



Program Review Report

Program Reviews - 2018

B. Sc (Honours) in Business Management

B. Sc (Honours) in Marketing Management

B. Sc (Honours) in Eco Business Management

Faculty of Management Studies

Sabaragamuwa University of Sri Lanka

26th to 30th August 2018



Prof. Sandun Kumari Senarath

Dr. A. Saravanabawan

Dr. KS Hemachandra

Quality Assurance Council

University Grants Commission

Contents

Section 1	Brief Introduction to the Programme	2
	1.1 The Department of Business Management	3
	1.2 The Department of Marketing Management	4
	1.3 The Department of Tourism Management	5
Section 2	Review Team’s Observations on the SER	8
Section 3	A brief description of the Review Process	9
Section 4	Overview of the Faculty’s Approach to Quality and Standards	11
Section 5	Judgment on the eight criteria of programme Review	12
	5.1: Criterion 1- Programme Management	12
	5.2: Criterion 2- Human and Physical Resources	13
	5.3: Criterion 3- Programme Design and Development	14
	5.4: Criterion 4- Course/Module Design and Development	15
	5.5: Criterion 5-Teaching and Learning	17
	5.6: Criterion 6- Learning Environment, Student Support and Progression	18
	5.7: Criterion 7- Student Assessment and Awards	19
	5.8: Criterion 8- Innovative and Healthy Practices	20
Section 6	Grading of Overall Performance of the Programme	21
Section 7	Commendations and Recommendation	22
Section 8	Summary	24
Annexure 1		26

Section 1: Brief introduction to the program

The Sabaragamuwa University of Sri Lanka was established under the Universities Act Number 16 of 1978 on 7th November 1995 and ceremonially inaugurated on 2nd February 1996. At present, it consists of eight faculties namely the Faculty of Agricultural Sciences, Faculty of Applied Sciences, Faculty of Geomatics, Faculty of Graduate Studies, Faculty of Management Studies, Faculty of Medicine, Faculty of Social Sciences and Languages and Faculty of Technology.

The Faculty of Management Studies (FMS), which was started as Faculty of Business Studies in 1996, commenced its Study Programmes offering a three year degree under the Department of Accountancy & Finance and the Department of Business Management in September 1996. Students are enrolled in a four year of Bachelor of Science Honours Degree program. After completion of the foundation year and two specialization years, a Bachelor of Science (BSc) Honours Degree could be obtained in Financial Management, Business Management, Marketing Management or Tourism Management. Six batches of students obtained their BSc. Special Degrees in Financial Management, Business Management, Marketing Management and Tourism Management and passed out in the years 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001 and 2002

The Faculty of Business Studies was renamed as the Faculty of Management Studies with the approval of the University Grants Commission (UGC) in year 2003. Students come to the Faculty through two separate windows namely Management and Tourism/ Hospitality. The Faculty offers seven Honours Degree programmes (Table 1.1).

Table 1.1: Honours Degree Programs Offered by the Faculty of Management Studies

Department	Name of the Degree
Department of Accountancy & Finance	BSc. Honours in Financial Management
	BSc. Honours in Banking & Insurance
Department of Business Management	BSc. Honours in Business Management
Department of Marketing Management	BSc. Honours in Marketing Management
Department of Tourism Management	BSc. Honours in Tourism Management
	BSc. Honours in Hospitality Management
	BSc. Honours in Eco Business Management

1.1 The Department of Business Management

The Department of Business Management, one of the oldest departments in the Faculty, offers BSc. Honours in Business Management covering all managerial functions including Human Resources, Finance, Marketing, Operations and other fundamental managerial functions with the aim of producing intellectual and employable graduates who are capable of serving in high positions in management,

The curriculum of the BSc. Honours in Business Management has been designed based on seven vertical pillars namely Management, Management Science, Economics, Accounting, Business Law, Information Technology and Business Communication, under the supervision of eleven members of the academic staff (Table 1.2). Table 1.3 depicts the student enrolment for the BSc. Honours in Business Management, for the last five academic years.

Table 1.2: Number of Academic and Non-Academic Staff Members in the Department of Business Management

Academic Staff	Quantity
Senior Lecturer (Grade I)	03
Senior Lecturer (Grade II)	04
Lecturer (Prob.)	04
Total	11
Non-Academic Staff	Quantity
Staff Assistant	01
Labour (Grade I)	01
Total	02

Table 1.3: Student Enrollment –BSc. Honours in Business Management

Academic Year	Number of Students- Overall Enrolment to the Faculty	Number of Students – Enrolment to BSc. Honours in Business Management
2012/2013	324	57
2013/2014	353	61
2014/2015	355	63
2015/2016	358	64
2016/2017	363	68
Total	1753	313

1.2 The Department of Marketing Management

The Department of Marketing Management is the youngest Department of the Faculty which is on a steady growth with a reputation for its innovative study programmes. With its strong commitment to excellence and links with the industry and professional partners, it intends to create a platform for the vibrant youth of Sri Lanka who are planning to become practicing marketers in the arena of business.

