full time teaching staff numbers. For example if there were 30 presentations and 18 full time staff the ratio for this indicator would be 1.67 papers per full time staff member.

This data should be provided for each section, and for each department, each college and the institution as a whole.

1. **Research income from external sources in the past year as a proportion of the number of full time teaching staff members.**

This item includes all funds received for the conduct of research other than what may be included in the institution’s basic operating grant. It includes grants to individuals, departments, colleges or the institution as a whole from research funding agencies, other government agencies and from industry sources. To make allowance for the size of different institutions the amount should be divided by the number of full time teaching staff calculated as in item 30.

The data should be provided for the institution as a whole.

1. **Proportion of total operating funds spent on research in the past financial year.**

The total amount of funds spent on research from all sources including general operating funds and external sources as a proportion of total institutional expenditure.

Research expenditure should include salaries and costs of faculty employed for research only, research and technical assistants appointed to assist with research, and secretarial and clerical assistants working in research centers or on research projects. Costs of equipment and maintenance and repair of equipment, computer software, computer maintenance and repair and facilities for the conduct of research should be included. If equipment or associated services are used partly for research and partly for teaching or administrative purposes the proportion of these costs attributable to research should be included. Expenditure on research should include research activities carried out by postgraduate research students and costs of supervision of their research.

The amount of research funds spent on research should be provided for the institution as a whole.

1. **Number of community education programs provided.**

This should include the number of educational and training programs provided for people in the community. Programs that carry credit towards an academic program at the level of a diploma, associate degree or higher aware should be excluded.

If community education programs are arranged by a central agency within the institution but delivered by staff from a particular department or college they should be included in the number of programs offered by that department or college for the purpose of this indicator as well as for the institution as a whole.

This number should be provided for each section and for each department, college and the institution as a whole.

**4. Reading from NCAAA Handbook Part2:**

**CHAPTER 1**

**Administration of Quality Assurance Processes**

The organizational arrangements procedures outlined in this chapter have been found to be effective in higher education institutions in many parts of the world. They should be implemented in flexible ways that take account of the differing size and complexity of institutions and the nature of programs offered. New and different strategies are encouraged, and the quality system itself should be reviewed and improved as part of an institution’s quality assurance process. Innovative ideas consistent with what is generally considered good practice and planned with the goal of improving quality in all aspects of an institution’s activities are encouraged.

Committed support and encouragement from the most senior levels of an institution are essential pre-requisites for an effective quality assurance system. This should include a commitment of support from the senior policy making body (a Council, board of trustees, or a board of governors or equivalent body), leadership from the head of the institution (the Rector or Dean), and adequate support for the costs and services required for an effective quality assurance system. However high quality cannot be achieved by the actions of leaders alone. A commitment to quality must be shared throughout the institution, with individual members of teaching and other staff, and organizational units throughout the institution, evaluating their own performance, doing their best to improve, and contributing cooperatively with others to institutional improvement as valued members of the institutional team.

**1.1 Criteria for Quality Evaluations**

Evaluations of quality involve judgments about two main elements, the extent to which goals and objectives are achieved, and consistency with generally accepted standards of performance in higher education.

The goals and objectives should be based on a clearly defined mission that is appropriate for an institution of its kind and circumstances. The mission, and the goals and objectives derived from it are for an institution to determine. However some criteria for an evaluation of the mission are included in the standards specified by the Commission.

The generally accepted standards defined by the Commission in eleven broad areas of activity relate to inputs (the level and quality of resources available) processes followed, and outcomes or results achieved. In each case the judgments about quality are not just about whether a resource is available, a process followed or an outcome achieved, but also about how good these are compared with standards of performance at other good quality institutions of similar kind. Consequently it is necessary to identify institutions with which comparisons on important matters can be made and make arrangements for collecting (or sharing ) information so this can be done. The levels of performance identified in this way are benchmarks to be used in setting performance objectives.

The Commission has identified a number of important items as Key Performance Indicators and will be collecting information from institutions relating to these indicators. It will aggregate the data so that national figures on these items are available and can serve as benchmarks. Other benchmarks should also be established by institutions, dealing with matters that are important to them in their own quality improvement strategies. These benchmarks can be based on institutions within Saudi Arabia or in other countries. However because an important objective for Saudi Arabia is to demonstrate standards equal to good international standards, at least some of the important benchmarks should be based on performance at good international institutions.

**1.2 Quality Planning and Review Cycle**

The process of improving quality involves assessing current levels of performance and the environment in which the institution is operating, identifying strategic priorities for improvement and setting objectives, developing plans, implementing those plans, monitoring what happens and making adjustments if necessary, and finally assessing the results achieved. These steps involve a repeating cycle of planning and review. Major plans may involve a sequence of activities over a number of years, with a number of steps to be taken and results of each step assessed at stages within that longer term plan.

While the monitoring should be continuing, there are normally two time periods when more formal assessments take place, one annual as performance is monitored and adjustments made as required, and one on a longer term cycle in which major reviews are undertaken on a periodic basis. For issues relating to quality assurance and accreditation periodic assessments should be planned to coincide with the five-yearly external reviews for accreditation and re-accreditation conducted by the Commission.

Although this planning and review cycle is presented as a set of steps in a linear sequence with set timelines, in practice steps may be repeated or changed in a flexible way in response to feedback and changing circumstances. For example, a review of performance may lead to a conclusion that objectives need to be redefined and a new plan for development prepared.
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In considering these phases it should be recognized that they relate to a number of different levels of activity within an institution—to the institution as a whole, to academic and administrative units within it, and to individual programs or groups of programs managed by a department or college.

When applied to planning for quality improvement some of the steps in this planning cycle have special meaning. For example, the scan of the internal and external environment at the initial stage should include a thorough assessment of current quality of performance and an analysis of constraints and opportunities for development. A SWOT analysis (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) can be a useful planning tool at this stage.

A major development strategy will normally be phased in over a period of years with implementation, monitoring and adjustments through action plans on an annual basis.

It is important to periodically step back and carry out a thorough review of the relevance and effectiveness of an institution’s activities., and to periodically review the appropriateness and effectiveness of a program.

A periodic self study of an institution should be comprehensive, and include a re-examination of the environment in which the institution is operating and any implications of changes or expected developments for the institution’s activities. A periodic self study of a program should consider all aspects of the program delivery and supporting infrastructure, and the quality of learning by students. In any periodic self study a report should be prepared that includes an analysis of variations in original plans that may have occurred over the period, evaluations of the degree of success in achieving objectives, assessments of strengths and weaknesses that need to be addressed in future planning, and plans for responses to those assessments.

The primary purpose of a periodic self study is to support the institution’s own efforts at improvement, but reports developed are also used as a basis for the external reviews by the Commission for re-accreditation. For this purpose there are some specific requirements and these are set out in Part 3 of this handbook which deals with the external review processes.

**1.3 Organizational Arrangements**

**1.3.1 Establishment of a Quality Center**

An organizational unit, commonly called a quality center, should be established within the institution’s central administration. A senior person responsible to the Rector or Dean or a senior Vice Rector should be appointed to manage the center and to lead and coordinate the management of institution-wide quality assurance activities.

**1.3.3 Formation of a Quality Committee**

A quality committee should be established with membership from all major academic and administrative units including both colleges and other functional areas, to work with the quality center in planning and carrying out responsibilities for quality assurance. A senior administrator such as an academic Vice Rector would normally chair the committee and work closely with the director of the quality center in leading and supporting the institutions quality assurance activities.. The members of the committee should be informed about and committed to quality assurance and have capacity to provide leadership within their own areas of activity in the implementation of quality assurance processes.

**1.3.4 Cross-Institutional Involvement in Quality Assurance**

All organizational and administrative units should be involved in quality assurance, with performance monitored and plans for improvement made and implemented. Summary reports need to be prepared regularly so the institution’s senior management and governing body are aware of what is occurring. These regular reports do not need to be large or complicated, but should include key performance indicators relating to the most important objectives, and an indication of whether the short term results on operational plans conform to what is required if the longer term strategic plans and objectives are to be achieved.

In many cases it has proved valuable to appoint quality assurance officers, establish a small quality unit and form sub-committees within colleges or large departments, or other organizational unite (eg. libraries, and major administrative departments) to consider the programs and services they offer and provide assistance with quality improvement. It is extremely important that any units or committees of this kind cooperate closely with an institutional quality center and support any institution-wide quality improvement initiatives. However the existence of units of this sort within colleges and other organizational units can give credibility to quality initiatives for faculty and staff who identify closely with their special academic field or area of activity and help to provide specialized assistance and resources or arrange training programs that deal with particular issues found in that area.

**1.3.5 Monitoring Performance**

There should be an assessment of performance by academic and administrative units at least once per year. This need not be a major task, for example it could be simply a brief analysis of performance in relation to selected items from the self evaluation scales, a check on progress made in implementation of plans for development, and consideration of data on certain selected performance indicators. The choice of indicators will depend on the area of activity and the nature of the plan, but they should be things that allow progress to be monitored annually even though a plan may take several years to complete The analysis should include details of any adjustments that should be made in planning or corrective action required.

Templates have been developed by the Commission for this annual reporting on courses and programs. However this has not been done for other administrative and organizational units because what is needed in this analysis will vary widely for different functions. Whatever format is used for this analysis and reporting there should be some formality in requirements for analysis and reports to prevent the assessment being overlooked. The reports should be prepared by those responsible for particular functions. If administration of a function is distributed to different parts of an institution selected items of information should be provided from each distributed section so the overall quality of performance for that function can be monitored.

The Rector or Dean, and other senior administrators should be aware of the goals and objectives of organizational units, the outcomes of their self evaluations and of the priorities for improvement on the part of those delivering services. Consequently brief reports should be prepared for them and for any institutional committees with responsibility for overseeing the function concerned.

Comprehensive self-studies followed by external reviews by the Commission will occur every five years. This time period is too long to go without some general review of performance. Consequently there should be an internal review comparable to the preliminary self-evaluation during this period. A two or three year period would be the norm, but the time could be longer or shorter depending on the circumstances of the institution, and it may vary for different activities within the institution. Like the initial step, the rating scales from the *Self Evaluation Scales for Higher Education* *Institutions* should be used, together with relevant surveys and other sources of information. Indicators should be selected, results reported on, and plans for improvement reconsidered as for the initial self-assessment.

**1.4.3 Carrying Out an Initial Self Evaluation**

The first stage in the process for each unit should be a frank assessment of existing performance.

The scope of the initial evaluation should be comprehensive. It should deal with programs in all areas, and with facilities, equipment, services and administrative processes.

The rating scales in the *Self Evaluation Scales for Higher Education Institutions* should be used, These scales are likely to indicate that some are done very well, some things are not done, some are done poorly, The information about current levels of performance will provide a benchmark against which future improvements can be assessed.

Preparations

All members of faculty and other staff should be informed about the initial self-evaluation and their cooperation sought for the processes to be followed.

The announcement should explain the main reasons why the evaluation is taking place as a basis for developing plans for quality improvement and accreditation and why that is important. Reasons would normally include benefits for students and faculty and other staff at the institution, for the wider community, and for national development. Information should be given about the processes to be used and opportunities for individuals to have input. This communication should emphasize that the objective is not to find fault or to criticize, but rather to provide a realistic basis for plans for improvement.

