



PROGRAM REVIEW 2017

University of Jaffna
Faculty of Arts
Social Sciences i

**Programme Review Report
of
BA (Honours) Degree Programmes in Social
Sciences**

**BA (Hons) in Archaeology
BA (Hons) in History
BA (Hons) in Economics
BA (Hons) in Geography
BA (Hons) in Planning
(CLUSTER I)**

**Faculty of Arts
University of Jaffna**

**Quality Assurance and Accreditation Council
University Grants Commission
March 2018**

Table of Contents

Section 1: Brief Introduction to the Study Programmes	03
Section 2: Review Team's Observations on the SER	04
2.1 Preparation of the SER	04
2.2 Observations on the SWOT Analysis and Profile	05
2.3 Follow-up on the Recommendations made by the Previous Reviews	05
Section 3: A Brief Description of the Review Process	06
3.1 Schedule of Meetings	06
3.2 Review Teams' General Observations and Comments on the Site Visit	07
Section 4: Overview of the Faculty's Approach to Quality and Standards	08
Section 5: Judgment on the Eight Criteria of Program Review	09
5.1 Criterion 1: Programme Management	09
5.2 Criterion 2: Human and Physical Resources	09
5.3 Criterion 3: Program Design and Development	10
5.4 Criterion 4: Course Design and Development	12
5.5 Criterion 5: Teaching and Learning	13
5.6 Criterion 6: Learning Environment, Student Support and Progression	14
5.7 Criterion 7: Student Assessment and Awards	15
5.8 Criterion 8: Innovative and Healthy Practices	16
Section 6: Grading of Overall Performance of the Programmes	18
Section 7: Commendations and Recommendations	20
7.1 Commendations	20
7.2 Recommendations	20
Section 8: Summary	22
Programme Review Team	24

Section 1: Brief Introduction to the Study Programmes

The University of Jaffna (UoJ) was established in 1974 with two faculties, namely Faculty of Humanities and Sciences. The Faculty of Humanities, commenced with four departments of study was renamed as the Faculty of Arts (FoA) in 1975 and expanded the number of departments of study to 10. Currently, the Faculty comprises of 15 departments of study and 3 units and offers degree programmes of BA (General), BA (Honours), BFA and LLB. In total, the FA offers degree programmes in 29 disciplines.

The FoA which, located in the main campus of the UoJ, and it is the largest faculty in terms of number of students and degree programmes offered. As of 2017, it caters for approximately 2700 students and the number of students enrolled in 2016 in the study programmes under review was reported as 504. The academic staff of the FA consists of 137 permanent members; 2 senior professors, 9 professors, 5 associate professors, 71 senior lecturers and 43 probationary lectures. Among the academic staff members, about 42% hold PhDs and 42% are females. Academic staff strength of the study programmes under review is 25; 6 professors, 13 senior lecturers, 2 lecturers and 4 probationary lecturers. They are assisted by 8 non-academic staff members; 2 computer application assistants, 1 clerk, 2 technical officers, 1 laboratory attendant and 2 labourers.

Human resources available for offering the degree programmes are not adequate, particularly in some departments. The staff: student ratio of the study programmes ranges from 57:1 to 17:1 with the new degree programme of Planning having the highest ratio. Similarly, the physical resources, particularly the building space available is not adequate and the conditions prevailing in the existing facilities are far from satisfactory. Number of lecture rooms available are grossly inadequate, and further, the conditions of the available lecture rooms too are dismal. Moreover, most of the staff members do not have office rooms and even the conditions prevailing in the available room given to most senior members are poor.

Several student support services are offered by central and faculty-based units. Staff members responsible for student welfare and counseling are aware of the need of providing learner support services for the students, many of whom are survivors of the civil war. Faculty also provides many opportunities to students to engage in cultural and sports activities and has given special attention to promote ethnic and social harmony among the students, and taken a strong stand against ragging. The University operates a Well Being Centre to handle psycho mental issues of students and is in the process of establishing a Gender Equity Center to handle issues related to gender.