The curriculum of the BSc. Honours in Marketing Management was developed under the supervision of eight permanent academic staff (Table 1.4). Table 1.5 depicts the student enrolment for the BSc. Honours in Marketing Management, respectively, for the last five academic years.

Table 1.4: Number of Academic and Non-Academic Staff Members in the Department of Marketing Management

Academic Staff	Quantity
Senior Lecturer (Grade I)	01
Senior Lecturer (Grade II)	07
Lecturer (Temp.)	01
Total	09
Non-Academic Staff	Quantity
Clerk (Grade I)	01
Labour (Grade I)	01
Total	02

Table 1.5: Student Enrollment – BSc. Honours in Marketing Management

Academic Year	Number of Students- Overall Enrolment to the Faculty	Number of Students – Enrolment to BSc. Honours in Marketing Management
2012/2013	324	61
2013/2014	353	59
2014/2015	355	62
2015/2016	358	62
2016/2017	363	66
Total	1753	310

1.3 The Department of Tourism Management

The Department of Tourism Management offers undergraduate courses in three separate academic disciplines namely, Tourism Management, Eco business Management and Hospitality Management. The study program reviewed during 27th - 30th July 2018, which is the BSc. Honours in Eco business Management is recognized as the first study programme to integrate Management and the Environment.

The prime concern of the BSc. Honours in Eco business Management is to develop core functional managerial skills, problem solving capabilities, key interpersonal skills while recognizing and pursuing quality management, sustainable development and effective social, environmental and economic performance. The curriculum of the BSc. Honours in Eco business Management was designed by eleven well qualified and experienced academic staff members (Table 1.6). Table 1.7 depicts the student enrolment for the BSc. Honours in Eco business Management, for the last three academic years.

Table 1.6: Number of Academic and Non-Academic Staff Members in the Department of Tourism Management

Academic Staff	Quantity
Professor	03
Senior Lecturer (Grade I)	01
Senior Lecturer (Grade II)	04
Lecturer	02
Lecturer (Prob.)	02
Lecturer (Temp.)	02
Total	14
Non-Academic Staff	Quantity
Data Entry Operator (Grade I)	01
Labour (Grade III)	01
Total	02

Table 1.7: Student Enrolment – BSc. Honours in Eco business Management

Academic Year	Number of Students- Overall Enrolment to the Faculty	Number of Students – Enrolment to BSc. Honours in Eco business Management
2012/2013	324	50
2013/2014	353	56
2014/2015	355	61
2015/2016	358	59
2016/2017	363	54
Total	1753	280

The Faculty is moderately equipped with most of the world’s modern learning resources which are helpful to produce quality graduates in the 21st century.

Section 2: Review Team's Observation on the Self Evaluation Report (SER)

The review team observed that the SER has been prepared according to the guideline given in the Program Review (PR) manual, using a participatory approach involving all constituents of the Faculty. The references for the evidence have been provided alongside the standards and criteria according to the template provided. It was observed that most of the documents have been submitted and, in some cases, the documents required had to be requested although they were readily available but not provided. For example, the student feedback on the mentoring program, and peer observation records etc. were already available but only the formats have been incorporated as evidence. The three study programs were designed in a way that reflects the mission, goals and objectives set out in the Corporate Plan. Student centered learning and outcome based educational approaches have been adopted, along with a clearly laid down graduate profile. All three study programs were in accordance with the SLQF guidelines.

As this was the first subject review on the three study programs, no previous records were available. However, there was a report on the subject review conducted in 2005 for the Faculty of Management studies for the BSc. Business Management, BSc. Tourism Management and BSc. Marketing Management and the review team considered the recommendations of that report. It was observed that most of the recommendations, relevant for programmes under review, have been implemented in order to enhance the quality of the study programs.

Section 3: A Brief Description of the Review Process

The Programme Review evaluated the quality of education within a specific subject or discipline. This review evaluated the quality of education within three study programs – Bachelor of Science (Honours) in Business Management, Bachelor of Science (Honours) in Marketing Management and Bachelor of Science (Honours) in Eco-business Management within the Faculty of Management Studies at Sabaragmwa University of Sri Lanka. The process focused on the student learning experience, given by each study program and students achievements.

The review process started with the independent individual desk evaluation by panel members followed by the meeting of the review panel at the UGC before the site visit. At this meeting, all the reviewers put forward their observations and marks allocated for each section for each criterion, with their justification for the marks given. At the end of the session, the team negotiated and agreed upon mark allocation for each criterion. The documentary evidence needed to support the marks allocated was listed (Annexure 1) and sent to the Dean of the Faculty before site visit of the review. The team prepared the agenda for each day of the site visit which was forwarded to the Dean for his comments or modifications. The format (Annexure 2) was finalized. Since time management was a key factor, the agenda was strictly followed every day.