A senior member of staff of the institution should be appointed to lead the process working with the assistance of a quality center. A planning or steering committee should be established chaired by the person appointed to lead the process. This steering committee could be an existing quality committee, or a a special committee could be appointed for this particular task.

The committee should prepare a strategy for carrying out the evaluation. This will normally involve appointment of sub-committees to carry out particular tasks related to the 11 standards identified by the Commission. Different procedures may be appropriate for different functions or organizational units within the institution.

Managing the Self Evaluation

Sub-committees should investigate and provide information and reports on one or more standards using the *Self Evaluation Scales for Higher Education Institutions*. The sub-committees should include representation from units responsible for functions considered, users of the service provided, and wherever possible someone independent of that function to ensure some independence and objectivity in the judgments made. Students should be included in sub-committees where appropriate.

The sub-committees should consult with those responsible for the function they are considering and with users of those services, and consider any evidence of quality that is available including documents, surveys and statistical data such as information from the student record system. They should complete the self evaluation scales using the starring system described, and indicate priorities for improvement where relevant.

Although some of the groupings of statements of good practice may coincide with the administrative responsibility of academic or organizational units, others will not, and this will vary for different institutions. This means that in completing scales from the *Self Evaluation Scales for Higher Education Institutions* for these functions it may be necessary to gather information from both the central units and other parts of the institution providing similar services.

This requirement to obtain information from different parts of an institution has particular relevance to programs, which are offered by colleges and departments throughout the institution. The quality of programs is a major issue in any educational institution. However there may be many programs and this could be a very large task. It is recommended that evaluations be done within each department with results consolidated at the level of colleges before being brought together for a summary evaluation in the total institution report. The summary evaluation should not be an “average” response for all programs, but one that identifies both common elements and significant variations. This approach should also be used in considering possible differences between sections for male and female students.

The self evaluation scales are intended to draw attention to processes and evaluative data that are needed, and to help identify priorities for improvement. It is not expected at this initial stage that an institution would satisfy all of these standards or follow all the processes that are included in the self evaluation scales. It is also likely that for a number of items valid evidence will not be available and benchmarks will not have been established. Because of this reliance will have to be placed on opinions and limited data. If relevant evidence is not available, that in itself is a quality matter that should be stated clearly in reports prepared. Providing for the gathering of such evidence should be considered in suggesting priorities for improvement.

Opportunities should be provided for stakeholders or members of the university community, including users of various services, who are not directly involved in the process to provide comments and advice. Submissions or presentations of this sort should be acknowledged, and should be considered carefully by those preparing reports.

Report on an Initial Self Evaluation

A report should be prepared on the outcomes of the evaluation, indicating the processes followed in conducting the evaluation, the conclusions reached, identifying areas of particular strength or requiring attention, and summarizing the evidence on which those conclusions were based. Reports by sub committees or working parties should be attached and summaries of their procedures and conclusions incorporated into a single document.

The report should include recommendations about matters that are considered of highest priority in a plan for quality improvement.

**1.5 Developing a Strategic Plan for Quality Improvement**

As noted above a plan for quality improvement should include two major elements, planning to progressively implement arrangements to meet accreditation requirements for quality assurance if these are not already in place, and planning to deal with any problems identified in an initial self evaluation.

In an institution implementing quality assurance processes for the first time involvement in quality assurance processes by different organizational and administrative units may need to be phased in as experience is gained and faculty and staff become more confident about the processes involved. (See suggestions in Attachment 1)

**1.5.1 Quality Assurance Requirements for Accreditation**

The timing for introduction of these requirements will vary in response to the experience and circumstances of different institutions and the extent to which these arrangements are already in place. Subject to these variations the following requirements should be met.

1. Establishment of a quality center, appointment of a director for the center and appointment of a quality committee chaired by a senior member of the institution’s administration. (This has already been done in most institutions)
2. Establishment of arrangements for quality assurance in each major organizational unit within the institution (for example, colleges or departments, deanship of research, organizations responsible for financial affairs, facilities and equipment etc). What is needed will vary according to the size and functions of organizational units. However the arrangements will usually involve appointing an individual as a quality officer and establishing a committee to provide coordination, leadership and advice on what should be done within the unit.
3. Preparation of program specifications and course specifications for each program. In most cases this is likely to be a staged process with action taken initially in selected departments and progressively extended to others.

The development of these program specifications will need to include checking for consistency with the National Qualifications Framework developed by the Commission, and for meeting of accreditation standards in professional fields. (As an interim arrangement consideration should be given to standards defined by international specialist accreditors pending development of standards for professional fields in Saudi Arabia).

(iv) Introduction of student evaluations of courses and programs.

1. Introduction of course and program reports using the templates developed by the Commission. As for the program and course specifications this will usually be done progressively for different departments.
2. Specification of performance indicators to provide evidence of quality in various areas of activity. Appropriate indicators should be specified for each major organizational unit, and selected key performance indicators specified for functions (such as educational programs) that are carried out in different parts of the institution. (See note below on Key Performance Indicators identified by the Commission).
3. Identification of performance benchmarks for assessment of quality relating to the main quality indicators specified (Benchmarks could involve either past performance or comparisons with other institutions, but should include at least some appropriate external comparisons)

(viii)Identification of relevant statistical information to provide evidence of quality of performance and establishment of arrangements for that information to be routinely provided to those who need it for their evaluation and planning activities.

(ix) Provision of training programs for faculty and staff in matters relevant to the improvement of quality.

**1.5.2 Other Priorities for Improvement following an Initial self evaluation.**

It is likely that a number of issues identified in an initial self-evaluation will be addressed through the introduction of the quality processes described above. Others will require special attention through appropriate strategies for improvement.

In some cases action will be needed on a “whole of institution” basis to deal with any general problems or concerns affecting the institution as a whole. In other cases action may be needed within individual organizational units or sections of the institution to deal with issues and concerns that have been identified there. The institutional strategic plan for quality improvement will give attention to issues affecting all or most parts of the institution but should also provide support for local internal initiatives where required. Internal organizational units would be expected to develop plans that complement the institutional plan and also deal with specific issues relating to their particular area of activity.

* + 1. **Dealing with Uncertainties About Future Funding**

Plans for improvement, whether supported from existing resources or extra funding, should have specific objectives, with timelines set and indicators of progress towards those objectives decided upon. These would normally be developed at two levels, strategic plans for development over a medium time period such as five years, and annual operational plans with specific objectives that contribute to the staged development of the strategic goals and objectives over time.

The longer term plans may need to involve assumptions about the resources that will be available since funding will normally be allocated to institutions over shorter periods. Plans should include risk assessments dealing with this funding issue as well as other possible concerns applicable to different development strategies, and adjustments may need to be made in the light of later developments. Uncertainty about future funding is common to educational institutions and cannot be allowed to prevent effective long term planning.

**1.5.4 Relationship of a Strategic Plan for Quality Improvement to General Strategic Planning**

At the initial stage of preparing for the introduction of a quality assurance system, assessing current levels of quality and planning for quality improvement a strategic plan for quality improvement might be prepared as a separate activity. However it really represents one important element in a broader strategic plan for the institution that might include such things as financial matters, development of facilities, introduction of new fields of study and so on, each of which would be represented in broad goals for development and with objectives and appropriate strategies for achievement. Consequently the plan for quality improvement should be seen as one important component of a broader strategic plan, with goals defined and objectives established, and strategies for implementation described in a way that is comparable to other strategic planning priorities.

* 1. **Other Issues**

Additional comments are made on some issues that have been raised by institutions

**1.6.1 Relationships Between Sections for Male and Female Students**

Organizational difficulties can arise because of difficulties in communication between sections for male and female students. Arrangements must conform to cultural norms in the Kingdom. However these do not prevent full participation on committees and sub committees by female members of faculty and staff using appropriate means of communication.

Variations in quality can occur for a number of understandable reasons including difficulties in recruiting appropriately qualified staff, recent development of a section of a campus, or extension of a program with resources still to be fully provided. Variations such as these must be expected and will cause no difficulty in a review for accreditation provided they are recognized and acknowledged, and appropriate strategies are in place to overcome the problems. The objective must be to provide services and resources of equal quality, and to achieve equal standards of learning outcomes of for all students and if this is not the case for particular reasons on a short term bases action must be being taken to overcome the problems as quickly as possible.

**With respect to standards required for accreditation:**

An institution with sections for male and female students is one institution and the standards apply to the institution as a whole.

A program offered in different sections for male and female students is one program and the standards apply to the program as a whole.

This does not mean that any assessment for either the institution or a program is “averaged” across the two sections. Information about quality must be collected in common form for each section in any quality report (annual report or periodic self study), then combined into a single report that identifies any common strengths or weaknesses and any significant variations. If there are any significant variations in quality between the sections the report should acknowledge this and include plans for responding constructively to the problems found.

The requirement to combine information from different sections means that information must be collected in similar form using comparable standards of judgment. To help ensure that this can occur both sections should participate on steering committees and sub committees, and be involved in planning surveys and data collection including the selection of quantifiable performance indicators.

**1.6.2 Reporting on Programs in an Institutional Evaluation.**

Institutional evaluations and reports must include educational programs. They are the core function of the institution. However the way this is done is a little different from other functions because there are other thorough processes for the evaluation of each program and each of the courses included in them.

What is needed in relation to programs in an institutional evaluation and report is an overview of all of the programs, something that is not provided for in the individual program reviews. The process is essentially one of combining certain selected information about all the programs and reporting on the overall result and significant variations from it. In situations where a number of programs are managed by departments or colleges this should be a two-stage process with combinations at college level initially, and then further consolidation for the institution as a whole.

At the initial stage as described above for institutional self assessments, the rating scales for Learning and Teaching should be completed for all programs (though how and when this is done must be carefully considered as part of an implementation strategy). These scales might be supplemented by other information available for all programs such as program completion rates, or by student ratings of the quality of their programs. The scales can then be aggregated, (for a college, or for the institution depending on the size of the institution) and significant variations in the ratings noted. Some suggestions for combining ratings in this way are included in the section on combining assessments below.

The planning process should allow for an appropriate balance of local flexibility and overall coordination. The requirements for effective learning and the environment affecting programs varies for different fields of study. It is entirely appropriate for colleges (and programs) to have different priorities and there should be scope in planning for these priorities to be addressed.

However because of the importance of learning and teaching as the central task of an educational institution it is likely that one of the major goals and strategic plans for the institution will focus on the development and improvement of programs across the institution. Annual operational plans would also normally be prepared for the institution’s programs generally.

This means that as well as providing for developments that departments and colleges require for their particular sphere of activity there must also be scope for total institutional priorities and for policies established for programs throughout the institution. This should be done if general institutional policies are established for programs, or if any general weaknesses are found in all or most programs.