Section 2: Review Team's Observations on the Self-evaluation Report

2.1 Preparation of the SER

The study programmes in Social Sciences included in Cluster 1 consists of five honours degree programmes, namely BA (Hons) in Archaeology, BA (Hons) in History, BA (Hons) in Economics, BA (Hons) in Geography and BA (Hons) in Planning. The self-evaluation report (SER), submitted has generally followed the guidelines prescribed by the Programme Review Manual of the QAAC/UGC (PR Manual). In preparing the SER, the 156 standards under 8 criteria were separated into two groups as common and programme specific; 113 standards are categorized as common while 43 as programme specific. Claims and evidence for programme specific standards were prepared by the relevant Departments where as those for the common standards were prepared as one document, jointly by all relevant Departments. The review team evaluated these six documents provided under Section 3 separately and allocated marks for each programme based on the claims and evidences provided.

As indicated in the SER, it was prepared by a committee appointed by the Faculty with the participation of all relevant staff of the Faculty. The working groups for each of the criteria appointed met regularly assess the progress. However, as stated the SER itself, the report was prepared in a hurry. Some of the shortcomings found in the SER are given below.

- It was evident that there was no proper coordination between the team that prepared the common document of the Section 3 and the teams who prepared programme specific documents for the same. Some of the standards that are given as programme specific in the common document are given as common in programme specific documents. For example, In the document for Archaeology, standards 2.5, 2.6, 5.3, 5.6, 5.7, 5.11, 5.15, 5.17, 5. 18, 6.24, 7.10, 7.15, 8.3, 8.9, 8.10, and 8.11 are given as common whereas in the common document they are given as programme specific. Therefore, no claims and hence no evidences were available for those standards.
- There were a number of standards without claims or evidences. For example, standard 7.4, 7.8, and 7.9 in the common document, 5.2 and 5.4 in Archaeology, 8.7 and 8.9 in History.
- For many of the standards, claims and evidences provided were not in line with the standards.
- For standards 7.4 to 7.7 in the common document, claims are not given under the correct standard. It seems to be a mistake due to 'copy and paste' approach. Further, there was no claim or evidence provided for the standard 7.7.
- For some standards, evidences were not provided or irrelevant documents were cited as evidences.
- The SER carried many typographical errors which indicates that it had not been proof read.
- At the end of each sub-section, it was required to make a summary statement on how the programme has complied with the prescribed standards of the respective criterion. Only the

departments of Archeology and History have made these summaries while the departments of Economics and Geography and Planning did not.

2.2 Observations on the SWOT Analysis and Profile

The SWOT profile for the cluster was given in the Appendix-2 in the SER. Though the review team agrees with the most findings of SWOT analysis, there were number of issues noted by the review during the site visit which were not captured by the analysis. The review team identified that poor physical infrastructure, which was not listed in SWOT profile, as a weakness that affects the quality of the study programmes; existing lecture rooms, staff office rooms and other physical resources are not only insufficient, but also poor in quality. Another weakness not listed in the SWOT profile is the lack of facilities for differently-abled students. It appears that the Faculty has not adopted any special teaching strategies and hence no special facilities were provided for differently-abled students.

The SWOT profile stated non-cooperation among the staff and lack of English knowledge of students as threats among others. During the site visit, the review team was impressed with the commitment and dedication of the academic staff members who were involved in coordinating the site visit, but very much disappointed by the non-participation of others. Unlike in some other universities, students had no complaints against the staff or the administration. However, they explained the difficulties that they face due to inadequacies in physical resources, and submitted their grievances and requests in writing. They expressed their willingness to follow the study programmes in English medium.

The team observed that the study programmes reflect the vision and mission set out by the Corporate Plan of the university. The review team noted that the graduate profiles for the current programme were not available, and also observed that the SLQF was not fully adopted in designing the study programmes under review. However, the graduate profiles were presented for the new curricula which are being formulated, but the team observed that even the new curricula had failed to fully comply with SLQF guidelines and adopt OBE-SCL concepts and approach; credit definition in SLQF was not accommodated in defining the volume of learning and the course ILOS were not aligned with the programme ILOs. It was observed that some departments have referred to relevant SBSs in preparing the course contents of subjects offered.

2.3 Follow-up on the Recommendations made by the Previous Reviews

Though the SER mentioned about the previous reviews and actions taken to implement the recommendations made by those reviews, no documentary evidences were submitted with the SER or during the site visit to that effect. Therefore, it was not possible to verify the implementation of recommendations of previous reviews.

Section 3: A Brief Description of the Review Process

Preparation for the programme review (PR) by the review team involved the following steps. The first step was the desk-based evaluation of the SER. The four reviewers individually reviewed the SER submitted by the FoA. Then, those desk review reports were submitted to the Director of the QAAC. After completion of this step, the review team met at a meeting, organized by the QAAC at the UGC, to discuss their findings and views on SER. All reviewers agreed that the desk review is a preliminary document and their assessments and views on programmes may change after observing the real evidences presented during the site visit. Before leaving for the site visit, schedule prepared by the FoA for the site visit was circulated among members of the review team and necessary changes were agreed upon.