The review focussed on the eight criteria described in Manual for Reviewing Undergraduate Study Programs of Sri Lankan Universities and Higher Education Institutes by the University Grant Commission, Sri Lanka. The eight criteria focussed were:

1. Program Management
2. Human and Physical Resources
3. Programme Design and Development
4. Course / Module Design and Development
5. Teaching and Learning
6. Learning Environment, Student Support and Progression
7. Student Assessment and Awards
8. Innovative and Healthy Practices

The evaluation of the above eight aspects were done using the information obtained from the following sources:

1. SER submitted by the cluster
2. Meeting with Vice Chancellor, Dean, Heads of Departments, cross section of academic and non- academic staff members, administrative staff, cross section of undergraduate

students representing all study programs covering all academic years and representing both gender and stakeholders (alumni and industry people).

3. Observing teaching sessions (Annexure 3)
4. Observing all documentary evidence; which were observed by at least two members of review panel and initialled
5. Observing the physical facilities available within university and faculty that could be used by the three study programs under review

Each of the quality standards of the eight criteria were carefully assessed using the 0-3 scale as per the marking scheme provided by the handbook and the final overall judgement was made using the observations made by all members of the panel.

Section 4: Overview of the Faculty's Approach to Quality and Standards

The Internal Quality Assurance Cell (IQAC) is maintaining good standards although with minimum physical facilities and human resources. All the documents are maintained in order and common formats for feedback forms, peer review reports, syllabi etc. have been designed and distributed to departments regularly. The necessary documentary evidence for future assessments for either the institutional review or subject review are maintained well and the process continues. The Faculty QAC is at the initial stages of establishment but is maintained at a good standard. Quality assurance plays a pivotal role in the Faculty and QA is considered as a compulsory agenda item in the FB. IQAC functions in line with the guidelines of IQAU.

Section 5: Judgement on the Eight Criteria of Program Review

Criterion 1: Program Management

The management of the program was very good, and the review team observed that there are number of strengths within three study programs reviewed. Course syllabi are available together with Intended Learning Outcomes (ILO). All the courses offered have a common format and Outcome Based Education (OBE) is being practiced in all three study programs. There is a well-organized staff development and Continuous Professional Development (CPD) programs. Evaluation of Lecturers by students has been proven, with sufficient evidence and the statistics are maintained in an appropriate manner at the Quality Assurance Cell (QAC). Well organized orientation programs for new students have been conducted and the student feedback on the program is well maintained. Students are aware of the disciplinary actions and respective punishments.

On the other hand, some weaknesses have also been observed. Implementation of the Action Plan and new initiatives through Action Plan has not been recorded at any point. Although the LMS is available, the usage is yet inadequate and operation system is not efficient as well. The Wi-Fi is very weak and a wider band for it is needed. No duty list for non-academic staff is provided, so some of the members are not aware of their respective duties. During the review process, stake-holder participation at meetings was insufficient and strong collaboration with alumni was not observed. Evidence for research grants were not provided, as neither award letter nor a copy is issued to the grantee. There is an established process for providing university grants. However, the mechanism of advertising is not transparent. There were number of MoUs signed, yet the outcome or implementations of these were not provided. The team agreed upon the necessity of modification of the composition of the Disciplinary Board, as only the Vice Chancellor and the Deans are represented in it. The accused/ suspect is not called for their justification. There are cases of severe ragging reported and a zero ragging policy has not been implemented. Students claimed that the welcome/social for freshers has not been arranged by seniors, even at the middle of the second semester, indicating that the duration of ragging may continue throughout the first year.

The marks obtained for this criterion was calculated as:

$$71/81 \times 150 = 131.5$$

Criterion 2: Human and Physical Resources

In general, the physical resources available are very good and are maintained well by trained staff. Since newly qualified energetic young staff is available, non-traditional courses are offered to cater to the job market and sufficient basics are also provided in relation to subjects. Lecturers are reviewed by peers and standard formats are available. There is an organized annual schedule for the Career Guidance Unit which covers a number of necessary aspects. A well established student counselling system and the availability of the services of a professional counsellor round the clock was one of the most impressive resources observed by the panel. Student feedback is regularly obtained through a feedback form, but no mechanism was seen regarding implementation of comments. Labs and lecture rooms are well equipped with modern facilities. The Computer lab is maintained well and has the capacity to accommodate a large number of students. Lecturers are provided with private rooms, giving them sufficient freedom to prepare for academic work. The Faculty has established a video conferencing room with the aim of encouraging participatory learning of students through continuous engagement with industry experts, alumni and academic staff.