It is generally regarded as good practice for an institution to decide on certain characteristics (or attributes) of graduates that it wants to develop, and for action to be taken in all programs to develop those characteristics. For example an institution may decide as an overall institutional policy that its graduates should be particularly skilled in information and communications technology or that they should be particularly good at applying their learning in creative problem solving. If this is done, attention should be given to these outcomes in all programs in addition to the outcomes sought in particular courses of study. Indicators of achievement relating to these special institutional student attributes should be developed and used throughout the institution.

While a lot of detail is needed for the annual reporting and planning within individual programs, this is not needed at institutional level and would be unmanageable for an institution as a whole. Consequently a small number of key performance indicators should be selected for reporting within the institutional monitoring process. The indicators may vary according to institutional mission and priorities, but should always include progress towards total institutional policy initiatives for programs and some general measures of quality of outcomes and processes that are directly related to them. Some possible examples are:

* Current statistics and trends in student progression and completion rates;
* Current statistics and trends in student assessments of teaching or quality of programs;
* Data on graduate employment outcomes;
* Extent of staff involvement in professional development activities relating to teaching quality;
* Number and proportion of program reports that comply with requirements that are completed by a specified date.

The indicators selected should include the Key Performance Indicators required by the NCAAA, and also others needed for the institutions own policy objectives and quality improvement strategies.

**1.6.3 Developing an Institutional Overview for Functions that are Decentralized**

Quality assurance processes should be followed within all academic and administrative units in an institution. Where a unit provides services for the total institution, as is often the case for central administrative functions, the evaluation and reporting of unit and institutional performance are relatively straight forward, though it is important to include the perspectives of the recipients of the services as well as those of the providers.

When functions are decentralized and managed by different academic and administrative units, the evaluation and reporting processes should be followed in each unit and also consolidated to provide an overall picture of the quality of that function for the institution as a whole. For example, if some library facilities are managed within colleges it would be appropriate to consider the effectiveness of the library function within each college as part of the college’s quality evaluation, and also to develop an overview of the quality of library provision for the institution as a whole, including both the central library and provisions within the colleges. The rating scales in the *Self Evaluation Scales for Higher Education Institutions* are intended to help with this process.

The planning and delivery of educational programs is an obvious example of the same relationship. Quality assurance processes must of course be carried out at the level of courses and programs, and considered at the level of the academic departments or colleges within which they are managed. Provision at the level of programs will be the primary focus for program accreditation judgments. However there also needs to be overall institutional consideration of the quality of its programs as a whole, and capacity to identify areas within the institution where improvements may be required.

In some cases educational support functions will be carried out within departments or colleges, and reports should be provided to those departments of colleges in the first instance. In other cases functions may be managed centrally for the total institution and the reports on those activities would be provided to the institution’s central administration. There are also other functions where there is a combination of central administration and decentralization, with services provided locally within colleges or departments as well as centrally. Library services are sometimes managed in this way with a central library and branch libraries in at least some colleges. However these functions are organized, it should be possible for the overall quality of the function within the institution to be monitored by those with ultimate responsibility–the institution’s senior management and governing board.

If a particular function is managed centrally as a service to the total institution evaluations need only be done once. However it is essential that the evaluations provide for input from the full range of stakeholders across the institution. (The management of buildings and grounds might be an example of such an activity)

If a particular function is fully or partly decentralized and managed by a number of different sections within the institution, the quality of provision of that function should be evaluated by those involved within each of those sections, but it must be also be possible for information to be consolidated to provide an overall picture for that function for the whole institution, in a way that identifies areas within the institution where there are particular strengths, or weaknesses that may require special attention.

The *Self Evaluation Scales for Higher Education Institutions* describes standards and rating scales in eleven areas of activity. The use of these scales should make it possible to aggregate assessments for the institution as a whole, and at the same time to identify organizational units within the institution where there are significant variations from the overall level of performance. For example:

(a) Where a function is managed once for the institution as a whole (possible example: Governance);

It should be possible to use the rating scales for this function once in a single assessment for the total institution.

(b) Where a function is decentralized and managed in different organizational units throughout the institution (possible example: Learning and Teaching);

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Ratings on Learning and Teaching Scales | College or Program 1 | College or Program 2 | College or Program 3 | Etc. | Total Institution |
| 4.1 Student Learning Outcomes | xxx | xxxx | xx |  | xxx |
| 4.2 Educational Assistance for Students | xxxx | xxxx | xxx |  | xxxx |
| 4.3 Quality of Teaching | xxx | xxxx | xx |  | xxx |
| 4.4 Support for Improvements in Teaching | xx | xxx | xx |  | xx |
| 4.5 Etc. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall Assessment | xxx | xxxx | xx |  | xxx |

In this example there is considerable variation between the evaluations for different parts of the institution. The overall assessment is much less important than the variations and it is those that should receive most attention. College or Program 2 seems to be functioning fairly well, though there is room for improvement. However College or Program 3 appears to be having difficulties. The ratings for Student Learning Outcomes, Quality of Teaching and Support for Improvements in Quality of Teaching are all low and the information suggests that some action is needed in this College or Program to improve this set of related items. There may also be a case for developing a general institution wide strategy to improve what is done to support improvements in teaching which seems to be a general weakness for the institution as a whole.

C. Where a function is partly managed centrally and partly decentralized to different organizational units (possible example: Learning Resources).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Ratings on Learning Resources | Central Library | College or Program 1 | College or Program 2 | Etc. | Total Institution |
| 6.1 Planning and Evaluation | xxx | xxx | xx |  | xxx |
| 6.2 Organization | xxxx | xxxx | xxxx |  | xxxx |
| 6.3 Support for Users | xxxx | xxx | xx |  | xxx |
| 6.4 Resources | xxxx | xxx | xx |  | xxx |
| Overall Assessment | xxxx | xxx | xx |  | xxx |

In this example also the details seem more significant for planning for quality improvement than the overall result. The overall assessments and the total institutional ratings seem satisfactory, but there are problems in College or Program 2 that seem to require action.

**1.7 Periodic Institutional Self Study**

An institutional self-study is a comprehensive review of the quality of all aspects of an institution’s activities. It is a central component of the internal quality assurance system, but also serves as the primary focus of external reviews by the Commission.

For a new institution a periodic self-study should be carried out immediately after the graduation of the first group of students, and prior to the Commission’s external review for full approval.

For an existing institution a self-study should be carried out as soon as possible after its quality assurance system has been put in place and the Commission’s external review for full accreditation will be conducted after that.

After these initial institutional external reviews have been carried out by the Commission it will conduct further external reviews every five years and an institutional self-study should be undertaken in preparation for each of those reviews.

While an institutional self-study should be comprehensive and should consider the eleven specified standards as criteria for evaluation, it should have a focus relating to the institution’s mission and priorities. Particular attention should be given to what had been identified as priorities for planning and development at the beginning of the review period and progress made in dealing with those priorities, and to any current priorities and activities that the governing body or the senior administration believe should be given special attention.

**1.7.1 Managing the Institutional Self-Study Process**

The following organizational arrangements are suggested. They assume the existence of an institutional quality unit or center with responsibility for leading, assisting, and coordinating quality assurance processes; a central quality committee chaired by a senior member of the central administration and including senior and experienced staff from major administrative units and service functions; and the identification of individuals within the major colleges or departments to assist with quality assurance processes.

* A plan for an institutional self-study should be prepared by the quality center, discussed and approved by the quality committee, and adopted by the appropriate decision making mechanism within the institution. This plan should include a description in broad terms of how the self-study should be carried out, staff requirements and proposed committees and working parties, and a budget covering any additional costs. This plan should be prepared well before the proposed timing of external reviews by the Commission. The Commission will allow a minimum of 9 months for an institution to prepare for a review, but an institution may wish to initiate the process earlier than this and preparation time of at least 12 months is recommended.
* Arrangements should be made with the Commission for the external institutional review. (Note that the Commission’s capacity to respond to requests for particular dates will depend on the volume of activity at the time. Since the external reviews should be undertaken as soon as possible after completion of self studies, there will need to be some flexibility in the timing of the whole process.)
* An announcement should be made within the institution, normally by the Rector or Dean, informing faculty and other stakeholders about the self-study and anticipated external review, and including information about opportunities to provide input.
* A number of sub-committees or working parties should be established to carry out the detailed analysis and planning required. Each should be chaired by a senior person knowledgeable about the area for consideration and about quality assurance processes. This could be the person responsible for the function that is being evaluated. However to provide some independence in evaluations it is generally considered preferable that for a major periodic self study the chair of the sub-committee not be the person with administrative responsibility for the function concerned. The number and range of responsibilities of the sub-committees and working parties may vary according to requirements and priorities of the institution, but they would normally include a small steering committee drawn from among the members of the quality committee, and working parties to consider one or more of the sections in the *Standards for Quality Assurance and Accreditation of Higher Education Institutions* and the *Self Evaluation Scales for Higher Education Institutions.*
* The steering committee, with the assistance of the quality center, should prepare specifications or terms of reference for the work to be done by the sub-committees and working parties, including timelines, formats and templates for the provision of information and reports, guidance on procedures to be followed, and timelines for completion of major tasks.
* A full briefing should be provided for the people involved on the various committees and working parties and a series of meetings scheduled for the chairs of the committees and working parties to review progress and discuss and resolve issues that may arise.
* The process of review should include consideration of performance in relation to major policy objectives and completion of the rating scales in the *Self Evaluation Scales for Higher Education Institutions*. Information from surveys, focus group consultations, and examination of indicators and benchmarks should be considered. For a major self-study it is particularly important to use independent advice on aspects of the matters considered, to draw comparisons with other comparable institutions and to verify conclusions about this evidence through independent opinions. The processes of doing this should be documented.
* As the committees and working parties undertake their tasks assistance should be provided as required by the quality center. The centre may help in finding appropriate persons external to the institution to provide independent comment on interpretations of evidence and conclusions drawn from it.
* The reports from the various working parties and subcommittees should be brought together and reviewed by the coordinating committee with the assistance of the quality center. The information provided should be incorporated into an overall report that includes a description of the processes followed, a summary of independent external advice received and the institutions response to that advice, and recommendations for change and improvement. The quality committee should review the draft report for consistency and appropriateness in responding to information obtained and provide comment on priorities for improvement from a strategic institution-wide perspective. Its conclusions should be incorporated into the report.

1.7.2 Matters for Inclusion in an Institutional Self-Study Report

(See template for institutional self study Report in Attachment 2 (o))

**Institutional Profile**

* A brief summary of the institution’s history, scale and range of activities
* Description of the management and administrative structure.
* Campus locations with programs offered and student numbers.
* Faculty, staff and student numbers by department and college.
* Information about previous of planned accreditations.
* Summary of quality assurance arrangements.
* Summary of strategic plan.
* Matters of special interest on which the institution is seeking comment and advice.

**Context**

* Institutional Context--Brief summary description of the history and development of the institution.
* Environmental Context—Main features of the environment in which the institution is operating noting any significant changes that have occurred during the last planning period or that are expected to occur in the next.

**Mission, Goals and Objectives**

* The mission goals and strategic quality improvement objectives established by the institution and indicators and benchmarks selected to evaluate performance.

**Special Focus in the Review**

A statement of any particular aspects of the institution’s operations to which the institution wishes to give particular attention during the self-study. These may reflect changes in the institutional or environmental context, development priorities at the institution, responses to internal quality assessments, government policies, or other matters.