The site visit was initially scheduled for 29th October- 1st November, 2017. The team arrived at the site as scheduled and had a brief meeting among themselves before commencing the review. However, early in the morning of the first day, the reviewers were informed that there was a protest going on within the University premises, and thus it was not possible to continue with the scheduled review. After the discussion that the review team had with the Dean of the Faculty, Assistant Registrar, Director and of IQAU and Coordinator of IQAC held at the Hotel Valampuri, Jaffna, all agreed that it was not possible to continue with the scheduled review, and therefore, to postpone the site visit. The site visit was rescheduled and the review was conducted from 10th – 12th January, 2018.

The review consisted of inspection of the documentary evidences provided for each criterion and accompanied standards, meetings with persons involved directly and indirectly with the study programmes under review, visits to relevant Departments of study, all Centres and Units cited in the SER, and observation of facilities provided for staff and students and environment prevailing within the Faculty and University, in general. Following is a brief record of the steps followed during the review process.

3.1 Schedule of Meetings

The schedule of the site visit included the meetings with the administrative, academic and non-academic staff and the students. First meeting was held with the Vice-Chancellor, Dean of the Faculty, Director of IQAU, and Coordinator of the IQAC, at the main administrative building. The meetings with the Faculty staff were arranged at the Dean's Office of the Faculty. The team also had discussions with the Heads of relevant Departments and the program coordinators and the other academics of the Departments. Assistant registrar joined the discussion representing the administrative staff. Review team also met the directors/coordinators of centers/units, technical officers and the support staff. Discussion with students was arranged in a lecture hall and about 50 students were participated, representing five-degree programmes. The group had a good

representation from both genders, ethnic groups (Tamil and Muslim), and all 4 years of the five study programmes. Discussion was conducted in both English and Tamil languages and one team member facilitated the discussion when the communication was in Tamil. The discussion went on about an hour. At the end, some of the students handed over several documents signed by all students indicating the problems faced and their suggestions, to the Chairperson of the review team.

In addition to these meetings, the review team visited all the Departments which cater to the 5 study programmes under review and all centres/units mentioned in the SER. Review team had discussions with the Librarian, coordinator of the Career Guidance Unit (CGU), a senior professor of the English Language Teaching Center (ELTC) and the acting director of the Staff Development Center (SDC). Review team also visited the ICT facilities of the Faculty, physical resources of each Department, lecture halls, and some common places such as canteens and student center. Furthermore, the team visited the teaching and learning facilities and also attended several teaching sessions conducted for different degree programmes.

A major part of the review was devoted for the inspection of the documents submitted as evidences for the claims made in the SER. The documentary evidences were arranged in very organized manner in a separate room with sufficient physical facilities including access to internet. The Faculty had initially arranged 5 staff members to facilitate the scrutiny of relevant documents, but the review team later requested to limit the number to 2 in order to maximize the efficiency and minimize the disturbances. After scrutinizing all the documentary evidences the review team had a thorough discussion about their observations and reached consensus on the assessments and hence the marks allocated for each standard .

Finally, on the third day, the review team had a wrap up meeting from 01.30-02.30 pm with the higher management of the FoA to present an overview of the visit, general observations, and key findings of the review.

3.2 Review Teams' General Observations and Comments on the Site Visit

The UoJ has made all required arrangement for the site visit and warmly welcomed the review team. However, due to the heavy workload associated with reviewing five-degree programmes with the SER consisting of six documents for the Section 3 and accompanied documentary evidences for each of them, the team encountered the limitation of available time for visiting the common resources such as sports and hostel facilities.

The team observed that the Faculty was ready to discuss about their strengths and weaknesses openly. Active participation of the Dean and the faculty staff was remarkable. Heads of Departments and the Coordinators of degree programmes showed a great concern about the difficulties they faced in offering study programmes with limited physical resources. The hospitality offered by the Faculty throughout the visit was commendable.