However, considerable weaknesses were also observed. The percentage of PhD holders and the number of Professors is quite low, and many senior academics have not pursued the PhD degrees yet. Only two of the academic members in the Department of Business Management have completed their PhD degrees yet and some have an MBA. There are only three Professors in the three study programs reviewed, which is below average. Staff to student ratio is too high, so more academic staff need to be recruited. There are some unfilled cadre positions which need to be filled, since temporary lecturers /demonstrators conduct lectures in some cases. A mechanism for staff performance appraisal is not available. Also, no allowances are given for serving in remote universities for the retention of staff. There is an urgent need for a lift or access for differently-abled students or staff with difficulties and a budget for that has not been allocated or provided, according to the administration. Although student counsellors are appointed, no academic counsellors are appointed to support students in their academic work. Most of the students are not aware about student counsellors. Therefore, details of this facility should be communicated well to students. Further, student counsellors do not meet regularly, to discuss related matters with the Director of Student Support Services and Welfare. Therefore, these meetings should be formalised.

All financial matters are directed to the Bursar as there is no cadre position for an Assistant Bursar for the Faculty. Some of the administrative staff members conduct lectures, not only for students but also for junior academic staff members, which cannot be considered as a healthy practice. It was observed by the panel that the Faculty Board is held after the Senate meeting of every month, so all matters go to the Senate meeting of the following month. Poor punctuality of

some academic members was observed during review process although this may not be a regular occurrence. As a result, students also enter the lecture room after commencement of the lecture. Files of past papers and moderator's reports, etc. are not maintained at the Department and the marking scheme is not provided to the moderator during paper moderation. Although there is a Spoken English camp, not many students are involved in it. No online procurement system and a mark entering system are in practice, so these need to be established.

Very few staff members use the university email address regularly and most of them do not use Google Scholar to showcase their research to the public/ scientific community. Key administrative positions are not equally distributed, and some are holding too many administrative positions while qualified junior staff is not getting any opportunity. Achievements related to the Action Plan of departments are not reported to the Faculty Board, so no information passes to the Senate. The University facilitates sports and physical wellbeing of both academic members as well as students, yet many improvements such as swimming pool maintenance, appointment of life guard, refurbishing the badminton court etc. are needed. Canteen facilities in the Faculty are of a low standard.

The marks obtained for this criterion was calculated as:

$$34/36 \times 100 = 94.5$$

Criterion 3: Programme Design and Development

The three degree programmes under review have been designed and developed following the accepted principles, approved guidelines, practices and procedures. The Curriculum Review and Curriculum Development committee (CR&CD) has been established in the Faculty and CR&CD has taken the leadership in design and development of the curricula through a participatory approach. Programme design principles and specifications have been shared among programme developers. At the initial phase of curriculum development, several consultative workshops have been held, in which industry experts and academia of the universities have participated. The programmes have been designed considering the goals, missions and objectives of the University, and the Faculty. Further, current knowledge, national needs and current practices have been considered. Programmes are in compliance with the standards laid out in the SLQF and SBS. The graduate profile of each programme has been well defined, and it has been used as the foundation for developing the programme as well. The courses of the programme have been logically arranged over the semesters; thereby, the progression of skills, conceptualization, learning autonomy has been ensured. The use of many learning strategies in the programme was evident, which allow the students to engage in effective learning. The integration of self-directed learning, collaborative learning, creative and critical thinking, lifelong learning, interpersonal

communication and teamwork were evident. It was observed that the Faculty has considered academic standards, learning opportunities etc. before approval and proper procedures have been followed to get the approval for the program from higher authorities.

There were some weaknesses in programme design and development. Though the programmes were designed with the consultation of industry experts and academia, it was limited to the initial phase of curriculum development. It is recommended that views of stakeholders are considered at all key stages of curriculum development. The process of documentation of the views of stakeholders, follow-up discussion on views of stake holders is appropriate but incorporation of ideas into the curricula is not apparent. Hence, it is recommended that stake holder views are incorporated in a clear and transparent way at the next curriculum revision. The stakeholders who attended the curriculum development workshop, did not represent the full spectrum of stakeholders and participation of all groups of stakeholders could give a better feedback. The process of external validation of the programmes has not been done or not properly documented. Therefore, it is recommended that external validation is done, following an accepted procedure. The programme ILOs have not been well documented and there is a need of well defined programme ILOs, although the programme aims and the graduate profile have been constantly used as programme ILOs. There are no supplementary or complimentary courses in the programme to enrich the generic skills of students and to increase the employability. Hence, it is recommended to include such courses. The flexibility of the programmes depends on available optional / elective courses, but the programmes which were under review do not have a sufficient number of elective/optional courses. It is recommended to include adequate number of optional courses. Programme exit details, together with fall back options have not been considered in the curricula and need to be implemented. The mechanisms for monitoring and evaluation of the programme are not in place, except for the course and teacher evaluation. The University has defined KPIs for Organizational Results Frame Work (ORF) which is under consideration, but there is no evidence of implementation. Since this aspect is very important for quality assurance, it is suggested to formulate a programme evaluation mechanism and to implement it..