**Self-Study Process**

* Summary description (using charts and diagrams as appropriate) of the structure and organization of the self-study process.

**Institutional Performance Evaluation**

* Discussion of performance in relation to the institutions major strategic quality objectives, considering results as shown by indicators and benchmarks, and implications of those results for future planning.
* Reports should be prepared on performance in relation to each of the eleven specified standards, i.e.

Mission and Objectives.

Governance and Administration

Management of Quality Assurance and Improvement

Learning and Teaching

Student Administration and Support Services

Learning Resources

Facilities and Equipment

Financial Planning and Management

Employment Processes

Research

Institutional Relationships with the Community

* For a number of the standards the administrative arrangements and processes for the activity concerned will be described in other documents and need not be repeated. However the introductory section of the report on each standard should include any background information the steering committee believes should be drawn to the attention of an external review team. This might include recent changes in arrangements or new strategies being introduced.
* The reports on the standards should be considered as research reports on the quality of the institution and presented in a way that is comparable to other research reports. For each standard there should be a brief statement on the processes followed for investigation and preparation of the report.
* The completed rating scales from the *Self Evaluation Scales for Higher Education Institutions* will be made available to the external review team and that level of detail need not be repeated in this descriptive report. However particular strengths and weaknesses should be noted with evidence cited in tables or other appropriate forms of presentation. Key performance indicators and benchmarks should be referred to wherever appropriate and reference should be made to other documents where more detailed information could be obtained.
* For functions that are fully or partly decentralized and administered by units in different parts of the institution consideration should be given to the overall level of performance, and also to variations in quality of performance in different parts of the institution. Very high levels of performance (verified by evidence) should be acknowledged, and problem areas identified. Where weaknesses are found these should be considered as opportunities for improvement and the reports should indicate what is planned to deal with them.
* Trends in quality of performance should be noted and improvements in response to remedial action acknowledged.

**Independent Evaluation**

* Summary of views of independent external evaluator(s). This might be an overview of the views presented by evaluators to the sections of the evaluation above, a comment by an external evaluator on the report as a whole, or a combination of these approaches.

**Conclusion and Action Plan**

* An overall summary of the results of the self-study noting areas of high achievement and areas of concern that require attention.
* A list and brief description of actions that are recommended at the level of the institution as a whole, in parts of the institution where weaknesses have been identified, or where strategic priorities have been established for improvements. Matters that are regarded as the highest strategic priorities should be identified.

**5. Report on an Institutional Self Study**

**Introductory Comments**

A self study is a thorough examination of all of an institutions functions and activities taking account of its mission and objectives, and the standards for quality assurance and accreditation defined by the NCAAA. Conclusions should be supported by evidence, with verification of analysis and conclusions, and advice from others able to offer informed and independent comment.

A self study report should be considered as a research report on the quality of the institution. It should include sufficient information to inform a reader who is unfamiliar with the institution about the process of investigation and the evidence on which conclusions are based to have reasonable confidence that those conclusions are sound.

Other documents such as university handbooks should be available separately and completed scales from the *Self Evaluation Scales for Higher Education Institutions* should have been completed and made available with the self study report. Consequently full details of what is included in these documents need not be repeated in the self study report. However this report should include all the necessary information for it to be read as a complete report on the quality of the institution.

The template includes a number of sections and headings to assist in preparing the report. These sections and headings should be followed in the report. However additional information can be included. Throughout the report evidence should be presented in tables or other forms of data presentation to support conclusions, with comparative data included where appropriate, and reference made to other reports or surveys with more detailed information.

The report should be provided as a single page numbered document, single sided, with a table of contents. A list of acronyms used in the report should be attached.

**Template for Report on Institutional Self-Study**

For guidance on the completion of this template, please refer to Sections 3.6, 3.7 and 3.8 of Chapter 3 of Part 2 of this *Handbook.*

**A. General Information**

|  |
| --- |
| Name of Institution |
| Date of Report |

**B. Institutional Profile**

|  |
| --- |
| An institutional profile should be prepared including the following material:   * A brief summary of the institution’s history, scale and range of activities; * A description of the management and organizational structure using an organizational chart, list of colleges and departments, and the names and contact details of key individuals; * A list of campus locations indicating programs offered and student numbers; * Teaching and other staff and student numbers in total and by college, department, and program; * Summary information about the institution’s accreditation status including the outcomes of any previous institutional reviews, and any conditions that were established; * A description of the institution’s quality assurance arrangements, priorities for development, and any special issues affecting its operations; * A summary of the institution's strategic plan. (A copy of the actual strategic plan should be available for reference if required.) * A list of matters that are of particular interest to the institution and on which the institution is seeking comment and advice in the review. |

**C. Self-Study Process**

|  |
| --- |
| Provide a brief description of procedures followed and administrative arrangements for the self study. Include an organization chart. Membership and terms of reference for committees and /or working parties should be attached. |
|  |

**D. Context of the Self Study**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Environmental Context.  Summary of significant elements of the external environment in which the institution is operating and changes that have occurred recently or are expected to occur (eg. economic or social developments, population changes, government policies, developments at other institutions with implications for this institution’s programs). |
| 2. Institutional Context.  Brief summary of recent developments at the institution with implications for the review. |

**E. Mission, and Goals and Strategic Objectives for Quality Improvement**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Mission of the Institution |
| 2. Summary of Strategic Plan for Quality Improvement ( The institution's major goals and strategic objectives for quality improvement should be listed, indicating for each objective, performance indicators and benchmarks or standards of achievement the institution wishes to achieve.) |

**F Special Emphasis in the Self-Study (if any)**

|  |
| --- |
| Indicate any areas of particular interest to the institution in the review. (These may relate to responses to changes in the external or institutional environment, to planning priorities that may have been determined as a result of quality assessments or other strategic priorities, to government policies, etc.) |

**G. Progress Towards Major Quality Objectives** (Refer to Item D2 above)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Assessment of institutional performance in relation to plans or any major quality improvement initiatives in the period under review. These may have been undertaken in response to a previous self study, recommendations or requirements following an external review, or for other reasons.  Brief reports should be provided on each major initiative citing the objective(s), specific data indicating the results achieved, and a comment on reasons for success or failure to achieve the desired results.   |  | | --- | | 1. Objective 1 | | Result Achieved (Performance in relation to indicators and benchmarks) | | Comment | | Objective 2 | | Result Achieved (Performance in relation to indicators and benchmarks) | | Comment |   (continue for other strategic quality improvement objectives) |

**H. Evaluation in Relation to Quality Standards**

Reports should be given on performance in relation to each of the standards set out in the *Standards for Quality Assurance and Accreditation of Higher Education Institutions*. The reports should refer to areas of strength and weakness as indicated by the rating scales in the accompanying document—*Self Evaluation Scales for Higher Education Institutions*. Reference should also be made, where relevant, to other evidence such as performance indicators and surveys of students, graduates, faculty and employers and tables summarizing research output. If specific numerical data is available it should be included or provided in attachments and referred to in the text. Priorities for improvement should be indicated. If priorities for improvement have already been determined in planning, or initiatives already undertaken these should be noted and any initial results reported.

* To ensure a full understanding of the report by a person or persons unfamiliar with the institution Eg. external reviewers. (either local or international), a brief explanatory note should be included giving background information or explanations or processes relevant to the standard concerned.
* Some of the standards relate to functions that are administered by a central organizational unit for the institution as a whole. Others are decentralized and administered by colleges, departments, or other academic or administrative units in different parts of the institution. Where the functions are decentralized the reports should provide both an overall picture for the institution as a whole, and an indication of areas where quality of performance is particularly good or less than satisfactory. (See suggestions for reporting on decentralized functions in *Handbook 2 Internal Quality Assurance Arrangements*.)
* If the institution is operating in different locations or with major separate administrative centers (Eg, sections for male and female students, or a campus in another city or community)a single report should be provided but any significant differences should be noted and comments made about reasons for the differences and any response that should be made to deal with those differences. Where the institution operates in different locations or sections the descriptions of procedures should indicate how evaluations were conducted in the different locations
* It is not necessary to provide a detailed report on every individual item in every sub-section of each standard. The completed self evaluation scales will provide that more comprehensive coverage. However the report must include at least (a) Items where performance is poor or significantly different in different sections. (b) Items where performance is considered very good and evidence of strong performance can be provided. (c) Items that have been selected for special consideration as a result of strategic planning or previous evaluations
* **A vital element in these reports is to provide specific data to support conclusions, show trends, and make appropriate comparisons with other institutions selected to provide benchmarks for evaluation of performance.** This data can include statistical information, figures derived from survey results, student results (with standards verified), numbers of refereed publications or citations, usage rates of services or anything also that provides clear evidence about the matter being evaluated. A simple assertion that something is good, or needs improvement, is not sufficient without evidence to back it up.

Attach completed rating self evaluation rating scales from the Self Evaluation Scales for *Higher Education Institutions.*

|  |
| --- |
| **1. Mission and Objectives** (Overall Rating \_\_\_\_\_\_\_Stars)  *The institution's mission statement must clearly and appropriately define its principal purposes and priorities and be influential in guiding planning and action within the institution.*  Explanatory note about development and use of the mission.  Description of process for investigation and preparation of the report on this standard.  Report on subsections of the standard   * 1. Appropriateness of the Mission   2. Usefulness of the Mission Statement   3. Development and Review of the Mission   4. Use Made of the Mission Statement   5. Relationship Between Mission and Goals and Objectives   Overall Evaluation of Quality of Mission, Goals and Objectives. Refer to evidence obtained and provide a report based on that evidence and including a summary of particular strengths, areas requiring improvement, and priorities for action |

|  |
| --- |
| **2. Governance and Administration** (Overall Rating \_\_\_\_\_\_\_Stars)  *The governing body must provide effective leadership in the interests of the institution as a whole and its clients, through policy development and processes for accountability. Senior administrators must lead the activities of the institution effectively within a clearly defined governance structure. If there are separate sections for male and female students resources must be comparable in both sections, there must be effective communication between them, and full involvement in planning and decision making processes Planning and management must occur within a framework of sound policies and regulations that ensure financial and administrative accountability, and provide an appropriate balance between coordinated planning and local initiative.*  Explanatory note about aspects of governance and administration relevant to the matters referred to in this standard that are not already explained in the institutional profile. The note can be in summary form and refer to other documents for further detail.  Description of process for investigation and preparation of report on this standard.  Report on subsections of the standard   * 1. Governing Body   2. Leadership   3. Planning Processes   4. Relationship Between Sections for Male and Female Students   5. Institutional Integrity   6. Internal Policies and Regulations   7. Organizational Climate   2.6 Associated Companies and Controlled Entities (if applicable)  Overall Evaluation of Quality of Governance and Administration. Refer to evidence obtained and provide a report based on that evidence and including a summary of particular strengths, areas requiring improvement, and priorities for action. |