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

As per the guidelines issued by the UGC through the Internal Quality Assurance Manual (2013), the University has established international quality assurance system (IQAS) in 2016 by establishing the Internal Quality Assurance Unit (IQAU) at the Centre and Internal Quality Assurance Cells (IQACs) at faculty level. The IQAS operates with well-defined functions and operational procedures, and the IQACs of faculties work in liaison with the central IQAU. IQACs of faculties are required to implement quality enhancement activities and report the progress to the respective faculty boards and IQAU at regular intervals.

The IQAC of FoA appear to be still in formative years; quality assurance initiatives in terms of curricula reforms and revisions, establishing of regular monitoring system for auditing the implementation of study programme curricula, regularizing student feedback assessments and peer reviews, graduate satisfaction surveys, employability surveys, employer satisfaction surveys, etc., are yet to be established at the FoA. It is indeed an urgent need of the FoA to consider strengthening the IQAC and systematizing the internal quality enhancement activities as essential ingredients of the study program management.

University-wide external review has been conducted by Commonwealth of Learning and Review and Implementation Model (CLORIM) in 2013. In addition, some members of academic staff too have taken several progressive steps to improve quality by means of traditional and ad-hoc approaches. In this regard, improvements appear to have been made with introduction of new programmes and courses, introducing modifications to qualification criteria and content to meet the needs of students and other stakeholders. However, these traditional modes and ad-hoc approaches need to be systematized and accelerated in order to achieve the required quality and standards in the light of current and emerging global trends.

The FoA is amply blessed with quality academic staff; 137 academic staff including 16 professors and 42% of the senior staff possess doctoral level qualifications. Therefore, the FoA is in a good position to embark on quality enhancement drive to upgrade the quality and standards of its programs and activities to the expected highest level. Providing adequate training to the academic staff on the application of SLQF guidelines in programme design and development and also on the use of OBE-SCL approach and tools in programme and course curricula design and development, and delivery, and internalizing the best practices prescribed in the PR Manual (2015) should be considered as essential steps in this drive. The review team is of the opinion that, the FoA being a traditional, comparatively large faculty in the country and catering to large population of students, it needs to consider improving quality and standards study programmes as a priority so as to equip its graduates to face challenges in local and global employment market.

Section 5: Judgment on the Eight criteria of Program Review

5.1 Criterion 1: Programme Management

Strengths

- Strategic plan and the action plans of the FoA closely reflect university's vision, mission and strategic directives.
- Student Handbook is very informative and prepared in two languages (Tamil and English) and made available to all newcomers at the orientation programme.
- Well prepared and approved regulations, by-laws, guidelines and operational manuals such University Calendar, Disciplinary by-laws, Examination by-laws and Regulations, Manual for Gender Equality and Equity, etc.
- Functional and well managed SDC.

Weaknesses

- Participation in decision making processes by students is not evident except their representation at the Faculty Board. Yet, the attendance of students in Faculty Board meetings, as of its minutes appears to be very poor.
- Absence of any evidence of wider stakeholder participation in programme management, especially in programme and course design and development and revision.
- Inadequate use of ICT platform and applications such as MIS and LMS for faculty administration and programme delivery.
- Annual academic calendar prepared by the Faculty is incomplete.
- Absence of accurate and up to date records of entry and graduation list of students.
- Inadequate human and physical resources to offer the BA (Hons) Degree programme in Planning introduced recently by the Department of Geography.
- Inadequate facilities and services for students with special needs; though, some measures have been taken to assist the students with vision impairments, the facilities offered for other differently-abled students need further improvements.

Recommendations

- Students should be accommodated in the decision-making bodies to give good hearing and due consideration to their views, opinions and grievances and solve their problems and issues in speedy manner.
- Promote wider stakeholder participation in curriculum development and revision process.
- Promote the application of ICT-based tools such as MIS and LMS for programme administration.

- Provide training for staff members in the application ICT-based tools and blended teaching and learning methods in programme delivery.
- Maintain databases on students; entry, progression, graduation and employment data.
- Improve the facilities for students with special needs.
- Streamline and strengthen academic and student counselling services; mentors should be appointed to guide and help the students in academic activities and personality development.

5.2 Criterion 2: Human and Physical Resources

Strengths

- Qualified staff, specialized in diverse fields of specialization with international collaborations.
- Continuing professional development programmes offered by SDC, particularly on application of SLQF guidelines and OBE-SCL concept and approach in programme and course curricula development.
- Staff with awareness on the value of application of OBE-SCL approach in curriculum development (through the training provided by the WB funded IDAS and QIG projects).
- Induction training programme offered for new recruits into academic staff.
- Students participation in multicultural programmes; Arts Week and '*Kavitha*' Talent Contest were some of them.