The marks obtained for this criterion was calculated as:

$$52/72 \times 150 = 108.3$$

Criterion 4: Course / Module Design and Development

The design and development of courses have been done following the standard procedures, and guidelines and many strengths could be identified. Programme aims, graduate profile, and current development in the field of study have been well considered. Course specifications have been set as per the SLQF and SBS. Course ILOs has been well defined and those have been well

aligned with programme aims and graduate profile. Engagement of students in learning activities of the course has been ensured by introducing students centered teaching and learning strategies, self-directed learning, group activities, mini project, individual assignments, class presentation etc. It is worthy to note the internship and research study which have been inbuilt into the curriculum in the last semester of the programme. The delivery of the course has been done using different media and technology such as multimedia, white board, LMS and smart class room and video conferencing to some extent. The courses are distributed well in all semesters and the programme can be completed within eight semesters. The University SDC ensures adequate training for academic staff on teaching methods, use of new technologies etc. Adequate level of resources is available for academic staff for designing and developing the courses and instructional materials. The approval of the courses has been done following the formal procedures, paying due attention to design principles, academic standards, and learning opportunities. The courses are evaluated by IQAC for effectiveness of teaching, facilities, together with peer review of teaching.

Some weaknesses related to the course design and developments were also noted during the reviewing process which are explained below, providing some recommendations / suggestions to minimize the weaknesses. It appeared that the involvement of external expertise in course development was minimal and no accepted procedure is available to get the assistance of an external party for course development at Faculty level. Obtaining the assistance of external expertise at the next curriculum revision could enhance the quality of the curriculum. Only lecture hours have been used for credit calculation and practical/ tutorial hours have not been taken into account. It is necessary to consider the practical/tutorial hours in credit calculation as indicated in the SLQF. Independent learning hours together with the activities have not been identified and are not included in the time table. Hence, it is suggested to consider this aspect at the next revision. Course design/development has not considered the needs of differently abled students, which require attention at the next curriculum revision, if the Faculty plans to provide registration for such students. Though the courses are spread over eight semesters enabling the students to complete programme within four calendar years, credit earning is low in the last semester. Only the internship and the research study are offered in the last semester. The course and teacher evaluation processes are well in place, but there is no formal procedure to use those data effectively and efficiently to improve the courses. Hence, it is suggested to develop a mechanism at Faculty/ Department level to incorporate and improve the courses considering valid and acceptable comments. Although the LMS is in operation, it has not been fully utilized in all courses. Thus, use of the LMS for all courses in the programme is needed.

The marks obtained for this criterion was calculates as:

$$52/57 \times 150 = 136.8$$

Criterion 5: Teaching and Learning

Teaching and learning process in all three degree programmes reviewed have been well designed and are aligned with many quality standards. Teaching and learning strategies of programmes are based on the mission of the University and the Faculty and satisfy the requirement of each curriculum. Conduct of the courses is clear and at the beginning of the programme course specifications are given to the students as hard copies as well as through the LMS. Time tables are posted on notice boards. Blended learning, which include teacher-centered and student-centered learning, with individual and group learning activities, directed and independent learning have been included into each study programme. Students engage in creative work, through different assignments and discovery of new knowledge through a research programme. Students get opportunities to get involved in research as a part of the learning activity, producing publishable data. The Faculty/University research session is an encouragement for students to publish their findings. Teachers use appropriate delivery modes to deliver the courses and the strategies were monitored and evaluated at the end of the course. Course evaluation, teacher evaluation and peer evaluation are conducted in collaboration with IQAC. Distribution of workload among the staff is fair and the courses have been allocated among the staff following a transparent procedure.

Some weaknesses related to teaching and learning was observed during the review which are noted below, and some recommendations are made to minimize the weaknesses. Constructive alignment of teaching, learning strategies, assessments and learning outcomes is not very apparent and requires attention at the next revision. Course delivery is mainly centered towards class room lectures, where student engagement is not very high, as per the lecture hours given in the prospectus. Use of diverse teaching methods is suggested to improve the involvement of students in the learning process. The use of research findings/data of the teachers or others appears to be minimal, which requires improvement. Though the teaching and learning process is monitored, the use of such data for improvement is not apparent. A procedure to assess excellence in teaching is not in place.

The marks obtained for this criterion was calculated as:

$$45/57 \times 150 = 118.4$$

Criterion 6: Learning Environment, Student Support and Progression

The learning environment was very friendly and student support services including the counselling unit were at a high standard. The Faculty adopts a student- friendly administrative, academic and technical support system and has identified learning support needs for its educational programmes. The Faculty offers all incoming students an induction programme at which the rules and regulations of the institution are explained and the student's view on this was highly satisfactory. The panel observed that the students are guided to comply with the Code of Conduct for students. There is a regular training for users (students and staff) of common learning resources such as library, ICT and language laboratories. The teachers are in partnership with library and information resources personnel to ensure that the use of the library and information resources is integrated into the learning process. Active academic/social interaction between the Faculty and students has been promoted. The learning experience is enhanced through opportunities such as industrial placement/ internships and the process was closely monitored. There is an internalized policy on Gender Equity and Equality, which ensures that there is no direct or indirect sex discrimination/ harassment. Complaints and grievances by students were promptly attended to and timely responses are delivered. Co-curricular activities such as sports and aesthetic programmes conform with the mission of the Faculty.