|  |
| --- |
| **3. Management of Quality Assurance and Improvement** (Overall Rating \_\_\_\_\_\_\_Stars)  *Quality assurance processes must involve all sections of the institution and be effectively integrated into normal planning and administrative processes. Criteria for assessment of quality must include inputs, processes and outcomes with a particular focus on outcomes. Processes must be established to ensure that teaching and other staff and students are committed to improvement and regularly evaluate their own performance. Quality must be assessed by reference to evidence based on indicators of performance and challenging external standards.*  Explanatory note. Provide a summary explanation of arrangements for quality assurance including major committees and organizational unit(s) and activities carried out at different levels of the institution (including colleges or departments) Include a listing of KPIs for use in the institution, and benchmarks selected for performance.  Description of process for preparation of report on this standard.  Report on subsections of the standard   * 1. Institutional Commitment to Quality Improvement   2. Scope of Quality Improvement Processes   3. Administration of Quality Assurance Processes   4. Use of Indicators and Benchmarks   2.5 Independent Verification of Standards  Overall Evaluation of Management of Quality Assurance and Improvement. Refer to evidence obtained and provide a report based on that evidence and including a summary of particular strengths, areas requiring improvement, and priorities for action. |

|  |
| --- |
| **4. Learning and Teaching**. (Overall Rating \_\_\_\_\_\_\_Stars)  *The institution must have an effective system for ensuring that all programs meet high standards of learning and teaching through initial approvals, monitoring of performance, and provision of institution-wide support services.*  *In all programs student learning outcomes must be clearly specified, consistent with the National Qualifications Framework and (for professional programs) requirements for employment or professional practice. Standards of learning must be assessed and verified through appropriate processes and benchmarked against demanding and relevant external reference points. Teaching staff must be appropriately qualified and experienced for their particular teaching responsibilities, use teaching strategies appropriate for different kinds of learning outcomes, and participate in activities to improve their teaching effectiveness. Teaching quality and the effectiveness of programs must be evaluated through student assessments and graduate and employer surveys, with feedback used as a basis for plans for improvement.*  Description of process for investigation and preparation of report on this standard.  Report on subsections of the standard  (In sub-section 4.1 a description should be given of the institutions processes for oversight of quality of learning and teaching. In each other subsection include an explanatory statement describing what is done throughout the institution.. If common procedures are not followed this should be indicated and an explanation given of major variations and how the institution as a whole monitors quality of performance.)   * 1. Institutional Oversight of Quality of Learning and Teaching   2. Student Learning Outcomes   3. Program Development Processes   4. Program Evaluation and Review Processes   5. Student Assessment   6. Educational Assistance for Students   7. Quality of Teaching   4.7 Support for Improvements in Quality of Teaching  4.8 Qualifications and Experience of Teaching Staff  4.9 Field Experience Activities  4.10 Partnership Arrangements with Other Institutions (If applicable)  Overall Evaluation of Quality of Learning and Teaching. Refer to evidence obtained and provide a report based on that evidence about the extent to which the requirements of the standard of learning are met throughout the institution. The evidence of performance should be provided (or summarized and referred to in other documents) including KPIs, survey reports and other relevant sources of evidence. A general conclusion should be drawn that includes a summary of particular strengths, areas requiring improvement, and priorities for action. |
| **5. Student Administration and Support Services** (Overall Rating \_\_\_\_\_\_\_Stars)  *Administration of admissions and student record systems must be reliable and responsive, with confidentiality of records maintained in keeping with stated policies. Students’ rights and responsibilities must be clearly defined and understood, with transparent and fair procedures available for discipline and appeals. Mechanisms for academic advice, counselling and support services must be accessible and responsive to student needs. Support services for students must go beyond formal academic requirements and include extra curricular provisions for religious, cultural, sporting, and other activities relevant to the needs of the student body.*  Explanatory note about student administration arrangements and support services, including functions carried out centrally and those managed in colleges or departments. For those managed in departments or colleges refer to any relevant institution-wide policies or regulations and describe the processes used by the institution to monitor how effectively local services are provided.  Description of process for preparation of report on this standard.  Report on subsections of the standard   * 1. Student Admissions   2. Student Records   3. Student Management   4. Planning and Evaluation of Student Services   5. Medical and Counseling Services   6. Extra-Curricular Activities for Students   Overall Evaluation of Quality of Student Administration and Support Services. Refer to evidence obtained and provide a report based on that evidence that includes a summary of particular strengths, areas requiring improvement, and priorities for action. |

|  |
| --- |
| **6. Learning Resources** (Overall Rating \_\_\_\_\_\_\_Stars)  *Learning resources including libraries and provisions for access to electronic and other reference material must be planned to meet the particular requirements of the institution’s programs and provided at an adequate level. Library and associated IT facilities must be accessible at times to support independent learning, with assistance provided in finding material required. Facilities must be provided for individual and group study in an environment conducive to effective investigations and research. The services must be evaluated and improved in response to systematic feedback from teaching staff and students.*  Explanatory note about provision of learning resources within the institution. This should include information about the extent to which library services are provided centrally or within colleges. If they are provided in different locations, descriptions should be given of any overall institutional coordination and performance monitoring.  Description of process for investigation and preparation of report on this standard. (if library services are provided in different locations this investigation should deal with provisions throughout the institution and draw conclusions about overall performance and variations between different locations)  Report on subsections of the standard   * 1. Planning and Evaluation   2. Organization   3. Support for Users   4. Resources and Facilities   Overall Evaluation of Learning Resource Provision. Refer to evidence and provide a report based on that evidence that includes a summary of particular strengths, areas requiring improvement, and priorities for action |

|  |
| --- |
| **7. Facilities and Equipment** (Overall Rating \_\_\_\_\_\_\_Stars)  *Facilities must be designed or adapted to meet the particular requirements for teaching and learning in the programs offered by the institution, and offer a safe and healthy environment for high quality education. Use of facilities must be monitored and user surveys used to assist in planning for improvement. Adequate provision must be made for classrooms and laboratories, use of computer technology and research equipment by faculty and student and appropriate provision made for associated services such as food services, extra curricular activities, and where relevant, student accommodation.*  Explanatory note about administration of arrangements for planning, development and maintenance of facilities and equipment. This should include cross references to other more detailed facilities planning documents.  Description of process for investigation and preparation of report on this standard.  Report on subsections of the standard   * 1. Policy and Planning   2. Quality and Adequacy of Facilities and Equipment   3. Management and Administration   4. Information Technology   5. Student Residences   Overall Evaluation of Provision of Facilities and Equipment. This report should refer to evidence and relevant benchmarks, and include a summary of particular strengths, areas requiring improvement, and priorities for action |

|  |
| --- |
| **8. Financial Planning and Management** (Overall Rating \_\_\_\_\_\_\_Stars)  *Financial resources must be adequate for the programs and services offered and efficiently managed in keeping with program requirements and institutional priorities. Effective systems must be used for budgeting and for financial delegations and accountability providing local flexibility, institutional oversight and effective risk management.*  Explanatory note describing budgeting and financial planning and funding submission processes and arrangements for audit. The explanation should include a list of financial reports that are prepared. Information should be given about levels of financial delegation within the institution with reference to other documents that set out institutional policies and regulations relating to these delegations. .  Description of process for investigation and preparation of report on this standard.  Report on subsections of the standard   * 1. Financial Planning   2. Financial Management   3. Auditing and Risk Management   Overall Evaluation of Financial Management and Planning Processes. The report should refer to relevant evidence and benchmarks and include a summary comment indicating particular strengths, areas requiring improvement, and priorities for action. |

|  |
| --- |
| **9. Employment Processes** (Overall Rating \_\_\_\_\_\_\_Stars)  *Teaching and other staff must have the qualifications and experience for effective exercise of their responsibilities and professional development strategies must be followed to ensure continuing improvement in faculty and staff expertise. Performance of all faculty and staff must be evaluated, with outstanding performance recognized and support provided for improvement where required. Effective, fair, and transparent processes must be available for the resolution of conflicts and disputes involving faculty and or staff.*  Explanatory note about processes for employment and professional development of teaching and other staff. The explanation should include a description of how colleges and departments are involved in the selection of teaching staff, a description of institutional policies on staff development and promotion, and indicators used for monitoring the quality of staff management processes throughout the institution,  Description of process for preparation of report on this standard.  Report on subsections of the standard   * 1. Policy and Administration   2. Recruitment   3. Personal and Career Development   4. Discipline, Complaints and Dispute Resolution   Overall Evaluation of Institutional Employment Processes. The report should refer to relevant evidence and benchmarks and include a summary comment indicating particular strengths, areas requiring improvement, and priorities for action. |

|  |
| --- |
| **10. Research** (Overall Rating \_\_\_\_\_\_\_Stars)  *All staff teaching higher education programs must be involved in sufficient appropriate scholarly activities to ensure they remain up to date with developments in their field, and those developments should be reflected in their teaching. Staff teaching in post graduate programs or supervising higher degree research students must be actively involved in research in their field. Adequate facilities and equipment must be available to support the research activities of teaching staff and post graduate students to meet these requirements. In universities and other institutions with research responsibility, teaching staff must be encouraged to pursue research interests and to publish the results of that research. Their research contributions must be recognized and reflected in evaluation and promotion criteria*. *The research output of the institution must be monitored and benchmarked against that of other similar institutions. Clear and equitable policies must be established for ownership and commercialization of intellectual property.*  Explanatory note describing the nature and extent of research involvement of the institution and of teaching staff within it. The explanation should include a brief description of organizational arrangements for developing and monitoring research activity across the institution including any research centers and activities to encourage research by individual staff members. Indicators used for monitoring research performance should be listed.  Description of process for preparation of report on this standard.  Report on subsections of the standard   * 1. Institutional Research Policies   2. Faculty and Student Involvement in Research   3. Commercialization of Research   10.4 Facilities and Equipment  Overall Evaluation of Research Performance. For a university the report should include statistical data on the extent and quality of research activity including competitive grants, publications and citations and other relevant information benchmarked against appropriate institutional benchmarks. For a college this information can be included but the report must include data on professional or scholarly activities that ensure teaching staff are up to date with developments in their teaching field. The report should include summary comment indicating particular strengths, areas requiring improvement, and priorities for action. |

|  |
| --- |
| **11. Institutional Relationships with the Community** (Overall Rating \_\_\_\_\_\_\_Stars)  *Contributing to the community must be recognized as an important institutional responsibility. Facilities and services are made available to assist with community developments, teaching and other staff must be encouraged to be involved in the community and information about the institution and its activities made known. Community perceptions of the institution must be monitored and appropriate strategies adopted to improve understanding and enhance its reputation.*  Explanatory note about institutional policies for community service activities and media or other contacts to develop community understanding and support. The explanation should include information about how contributions to the community are recognized within the institution.  Description of process for preparation of report on this standard.  Report on subsections of the standard   * 1. Institutional Policies on Community Relationships   2. Interactions with the Community   11.3 Institutional Reputation  Overall Evaluation of Institutional Relationships with the Community. The report should include relevant statistical and survey data and indicate particular strengths, areas requiring improvement, and priorities for action |

**I Independent Evaluations**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Describe the process used to obtain independent comment on the self study. Processes may include a review of documentation by experienced and independent persons familiar with similar institutions and who could comment on relative standards, consultancy advice or a report by a review panel, or even the results of an accreditation review by an independent agency. An independent evaluation may be conducted in relation to the total self-study, or involve a number of separate comments by different people on different issues. |
| 1. Summary of matters raised by independent evaluator(s) |
| 1. Comment on matters raised by independent evaluator(s) (Agree, disagree, further consideration required, action proposed, etc.) |

**J Conclusions**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. List and briefly describe institutional activities that are particularly successful or that demonstrate high quality. |
| 2. List and briefly describe institutional activities that are less than satisfactory and that need to be improved. |

**K Action Recommendations**

These should be based on the matters identified earlier in the report for further improvements or to overcome problems or weaknesses identified indicate specific actions proposed to deal with the most important priorities for action identified in those sections. Matters of greatest urgency or highest priority should be identified. For each action proposed recommendations should be made on who should be responsible for the action, timelines specified, and any necessary resources required.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  | | --- | | Action Recommendation 1 ….. | | Person (s) responsible | | Timelines (For total initiative and for major stages of development) | | Resources Required |  |  | | --- | | Action Recommendation 2….. | | Person(s) responsible | | Timelines | | Resources Required |  |  | | --- | | Action Recommendation 3….. | | Person(s) responsible | | Timelines | | Resources Required |  |  | | --- | | Action Recommendation 4….. | | Person(s) responsible | | Timelines | | Resources Required |   Continue for further action recommendations.. |

The Institutional Self Study Report should be on A4 paper, unbound, printed on one side, page numbered, and with a table of contents for easy reference.