Weaknesses

- Gross inadequacies of infrastructure facilities.
- Shortage of staff for the BA (Hons) Degree Programme in Planning.
- Absence of staff performance appraisal and reward system.
- Poor usage of library and library resources by the teachers and students.
- Teaching and training programmes offered by English Language Teaching Center (ELTC) appear to have failed to attract the interest of students and create excitement in learning English as a second language.
- Inadequacies in training and guidance services offered by the CGU.

Recommendations

- Develop and submit proposals to the UGC, Treasury and other appropriate authorities to obtain required human and physical resources, particularly to address the acute shortages faced by some departments/programmes.

- Appoint programme coordinators to coordinate BA (Hons) Degree Programmes to facilitate smooth administration of study programmes.
- Design and introduce staff performance appraisal and reward system to assess performance of the staff and recognize and reward high performers.
- Design and introduce measures such as independent learning assignment, library-based independent learning and assessments, etc., to encourage students to use of library resources for academic learning.
- Expand the facilities and resources of ELTC and encourage the ELTC to reform their ELT programme and expand the spectrum of courses.
- Consider introducing a gradual shift of medium of instruction from Tamil to English as many students showed the interest in following the degree programmes in English medium.
- Expand and strengthen career guidance training and services offered by CGU; students should be encouraged to attend the career guidance programmes and keep the record of attendance and obtain students feedback on the programmes offered.
- Provide institutional support and encourage greater student participation in multicultural programmes.
- Expand and strengthen ICT facilities provided for staff and students.

5.3 Criterion 3: Program Design and Development

Strengths

- Programme design accommodates supplementary courses to broaden the outlook and enrich the generic skills of students. (all programmes)
- Academic standards of the programmes with respect to their awards and qualifications are appropriate to the level and nature of the award and are aligned with the SBS and SLQF. (all programmes)
- Programmes are logically structured and consist of a coherent set of courses while allowing flexibility in students' choice of course. (Economics, Geography & Planning)
- Curriculum promotes academic progression so as to increase the demand on the student in intellectual capacity, skills, knowledge, conceptualization and learning autonomy. (Geography & Planning).

Weaknesses

- Faculty has not satisfactorily ensured external stakeholder participation at key stages of programme planning, design, and development and review. (All programmes)
- Programme design process has not incorporated feedback from employer satisfaction surveys. (all programmes)

- Intended Learning Outcomes of programs are not realistic, deliverable and feasible to achieve. (all programmes)
- Faculty has not designed ILO-based industrial training. (all programmes)
- Programme design and development has not integrated appropriate learning strategies for the development of self-directed learning, collaborative learning, creative and critical thinking, life-long learning, interpersonal communication and team work into courses. (Archaeology & History)
- Study programmes do not collect and record annually information about students' destination after graduation and use the information derived from such assessments for continuous improvement of study programmes. (Archaeology & Economics)

Recommendations

- Use relevant SBSs and adopt SLQF guidelines and OBE-SCL concept and approach in programme design and development.
- Enhance staff competencies through training on application of SLQF guidelines and OBE-SCL concept and approach in curricular design and development.
- Define the graduate profiles for each study programme, adopting relevant SBSs and SLQF guidelines.
- Define and programme learning outcome (programme ILOs) on the basis of inputs from regular tracer studies on employment market needs and desirable graduate competencies and attributes.
- Construct the skills map showing the links between the Programme ILOs and Course ILOs.

5.4 Criterion 4: Course Design and Development

Strengths

- Courses are scheduled and offered in a manner that allows the students to complete them within the intended period of time by appropriately defining the credit weight and volume of learning. (all programmes)
- Course contents have adequate breadth, depth, rigor and balance and the teaching program can be successfully completed within the planned time. (all programmes)
- Courses are evaluated at the end of each course with regard to its content, appropriateness and effectiveness of teaching and feedback used for further improvement of the course.
- Course design and development done is by designated course teams with the involvement of internal and external subject experts. (Archaeology)
- All course specifications provides a concise description of the ILOs, contents, teaching learning and assessment strategies. (Planning)

Weaknesses

- Courses are not designed in compliance with SLQF credit definition. (all programmes)
- Course design and development has not taken into consideration the needs of differently-abled students by inclusion of teaching and learning strategies which would make the delivery of the courses as inclusive as possible. (all programs)
- Courses are not designed in a manner that contents, learning activities and assessment tasks are systemically aligned with the course outcomes which in turn are to be aligned with the programme outcomes. (Archaeology & History)

Recommendations

- Adopt SLQF credit definition in course design.
- Design and develop course curricula in a manner that contents, leaning activities, and assessment tasks are systematically aligned with the course outcomes which in turn are to be aligned with the programme outcomes.
- Course curricula must be made inclusive in such a way to align the course ILOs with the programme ILOs.