The Faculty does not have appropriate infrastructure, delivery strategies, academic support services and guidance to meet the needs of differently-abled students. The program plan of the Staff Development Centre (SDC) in relation to student-centered learning, outcome-based education and technology-based learning needs to be modified. A guide to students on how to optimally use the available student support services are lacking and it is necessary to do a survey of student satisfaction. No report on usage of library facilities and ICT by students. There is no mechanism to recognize and facilitate academic interaction between peer helpers/ mentors/ senior guides and students through scheduled meeting between staff and students. Evidence on relevant career advisory activities was not provided. Physical and documentary evidence on staff training at SDC are lacking. The Faculty does not regularly monitor retention, progression, completion/ graduation rates, and employment rates. The Faculty policy on fall-back options needs to be given to students, so that students who wish to exit at subsequent stages will be benefited. The Faculty should regularly and systematically gather relevant information about satisfaction of students with the teaching programmes and courses offered. Finally, the Faculty network with alumni to encourage them to assist students is barely adequate. Network with alumni should be created at faculty level to assist students in preparing for their professional future.

The marks obtained for this criterion was calculated as:

$$51/72 \times 100 = 70.83$$

Criterion 7: Student Assessment and Awards

Assessment strategy of student learning is considered as an integral part of programme design. There is a Faculty policy on outcome-based programme design. The Faculty assigns the weightage relating to different components of assessments. Students are assessed using published criteria, regulations, and procedures and those are communicated to students at the time of enrolment. Students are provided with regular, appropriate and timely feedback on formative assessments to promote effective learning and support the academic development of students. Graduation requirements are ensured in the degree certification process and the transcript accurately reflects the stages of progression and student attainments. Examination results are documented accurately and communicated to students within the stipulated time. The study programs reviewed ensures that the degree awarded, and the name of the degree complies with the guidelines (qualification descriptor), credit requirements and competency levels (level descriptor) in the SLQF. Implementation of examination By-laws including those on academic misconduct, and strictly enforcing them according to the institutional policies and procedures are done in an orderly manner.

As observed by the review team, the assessment strategy is aligned to specified qualification/level descriptors of the SLQF and SBS, but requirements of professional bodies are lacking. Alignment of assessments to ILOs and teaching learning methods and exit survey reports are needed. Evidence of policy on assessment strategies, minutes of review meetings in relation to the procedures for designing, approving, monitoring and reviewing the assessment strategies for programmes, are lacking.

The Faculty reviews and amends assessment strategies and regulations periodically as appropriate but is not sufficient for the purpose. Study programs adopt policies and regulations governing the appointment of both internal and external examiners and provides them with clear Terms of References (ToR), yet evidence of ToRs is missing. Although the study programs claim that the Faculty ensures that the reports from external examiners are considered by the examination board in finalizing results, evidence of such records being into consideration or of external examiners' reports, were not observed. The procedure of selection of resource persons for the Staff Development Centre (SDC) is inappropriate. Evidence is lacking for appropriate arrangements/adjustments/ facilities which are made available regarding examination requirements for students with disabilities. Although well defined marking schemes, various forms of internal second marking and procedures for recording and verifying marks etc. to ensure transparency, fairness and consistency is adopted, second examiner reports are missing. A complete transcript indicating the courses followed, grades obtained and the aggregate GPA/grades, and Class (where appropriate) is not made available to all students at graduation.

The marks obtained for this criterion was calculated as:

$$43/51 \times 150 = 126.5$$

Criterion 8: Innovative and Healthy Practices

The Faculty recognizes the complementarity between academic training, research and development (R&D), innovations, and industry engagement as core duties of academics. The study programme contains an undergraduate research project as a part of the teaching and learning strategy and encourages students to disseminate their findings, which is a healthy practice, as this not only helps in dissemination of knowledge but also improves personality as well as soft skills. The study programme contains an 'industrial' attachment/training as a part of the teaching and learning strategy in which students find job opportunities in the same place in some cases. The Faculty promotes student and staff engagement in a wide variety of co-curricular activities such as social, cultural and aesthetic pursuits, community and industry-related activities.