**Attachments**

Membership and terms of reference for sub-committees and working parties

Reference list of key reports and other documents cited in the report

Glossary of acronyms and abbreviations used in the report

Copy of report(s) by independent evaluator(s)

In addition to the self-study report the following documents should be provided:

1. Self–evaluation Scales for Higher Education Institutions. The completed scales should include star ratings, independent comments and indications of priorities for improvement as requested in the document, and should be accompanied by a description of the processes used in investigating and making evaluations.
2. A copy of the institution's strategic plan.
3. A copy of the institution's strategic plan for quality improvement (which may be included within the broader institutional strategic plan).
4. Current student catalogue, prospectus, bulletin or handbook including descriptions of the curriculum, admissions requirements, degree completion requirements, and related information.

The following documents should be available for the review panel during the visit. Members of the panel may ask for some of it to be sent to them in advance.

1. Faculty handbook or similar document with information about staffing policies, professional development policies and procedures and related information.
2. Administrative and financial policies manual or similar document including the institution’s bylaws and regulations, roles and responsibilities of administrative and academic officers and major committees, and an explanation of the institutions governance and administrative structure.
3. Quality assurance manual or description of procedures including information about the institutions system of assessing programs and services, the role of the institution’s quality center and systems for gathering and analyzing data on quality of performance and planning for improvement.
4. Current data on faculty and other teaching staff including tables with numbers by academic rank, by highest qualification, teaching staff/student ratios for each department and college, and for the institution as a whole. For a university (optional for a college) information should be provided on research output for each department, college and for the institution as a whole. Current teaching staff CVs should be on file and available for the review panel if required.

# 6. Self Evaluation Scales for Higher Education Institutions

|  |
| --- |
| In this document information about the standards is presented at two levels. The first is a general statement of the standard as it applies to a broad area of activity and the second is a description of why it is important and the kinds of processes that are expected if the standard is achieved.  This explanatory information is followed for each standard by a number of more specific statements of “good practices” that are typically carried out in a high quality institution with scales to indicate whether and how well the practice is followed.. The scales” are presented in groups that deal with major components or sub-sections of the general standards.  The lists of specific practices are intended primarily as a guide for those responsible for particular activities to draw attention to things that are generally regarded as good practice, and to assist them in their self-evaluations.  Some of these statements are relevant to certain institutions but not to others. Where an item is not applicable it should be simply marked NA, and ignored.  For each individual item two responses are called for. The first is to indicate whether the practice is followed in the institution. The possible responses are:  NA -- the practice is not applicable or relevant for the institution or unit making the response.  Y – yes, the practice is followed; or  N – no, the practice is relevant but not followed.  The second response is called for in cases where the practice is relevant to the institution (i.e. a “Y” or “N” response). It involves the use of a five-point rating scale to evaluate on a how consistently and how well the practice is carried out. Stars, rather than a numeric or alphabetic rating scale, are used for this purpose.  The evaluations relate to:  The extent and consistency with which processes are followed;  The quality of the service or activity as assessed through systematic evaluations;  The effectiveness of what is done in achieving intended outcomes.  **Using Stars for Evaluations**  Performance should be assessed by allocating from zero to five stars in accordance with the following descriptions:  Improvement Required  No Star – The practice is relevant but not followed at all. A zero should be recorded on the scale.  One Star – The practice is followed occasionally but quality of the activity is poor or not evaluated.  Two Stars -- The practice is usually followed but the quality is less than satisfactory.  Good Performance  Three Stars—The practice is followed most of the time. Evidence of the effectiveness of the activity is usually obtained and indicates that satisfactory standards of performance are normally achieved although there is some room for improvement. Plans for improvement in quality are made and progress in implementation is monitored.  High Quality Performance  Four Stars—The practice is followed consistently. Indicators of quality of performance are established and suggest high quality but with still some room for improvement. Plans for this improvement have been developed and are being implemented, and progress is regularly monitored and reported on.  Five Stars—The practice is followed consistently and at a very high standard, with direct evidence or independent assessments indicating superior quality in relation to other comparable institutions. Despite clear evidence of high standards of performance plans for further improvement exist with realistic strategies and timelines established.  **Converting Survey Responses to a Starring System**.  In a number of cases the individual items refer to evaluations of quality by students, faculty, or other stakeholders. The wording of survey instruments and items in rating scales can influence results significantly and interpretations of the data and independent verification of conclusions is important. However as a general guide where a five point rating scale is used with possibilities of positive and negative assessments evenly balanced, an overall rating from respondents to a survey might achieve star ratings as follows:  Above 4.5 Five stars  3.6-4.5 Four stars  2.6-3.5 Three stars  1.6-2.5 Two stars  1.5 or below One star |

**Standard 3 : Management of Quality Assurance and Improvement** **Processes**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Quality assurance processes must involve all sections of the institution and be effectively integrated into normal planning and administrative processes. Criteria for assessment of quality must include inputs, processes and outcomes with a particular focus on outcomes. Processes must be established to ensure that teaching and other staff and students are committed to improvement and regularly evaluate their own performance. Quality must be assessed by reference to evidence based on indicators of performance and challenging external benchmarks. Specific requirements in the institution’s quality assurance system should be periodically reviewed to ensure that unnecessary requirements are not included and that data that is provided is actually used in an effective way. | | |
| *The scales below ask you to indicate whether these practices are followed in your institution and to show how well this is done. Wherever possible evaluations should be based on valid evidence and interpretations supported by independent opinions.* | | |
| **Good Practices Relating to This Standard** | **Is this true?**  **Y/No/NA** | **How well is this done?**  **(enter stars)** |
| * 1. **Institutional Commitment to Quality Improvement**   An institution must be committed to maintaining and improving quality through effective leadership and active involvement of teaching and other staff.   * + 1. The Rector or Dean strongly supports involvement in quality assurance processes.     2. Adequate resources are provided for the leadership and management of quality assurance processes, and provision of assistance where it is needed.     3. All teaching and other staff participate in self-assessments and cooperate with reporting and improvement processes in their sphere of activity.     4. Creativity and innovation combined with clear guidelines and accountability processes are actively encouraged at all levels.     5. Mistakes and weaknesses are recognized and used as a basis for planning for improvement.     6. Improvements in quality are appropriately acknowledged.     7. Evaluation and planning for quality improvement are integrated into normal administrative processes.   Overall Assessment  Comment\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Priorities for improvement\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Independent Opinion  Comment\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  **3.2 Scope of Quality Assurance Processes**  Quality assurance activities that are necessary to ensure good quality must apply to all functions carried out in the institution and involve teaching and other staff in all parts of the institution in performance evaluations and planning for improvement.   * + 1. All academic and administrative units within the institution (including the governing body, and senior management) participate in the processes of quality assurance and improvement.     2. Regular evaluations are carried out and reports prepared to provide an overview of performance for the institution as a whole, and organizational units and functions within it.     3. Quality evaluations consider inputs, processes and outcomes, with particular attention to quality of outcomes.     4. Evaluations are carried out for both routine activities and for strategic priorities for improvement.     5. Quality assurance processes are designed to ensure both that acceptable standards are met, and that thereis continuing improvement in performance.     6. A program of institutional research on quality issues is carried out to investigate and report to the Rector or Dean and the governing body, and inform the institution as a whole on the quality of the institution’s activities and achievement of its objectives.     7. In institutions with sections for male and female students detailed evaluations in relation   to all standards should be carried out in a consistent way in both sections and quality reports on  those standards should note any significant differences found and make appropriate  recommendations for action in response to what is found.  Overall Assessment  Comment\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Priorities for improvement\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Independent Opinion  Comment\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  **3.3 Administration of Quality Assurance Processes**  The institution must make adequate arrangements for the leadership and administrative support for quality assurance processes throughout the organization.   * + 1. A senior member of faculty is assigned responsibility and given a sufficient time allowance to provide guidance and support for the quality processes within the institution.   3.3.2 A quality center is established within the institution’s central administration and given sufficient staff and resources to operate effectively.   * + 1. A quality committee is formed with members drawn from all major sections of the institution. As a general guideline this might involve12 to 15 members and in a large   institution might require representatives from groups of Colleges in similar fields rather than from each college.   * + 1. The committee is chaired by a member of the institution’s senior administration who works closely with the director of the quality center in guiding and supporting quality initiatives throughout the institution.     2. The roles and responsibilities of the head of the quality centre, the centre itself, and the quality committee are formally defined and their relationship with other planning and administrative units made clear.     3. If quality assurance functions are managed by more than one organizational unit, the activities of these units are effectively coordinated under the supervision of a senior administrator.     4. The institution’s quality assurance system is fully integrated into normal planning and development strategies in a defined cycle of planning, implementation, assessment and review.     5. Evaluations are (i) based on evidence, (ii) linked to appropriate standards, (iii) include consideration of predetermined indicators, and (iv) take account of independent verification of interpretations.     6. Common forms and survey instruments are prepared for use for similar activities across the institution (eg. programs, courses, libraries etc.) and responses used in independent analyses of results including trends over time. (This does not preclude additional questions relevant to different programs or special instruments dealing with particular functions eg. specialized libraries or student services)     7. Statistical data (including pass rates, progression and completion rates and other   data required for indicators) are retained in a central data base and provided routinely and  promptly to colleges and departments (normally each semester or at least annually)  for their use in preparation of reports on indicators and other tasks in monitoring quality.  3.3.11The administrative arrangements and processes used for quality assurance in the institution are evaluated and reported on in a way that is comparable to the quality assurance processes for other functions and organizational units.   * + 1. Processes for evaluation of quality should be transparent with criteria for judgments and evidence considered made clear.   Overall Assessment  Comment\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Priorities for improvement\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Independent Opinion  Comment\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  **3.4 Use of Indicators and Benchmarks**  Specific indicators must be identified for monitoring performance and appropriate benchmarks selected for evaluation of the achievement of goals and objectives and for the quality of major institutional functions.   1. A limited number of key performance indicators that are capable of objective measurement have been identified and provide clear objective evidence of quality of performance for sections within the institution (including colleges and departments) and for the institution as a whole. 2. Additional indicators that provide clear evidence of quality of performance in achieving their objectives are selected by or for each academic and administrative unit within the institution. 3. When functions that are carried out by different organizational units (eg. teaching, research, community service) some common indicators are selected for all such units as measures of quality and to provide for comparisons of performance. 4. Benchmarks for comparing quality of performance (including past performance and at least some comparisons with other institutions) are established and achievements in relation to those benchmarks is regularly monitored.   3.4.5 Key performance indicators and benchmarks for major organizational units or functions are approved by the appropriate committee or council within the institution (eg. senior academic committee, university council)  3.4.6 The format for indicators and benchmarks is consistent across the institution and provides specific evidence relating to important objectives.  Overall Assessment  Comment\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Priorities for improvement\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Independent Opinion  Comment\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_   * 1. **Independent Verification of Standards**   3.5.1 Self-evaluations of quality of performance are checked against related evidence including feedback through user surveys and opinions of stakeholders such as students and teaching staff, graduates and employers.   * + 1. Interpretations of evidence of quality of performance are verified through independent advice from persons familiar with the type of activity concerned and impartial mechanisms are used to reconcile differing opinions.     2. Institutional policies and procedures have been established for the verification of standards of achievement by students in relation to other institutions and the requirements of the National Qualifications Framework.   Overall Assessment  Comment\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Priorities for improvement\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_    Independent Opinion  Comment\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Overall Assessment of Quality Assurance and Improvement Processes** |
| 3.1 Institutional Commitment to Quality Improvement  3.2 Scope of Quality Assurance Processes  3.3 Administration of Quality Assurance Processes  3.4 Use of Indicators and Benchmarks  3.5 Independent Verification of Standards  Combined Assessment |
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**Standard 4: Learning and Teaching**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| The institution must have an effective system for ensuring that all programs meet high standards of learning and teaching through initial approvals, monitoring of performance, and provision of institution-wide support services. In all programs student learning outcomes must be clearly specified, consistent with the National Qualifications Framework and (for professional programs) requirements for employment or professional practice. Standards of learning must be assessed through appropriate processes and benchmarked against demanding and relevant external reference points. Teaching staff must be appropriately qualified and experienced for their particular teaching responsibilities, use teaching strategies suitable for different kinds of learning outcomes, and participate in activities to improve their teaching effectiveness. Teaching quality and the effectiveness of programs must be evaluated through student assessments and graduate and employer surveys, with feedback used as a basis for plans for improvement. If programs are offered in different sections for male and female students required standards must be the same, equivalent resources must be provided, and evaluations must include data for each section. | | |
| *The scales below ask you to indicate whether these practices are followed in your institution and to show how well this is done. Wherever possible evaluations should be based on valid evidence and interpretations supported by independent opinions* | | |
| **Good Practices Relating to This Standard** | **Is this true?**  **Y/No/NA** | **How well is this done?**  **(enter stars)** |
| * 1. **Institutional Oversight of Quality of Learning and Teaching**   The institution must have effective systems for ensuring that high standards of learning and teaching are achieved in all programs offered, and for supporting their improvement. Institutional processes must be in place to monitor and report on the extent to which the requirements included in the standard for learning and teaching are met for all the programs across the institution. Appropriate action must be taken by the institution to deal with problems and support improvements through general institutional strategies or support for initiatives within particular organizational units where they are needed.   * + 1. 4.1.1 New program proposals and proposals for major changes in programs are thoroughly evaluated and approved by the institution’s senior academic committee.   4.1.2 The evaluation of new programs or major changes in programs by the senior academic committee includes consideration of the matters described in the standard for learning and teaching, including any special requirements applicable to the field of study concerned and requirements for graduates in Saudi Arabia.  4.1.3 Guidelines are established defining the levels for approval of changes in courses and programs and for considering indicators and reports on courses and programs. (for example a head of department might consider course reports for all courses and a departmental committee approve minor changes to keep courses up to date. A dean might consider program reports that include summary information about courses. The vice rector responsible for academic affairs, the quality committee and the senior academic committee might consider a general summary of program reports and data on key performance indicators, and approve more significant changes in programs.) (See also section 2.2.4)  4.1.4 Guidelines have been established defining the levels for approval of changes in courses and programs. Minor changes required to keep programs up to date and respond to course and program evaluations should be made flexibly and rapidly at departmental level and more substantial changes referred to the relevant senior committees for approval.  4.1.5 Data on key performance indicators for all programs are reviewed at least annually by senior administrators responsible for academic affairs, the institution’s quality committee and the institution’s senior academic committee, with overall institutional performance reported to the governing board.  4.1.6 Annual reports are prepared for all programs, and reviewed by department/college committees, with appropriate action taken in response to recommendations in those reports.  4.1.7 Self evaluations using the self evaluation scales for higher education programs are undertaken periodically (eg. every two or three years) for each program and reports prepared for consideration by the quality committee and the relevant academic committees.  4.1.8 Reports on the overall quality of teaching and learning for the institution as a whole are prepared periodically (eg. every three years) indicating common strengths and weaknesses, and significant variations in quality between programs/departments and sections.  4.1.9 Reports by departments to their college, or by departments or colleges to the central administration, are acknowledged with responses made to any queries or proposals made.  4.1.10 The senior administrator responsible for academic affairs takes responsibility, in cooperation with the quality committee and deans/heads of department, for developing and implementing strategies for improvement to deal with common issues affecting programs across the institution.  4.1.11 Colleges/departments cooperate with and participate in general institutional strategies for improvement, and arrange complementary further initiatives to deal with quality issues found in their own programs.  4.1.12 If programs are offered in different sections, including sections for male and female students, or in branch campuses, the standards of learning outcomes, the resources provided (including learning resources and staffing provisions and resources to undertake research) should be comparable in all sections. Data used for evaluations and performance indicators should be provided for all sections as well as for the programs in total.  Overall Assessment  Comment\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Priorities for improvement\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Independent opinion  Comment\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** |  |
| * 1. **Student Learning Outcomes**   Intended student learning outcomes must be consistent with the National Qualifications Framework, and with generally accepted standards for the field of study concerned, including requirements for any professions for which students are being prepared. Programs must be planned in a way that ensures that all courses contribute to program learning outcomes in a coordinated way.   * + 1. Intended learning outcomes are specified after consideration of relevant academic and professional advice.     2. Intended learning outcomes are consistent with the Qualifications Framework. (covering all of the domains of learning at the standards required).     3. Intended learning outcomes are consistent with requirements for professional practice in Saudi Arabia in the fields concerned. (These requirements should include local accreditation requirements and also take account of international accreditation requirements for that field of study, and any Saudi Arabian regulations or regional needs)     4. If an institution has identified special attributes to be developed in students graduating from the institution comprehensive strategies are established for these to be developed. (This means that the attributes to be developed in students are clearly defined, strategies for developing them planned and implemented across all programs, and mechanisms for assessing and reporting on the extent to which graduating students have developed them are in place.)     5. Graduates are surveyed and employers are consulted periodically to check the appropriateness of intended learning outcomes and the extent to which needed knowledge and skills have been developed. (see also sections 4.3 and 4.5.2 dealing with program evaluation processes and verification of standards of student achievement)   Overall Assessment  Comment\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Priorities for improvement\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Independent opinion  Comment\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **4.3 Program Development Processes**  Programs must be planned as coherent packages of learning experiences in which all courses contribute in planned ways to the intended learning outcomes for the program.  4.3.1 Plans for the delivery of programs and for their evaluation are set out in detailed program specifications. (These should include knowledge and skills to be acquired, and strategies for teaching and assessment for the progressive development of learning in all the domains of learning.)  4.3.2 Plans for courses are set out in course specifications that include knowledge and skills to be acquired and strategies for teaching and assessment for the domains of learning to be addressed in each course.  4.3.3 The content and strategies set out in course specifications are coordinated to ensure effective progressive development of learning for the total program in all the domains of learning.  4.3.4 Planning includes any actions necessary to ensure that teaching staff are familiar with and are able to use the strategies included in the program and course specifications.  4.3.5 The academic or professional fields for which students are being prepared are monitored on a continuing basis with necessary adjustments made in programs and in text and reference materials to ensure continuing relevance and quality.  