On the other hand, the Faculty has established and operates an ICT-based platform. However, all courses are not uploaded to the LMS. Internet facilities are not adequate to access the materials (poor network). There is a Faculty Board approved policy and guidelines on the use of OER to encourage the staff and students. But evidence of the existence of an organizational entity or entities to promote and coordinate R&D and outreach activities and a Strategic Plan/Action Plan to promote community and industry engagement of the Faculty are lacking. A reward system to encourage academics to achieve excellence in research and outreach activities is not available at Faculty level. The Faculty itself or the study programs under review, has not established and operationalized strong links with various international, national, governmental and non-governmental agencies and industries, which build the reputation of the institution and expose students to the 'world of work' and promote staff and student exchange. There are no diversified sources of income to complement the grants received through Government, by engaging in income-generating activities. The Faculty does not practice a credit-transfer policy in conformity with institutional policies that allows its students to transfer credits to another Faculty / Institute or submit credits earned from another Institute to the Faculty concerned. The Faculty has not encouraged student participation at regional/national level competitions (such as IQ, innovation, sports, general knowledge, etc.) and reward outstanding performers. The academic standards of the study programme are assured through regular revision of the curriculum. However, close monitoring of its implementation is not done, with use of external examiners for moderation and second marking.

The marks obtained for this criterion was calculated as:

$$26/42 \times 50 = 31.0$$

Section 6: Grading of Overall Performance of the Program

No	Criteria	Weighted minimum score*	Actual criteria-wise Score
01	Program management	75	131.5
02	Human and physical resources	50	94.5
03	Program design and development	75	108.3
04	Course / Module design and development	75	136.8
05	Teaching and learning	75	118.4
06	Learning environment, student support and progression	50	70.83
07	Student assessments and awards	75	126.5
08	Innovation and healthy practices	25	31.0
	Total on a thousand scale		817.8
	%		81.78

Grade: A

Section 7: Commendations and Recommendations

The three study programs reviewed during 27-30 August 2018 could be considered well designed quality programs of the Faculty of Management Studies of Sabaragamuwa University of Sri Lanka. Programme design and development has been done satisfying many of the quality standards as per PR manual for review of undergraduate study programmes and updated with revisions whenever necessary. Course design and development has been conducted through a participatory approach, satisfying many quality standards as indicated in the PR manual. There is a considerable amount of evidence that stakeholders are involved in curriculum revision, which is an excellent effort. The teaching and learning process is conducted quite well focussing more on student-centered learning. The library is well organized and has many new books related to the study programs. Maintenance of an archives library within the Faculty is appreciated.

The University QAC maintains a high quality, even with limited human and physical resources. The Faculty QAC is just established and is at the initial level of development and the effort is highly appreciated. The CGU of the University conducts courses which enhance entrepreneurship and employability of students. The counselling unit named “Sith Arana” is fully functional since late 2015 and provides the services of a professional counsellor and maintains confidentiality, giving an opportunity for students to release the stresses encountered during the study period. The Hospitality Management and Tourism Management degrees offered have very high demand in the job market. Annual Research conference, Spoken English camp etc. support students to enhance their personality together with gaining knowledge, during their study period.

The study programs reviewed provides a friendly working environment for both academic and non-academic staff as well as students. Classroom and laboratory facilities are at a high standard.

There is evidence of regular curriculum revision. However, the process of external validation of the programmes has not been done or is not properly documented. Therefore, it is recommended that external validation is done, following an accepted procedure. The process of documentation of the views of stakeholders and follow-up discussion on views of stake holders is insufficient and incorporation of the ideas into the curricula has not been apparent. Hence, it is recommended that stake holder views are incorporated in a clear and transparent way, in all key stages of curriculum development at the next curriculum revision.

Participation of external stakeholders at key stages of programme design/development, establish well defined programme ILOs, introduce defined exit criteria together with fall-back option, maintain the flexibility of the programme introducing adequate number of optional/elective courses, introduce adequate number of supplementary and complimentary courses to improve generic skills, establish a well defined programme monitoring process, introduce the curriculum

mapping is recommended to enhance the quality of courses of the study programs reviewed. In addition, defining the course credit value considering the both theory and tutorial/practical or any other course activities, identifying independent learning activities in the lesson sequence of the course, considering the needs of differently-abled students and identifying suitable activities in the curriculum if differently-abled students are registered, is recommended. Networking with industry and alumni should be strongly encouraged and internship, employability and feedback data should be incorporated in to the curriculum. English language courses should be introduced as non –credit but compulsory courses, credits can be allocated to main streams.

With respect to teaching and learning, it is recommended that attention should be paid to the following aspects: further improvement of student engagement in learning activities, appropriate integration of research/ scholarly activities into teaching , introduction of a well defined procedure to improve teaching and learning, based on the data gathered during course/teacher evaluation, introduction of a system to monitor excellence in teaching . and incorporate/ use data from student feed-back in teaching

A Faculty Career Guidance Unit/Cell needs to be established. Appointment of some of the resource persons in workshops conducted by the University CGU was not so appropriate. Thus, another mechanism is needed in such cases. The key administrative positions within the Faculty needs to be equally distributed, giving equal opportunity to all, if possible. Although the Hospitality Management and Tourism Management degrees are offered, no model hotel/guest house operates at the Faculty. It is recommended to establish one. Holding an annual conference and publishing a book of abstracts is regularly done but there is no journal published yet. So, it is high time to initiate the process of publishing a journal by the Faculty. Accesses to the upper floors of buildings are not user-friendly for unfit or differently-abled people. So, it is recommended to establish a lift and to enhance the quality of the canteen in the roof-top also.