4.3.6 In professional programs practitioners from the relevant occupations or professions are included in continuing advisory committees that monitor and advise on content and quality of programs.  4.3.7 New program proposals are assessed and approved or rejected by the institution’s senior academic committee using criteria that ensure thorough and appropriate consultation in planning and capacity for effective implementation.  Overall Assessment  Comment\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Priorities for improvement\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Independent opinion  Comment\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **4.4 Program Evaluation and Review Processes**  The quality of all courses and of programs as a whole must be monitored regularly through appropriate evaluation mechanisms and amended as required, with more extensive quality reviews conducted periodically.  4.4.1 Courses and programs are evaluated and reported on annually and reports include information about the effectiveness of planned strategies and the extent to which intended learning outcomes are being achieved.  4.4.2 When changes are made as a result of evaluations details of those changes and the reasons for them should be retained in course and program portfolios.  4.4.3 Quality indicators that include learning outcome measures are used for all courses and programs.  4.4.4 Records of student completion rates are kept for all courses and for programs as a whole and included among quality indicators.  4.4.5 Reports on programs are reviewed annually by senior administrators and quality committees. (See also item 4.1 3 relating to the level of detail for these reports at different levels of academic administration)  4.4.6 Systems have been established for central recording and analysis of course completion and program progression and completion rates and student course and program evaluations, with summaries and comparative data distributed automatically to departments, colleges, senior administrators and relevant committees at least once each year.  4.4.7 If problems are found through program evaluations appropriate action is taken to make improvements, either within the program concerned or through institutional action as appropriate.  4.4.8 In addition to annual evaluations a comprehensive reassessment of every program is conducted at least once every five years.  4.4.9 Program reviews involve experienced people from relevant industries and professions, and experienced teaching staff from other institutions.  4.4.10 In program reviews opinions about the quality of the program including the extent to which intended learning outcomes are achieved is sought from students and graduates through surveys and interviews, discussions with teaching staff, and other stakeholders such as employers.  Overall Assessment  Comment\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Priorities for improvement\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Independent opinion  Comment\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **4.5 Student Assessment**  Student assessment processes must be appropriate for the intended learning outcomes and effectively and fairly administered with independent verification of standards achieved.  4.5.1 Student assessment mechanisms are appropriate for the forms of learning sought.  4.5.2 Assessment processes are clearly communicated to students at the beginning of courses.  4.5.3 Appropriate, valid and reliable mechanisms are used in programs throughout the institution for verifying standards of student achievement in relation to relevant internal and external benchmarks. The standard of work required for different grades should be consistent over time, comparable in courses offered within a program and college and the institution as a whole, and in comparison with other highly regarded institutions. (Arrangements for verifying standards may include measures such as check marking of random samples of student work by teaching staff at other institutions, and independent comparisons of standards achieved with other comparable institutions within Saudi Arabia, and internationally.)  4.5.4 Grading of students tests, assignments and projects is assisted by the use of matrices or other means to ensure that the planned range of domains of student learning outcomes are addressed.  4.5.5 Arrangements are made within the institution for training of teaching staff in the theory and practice of student assessment.  4.5.6 Appropriate procedures are followed to deal with situations where standards of student achievement are inadequate or inconsistently assessed.  4.5.7 Effective procedures are followed that ensure that work submitted by students is actually done by the students concerned.  4.5.8 Feedback to students on their performance and results of assessments during each semester is given promptly and accompanied by mechanisms for assistance if needed.  4.5.9 Assessments of students work are conducted fairly and objectively.  4.5.10 Criteria and processes for academic appeals are made known to students and administered equitably (see also item 5.3)  Overall Assessment  Comment\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Priorities for improvement\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Independent opinion  Comment\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **4.6 Educational Assistance for Students**  Effective systems must be in place for assisting student learning through academic advice, study facilities, monitoring student progress, encouraging high performing students and provision of assistance when needed by individuals.  4.6.1 Teaching staff are available at sufficient scheduled times for consultation and advice to students. (this is confirmed, not simply scheduled, and if there are part time as well as full time students the scheduled times provide for access by both groups)  4.6.2 Teaching resources (including staffing, learning resources and equipment, and clinical or other field placements) should be sufficient to ensure achievement of the intended learning outcomes.  4.6.3 If arrangements for student academic counselling and advice include electronic communications through email or other means the effectiveness of those processes is evaluated through means such as analysis of response times and student evaluations.  4.6.4 Adequate tutorial assistance is provided to ensure understanding and ability to apply learning.  4.6.5 Appropriate preparatory and orientation mechanisms are used to prepare students for study in a higher education environment. Particular attention is given to preparation for the language of instruction, self directed learning, and transition programs if necessary for students transferring to the institution with credit for previous studies. Preparatory studies must not be counted within the credit hours for the programs that follow.  4.6.6 For any programs in which the language of instruction is English, action is taken to ensure that language skills are adequate for instruction in that language before students begin their higher education studies. (This may be done through language training prior to admission to the program. Language skills expected on entry should be benchmarked against other highly regarded institutions with the objective of skills at least comparable to minimum requirements for admission of international students in universities in English speaking countries. (Verification of standards should involve testing of at least a representative sample of students on a generally accepted standard English language test and a benchmark for performance equivalent to what is required for international students by universities in English speaking countries)  4.6.7 If preparatory programs are required but outsourced to other providers the institution accepts responsibility for ensuring the quality of these programs and ensures that required standards for entry are met.  4.6.8 Systems are in place within each program throughout the institution for monitoring and coordinating student workload across courses.  4.6.9 Systems are in place for monitoring the progress of individual students and assistance and/or counselling is provided to those facing difficulties.  4.6.10 Year to year progression rates and program completion rates are monitored, and action taken to help any categories or types of students needing help.  4.6.11 Adequate facilities are available for private study with access to computer terminals and other necessary equipment.  4.6.12 Teaching staff are familiar with the range of support services available in the institution for students, and refer them to appropriate sources of assistance when required.  4.6.13 The adequacy of arrangements for assistance to students should be periodically assessed through processes that include, but are not restricted to, feedback from students.  Overall Assessment  Comment\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Priorities for improvement\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Independent opinion  Comment\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  **4.7 Quality of Teaching**  Teaching must be of high quality with appropriate strategies used for different categories of learning outcomes.  4.7.1 Effective orientation and training programs are provided for new, short term and part time staff. (To be effective these programs should ensure that faculty are fully briefed on required learning outcomes, on planned teaching strategies, and the contribution of their course to the program as a whole.)  4.7.2 Teaching strategies are appropriate for the different types of learning outcomes programs are intended to develop.  4.7.3 Strategies of teaching and assessment set out in program and course specifications are followed by teaching staff with flexibility to meet the needs of different groups of students.  4.7.4 Students are fully informed about course requirements in advance through course descriptions that include knowledge and skills to be developed, work requirements and assessment processes.  4.7.5 The conduct of courses is consistent with the outlines provided to students and with the course specifications.  4.7.6 Textbooks and reference materials are up to date with latest developments in the field of study.  4.7.7 Textbooks and other required materials are available in sufficient quantities before classes commence.  4.7.8 Student attendance requirements in classes are made clear in student orientations, attendance is monitored, and regulations rigorously enforced.  4.7.9 A comprehensive system , (including but not limited to student surveys) is in place for evaluation of teaching effectiveness in all courses.  4.7.10 The effectiveness of planned teaching strategies in developing learning outcomes is regularly assessed, and adjustments made in response to evidence about their effectiveness.  4.7.11 Regular (at least annual) reports are provided to program administrators on the delivery of each course including any material that could not be covered and any difficulties found in using planned strategies.   * + 1. Appropriate adjustments made in plans for teaching as a result of course reports.   Overall Assessment  Comment\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Priorities for improvement\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Independent Opinion  Comment\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_   * 1. **Support for Improvements in Quality of Teaching**   The institution must implement appropriate strategies to support continuing improvement in quality of teaching.   * + 1. Training programs in teaching skills are provided for both new and continuing teaching staff including those in part time positions.     2. Training programs in teaching should include effective use of new and emerging technology.     3. Adequate opportunities are provided for the professional and academic development of teaching staff with special assistance given to any who are facing difficulties.     4. The extent to which teaching staff are involved in professional development to improve quality of teaching is monitored.     5. Teaching staff develop strategies for improvement of their own teaching and maintain a portfolio of evidence of evaluations and strategies for improvement.     6. Formal recognition is given to outstanding teaching, and encouragement given for innovation and creativity.     7. Strategies for improving quality of teaching include improving the quality of learning materials and the teaching strategies associated with them.   Overall Assessment  Comment\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Priorities for improvement\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Independent opinion  Comment\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_   * 1. **Qualifications and Experience of Teaching Staff**   4.9.1 Teaching staff have appropriate qualifications and experience for the courses they teach.  4.9.2 If part time teaching staff are needed there is an appropriate mix of full time and part time teaching staff. (As a general guideline at least 75 % of teaching staff should be employed on a full time basis.)  4.9.3 All teaching staff are involved on a continuing basis in scholarly activities that ensure they remain up to date with the latest developments in their field and can involve their students in learning that incorporates those developments.  4.9.4 Full time staff teaching post-graduate courses, are themselves active in scholarship and research in the fields of study they teach.  4.9.5 In professional programs teaching teams include some experienced and highly skilled professionals in the field.  Overall Assessment  Comment\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Priorities for improvement\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Independent opinion  Comment\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_   * 1. **Field Experience Activities**   (Field experience includes any work based activity such as internships, cooperative training, practicums, clinical placements or other activities in a work or clinical setting under the supervision of staff employed in that work or professional setting)  In programs that include field experience activities, the field experience activities must be planned and administered as fully integrated components of the program, with learning outcomes specified, supervising staff considered as members of teaching teams, and appropriate evaluation and course improvement strategies carried out.  4.10.1 In programs that include field experience activities the student learning to be developed through that experience is clearly specified and appropriate steps taken to ensure that those learning outcomes and expected experiences to develop that learning are understood by students and supervising staff in the field setting  4.10.2 Supervising staff in field locations are thoroughly briefed on their role and the relationship of the field experience to the program as a whole.  4.10.3 Teaching staff from the institution should visit the field setting for observations and consultations with students and field supervisors often enough to provide proper oversight and support. (Normally at least twice during a field experience activity)  4.10.4 Students are thoroughly prepared through briefings and descriptive material for participation in the field experience.  4.10.5 Follow up meetings or classes are organized in which students can reflect on and generalize from their experience.  4.10.6 Field experience placements are selected because of their capacity to develop the learning outcomes sought and their effectiveness in doing so is evaluated.  4.10.7 In situations where the supervisors in the field setting and teaching staff from the institution are both involved in student assessments, criteria for assessment are clearly specified and explained, and procedures established for reconciling differing opinions.  4.10.8 Provision is made for evaluations of the field experience activity (i) by students, (ii) by supervising staff in the field setting, and (iii) by staff of the institution, and results of those evaluations considered in subsequent planning.  4.10.9 Preparation for the field experience includes thorough risk assessment for all parties involved, and planning to minimize and deal with those risks.  Overall Assessment  Comment\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Priorities for improvement\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Independent opinion  Comment\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  **4.11 Partnership Arrangements With Other Institutions**  In situations in which local institutions deliver programs through cooperative arrangements with another institution the arrangements must be clearly specified, enforceable under Saudi Arabian law and all requirements for programs in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia must be fully complied with.  Educational programs or courses offered by international organizations including on line or other distance education programs or courses, must not be used unless they have been accredited or otherwise quality assured and approved by the relevant government authorized educational quality assurance agency in the country of origin. Any such programs must be adapted as needed to suit the needs of students in this country, and must meet all Saudi Arabian requirements regardless of where and by whom materials are developed.  In situations where institutions deliver programs using materials developed by another institution, the institution granting the academic award must accept full responsibility for the quality of all aspects of the program including the materials used and the teaching and other services provided.  An institution based in another country and delivering programs in Saudi Arabia through a Saudi Arabian agent or local institution, and for which it grants an academic award, must meet all Saudi Arabian requirements for standards of educational provision and for cross border provision of education into the country.  4.11.1 Responsibilities of the local institution and the partner are clearly defined in formal agreements enforceable under the laws of Saudi Arabia.  4.11.2 The effectiveness of the partnership arrangements is regularly evaluated..  4.11.3 Briefings and consultations on course requirements are adequate, with mechanisms available for ongoing consultation on emerging issues.  4.11.4 Teaching staff from the partner institution who are familiar with the content of courses visit regularly for consultation about course details and standards of assessments.  4.11.5 If arrangements involve assessment of student work by the partner in addition to assessments within the institution, final assessments are completed promptly and results made available to students within the time specified for reporting results under Saudi Arabian regulations..  4.11.6 If programs are based on those of partner institutions, courses, assignments and examinations are adapted to the local environment, avoiding colloquial expressions, and using examples and illustrations relevant to the setting where the programs are to be offered.  4.11.7 Programs and courses are consistent with the requirements of the Qualifications Framework for Saudi Arabia, and when relevant include regulations and conventions relevant to the Saudi environment.  4.11.8 If courses or programs developed by a partner institution are delivered in Saudi Arabia adequate processes should be followed to ensure that standards of student achievement are at least equal to those achieved elsewhere by the partner institution as well as by other appropriate institutions selected for benchmarking purposes.  4.11.9 If an international institution or other organization is invited to provide programs, or to assist in the development of programs for use in Saudi Arabia full information should be provided in advance about relevant Ministry regulations and NCAAA requirements for the National Qualifications Framework and requirements for program and course specifications and reports.  Overall Assessment  Comment\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Priorities for improvement\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Independent opinion  Comment\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_   |  | | --- | |  | |  |
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