Section 8: Summary

The Faculty of Management Studies, Sabaragamuwa University of Sri Lanka currently offers seven study programmes in compliance with SLQF guidelines (Level 6). The existing administrative structure of the Faculty enables the effective implementation of its core functions. IQAC in collaboration with the SDC and CGU organizes workshops/ training, regarding the use of learning resources such as ICT, data analysis, academic writing, career development, soft skills and personality development and automated library system. Malfunctions within appointing resource persons for SDC and CGU have been observed and need careful evaluation.

The Faculty curricula are revised once every five years, incorporating latest developments in every subject discipline. A participatory approach has been adopted in curriculum development and design including subject lecturers and relevant academic/ industry experts to an extent, addressing areas such as sustainability, cultural and social diversity, equity and social justice. Effectiveness of teaching and learning strategies are evaluated regularly through student feedback and peer evaluation and IUAC plays a vital role in it.

The capacity of the academic staff is in the process of being upgraded since there is a severe need of a higher number of PhD holders and Professors for the three study programs evaluated. Newly recruited staff is encouraged to follow an induction programme. Allocation of work for staff is fair, transparent and equitable, yet the individual workload is high due to lack of filled cadre positions.

Diverse student-centered teaching and learning strategies are incorporated in each course module design to encourage students' engagement and collaborative learning. A research component, dissertation, group assignments, field visits and project-based evaluations are incorporated in curriculum to support student's ability in applying knowledge in their career in future. In addition, students are provided with an opportunity to obtain industry exposure through an internship.

Innovative and healthy practices play a pivotal role in teaching and learning strategies. Lecturers utilize ICT-based platforms such as the LMS. However, facilities such as Wi-Fi for students to access the LMS regularly is lacking. English is incorporated within the credited courses for final grading, yet incorporation of more subject matter is needed by providing English as a non-credit course. More importantly, a healthy teaching and learning environment is provided for both academic, administrative, non-academic staff as well as for students.

An orientation programme for newly enrolled students is conducted regularly, which includes essential information on the faculty history and introduction to departments, aims and objectives and contents of courses of the study programmes, examination By-laws etc. No zero ragging policy is implemented. Mentors are allocated to guide and empower students, yet interactions are not continued throughout the study period. A well-established welfare system provides a counselling service, where confidentiality is maintained.

The Faculty adopts well defined marking schemes, second marking, practical training evaluation guidelines and third-person verification of the final mark sheets, to ensure transparency, fairness and consistency. However, no moderator's and second examiner's reports are maintained. Marking schemes are not provided to the moderator together with the question papers. The Faculty does not provide fallback options for students.

Collaborative research among staff, students and industry is encouraged by the Faculty and an annual conference to present students' research findings is organized. Some of the findings have been published in locally and internationally reputed journals and have received international awards, although the number is low. A research culture within study programs needs to be strengthened, to have more qualified academic staff and to support courses by incorporating findings in the curricula. University research grants need to be advertised in a transparent manner and an award letter to grantees must be issued.

There is no policy on differently-abled students and necessary facilities need to be included in future.

Annexure 1:

Additional documentary evidences needed for Program Review –Cluster 2

27-30 August 2018

1. Minutes of the action plan implementation
2. Monitoring committee composition and the minutes
3. Evidence for student awareness on disciplinary actions and the composition of disciplinary action committee, how they have been appointed and the process
4. Punishments for examination offences and how fast the process is?
5. Course syllabi
6. Evidence of adopting ICT based tools and LMS operation, inventory of ICT facilities
7. Duty list of academic administrative and academic support staff
8. Cadre filled and availability
9. Feedback from stakeholder meetings and remedial measures take
10. Outcome of MoU, evidence of implementation and the number or list of funded research projects
11. Counsellors duty, meetings and confidentiality
12. Online access to international limited access journals through library
13. Annual schedule of CGU for skill development and process
14. Mission goal and the objectives of courses if available
15. Program evaluation reports for last three years at least
16. Policy and procedure on course designing
17. Curriculum development committee minutes
18. Dropout rates and exit levels for fall back students
19. How external examiners appointed and External examiners reports
20. Research committee composition, reports etc
21. Evidence for group activities other than photographs
22. Work norm and work load of staff
23. Postgraduate course entry policy/ guidelines
24. Evidence for timely issuing results
25. Format for rescrutiny and the process/mechanism
26. Policy on using OER approved by FB
27. Any research awards

We might need some more during the visit and hope the QA cell director will assist us during the visit. These are some of the documents we – our group felt better to be seen during the visit.