5.5 Criterion 5: Teaching and Learning

Strengths

- All students are provided with a copy of the Student Handbook which provide information on study programme and course specifications, learning facilities and student support services, disciplinary matters, etc.
- All degree programmes reviewed regularly obtain student feedback on the effectiveness and quality of teaching and feed the summary information back to teachers.
- Some of the Departments appear to practice peer observation of teaching, but the process has not been formalised yet.
- All study programmes have a built-in student research project that carries 6 credits and require submission of undergraduate dissertation.

Weaknesses

- Adoption of OBE-SCL concept and approaches in teaching and learning, and assessment is not evident.
- Student feedback has not been utilised appropriately for making improvements in the study programmes or to address concerns of the students.
- Absence of proper mechanism to monitor teaching and learning activities for their appropriateness and effectiveness.

- Absence of institutionalized mechanism conduct peer observation of teaching and use the feedback from such assessment for further improvement of effectiveness of teaching and learning.
- Absence of staff appraisal system to identify and reward excellence in teaching.

Recommendations

- Expand the coverage of information provided in the Student Handbook; include more information on student support systems, learning resources, extra-curricular activities, student societies, contact information of key persons in order to facilitate students settling down with the University life.
- Conduct training programmes/workshops for academic on blended teaching and learning methods and encourage them to use them in programme delivery.
- Enhance the quality of the degree programme through introduction of field work, internships and courses/programmes in soft skill development into programme curricula.
- Design and adopt a set of indicators for performance appraisal of teachers and perform regular staff appraisals to promote adoption of excellent teaching and learning practices and reward champions of teaching excellence.

5.6 Criterion 6: Learning Environment, Student Support and Progression

Strengths

- Mandatory orientation programme offered to incoming students.
- Measures taken to provide student friendly environment.
- Offering at least a limited fall back option for those students who fail to complete the honours study programmes successfully.
- Holding annual sports and cultural events; ‘Colours Awards’ and ‘Arts Week’ held annually to recognise and reward students who excel in extracurricular activities.
- Inclusion of a regular agenda item in the agenda of Faculty Board meetings to address student appeals.

Weaknesses

- Inadequate use of available library facilities by staff and students.
- Limiting the Student Orientation Programme to 3 days.
- Failure to monitor student enrollment, retention, and progression, graduation rates, and graduate employment rates.
- Poor attendance of students at the Faculty Board Meetings.

- Inadequate links with alumni of the study programmes and utilisation of such networks for guiding and mentoring students.

Recommendations

- Extend the orientation programme for new entrants to include more programmes/activities that would help students in adjusting to the life in the University.
- Ensure the optimal use of available library facilities by staff and students.
- Design and institutionalize a suitable mechanism to obtain stakeholder feedback, carry out annual graduate satisfaction surveys at exit points, employability studies and employer feedback surveys and utilize information coming from such assessments in programme development.
- Design and adopt a routine monitoring mechanism of teaching and learning activities to assess their appropriateness and effectiveness.

5.7 Criterion 7: Student Assessment and Awards

Strengths

- Aligning the assessment strategy with the specified qualification descriptors of SLQF and SBSs.
- Establishing the institutional procedures for designing and approving the assessment strategies for all degree programmes.
- Specifying the weightages related to different assessments in course specifications.
- Publishing student assessment criteria and regulations for the information of students.
- Establishing appropriate arrangements and adjustments for examination requirements of differently-abled students.

Weaknesses

- Faculty has not given appropriate attention to give the feedback on formative assessments to use it as a teaching/learning method and to improve the critical thinking of the students.
- Even though second marking is apparent, measures have not been taken to practice blind marking; however, marking schemes are available for most of the degree programmes.
- Inadequate provision of appropriate facilities for the students with disabilities.
- Delays in processing and release of results; takes more than three months to communicate the results to the students.

- Lack of clarity as regard to alignment of qualifications at the exit point with the requirements specified by the SLQF.
- Absence of clearly defined examination regulations and rules.
- Failure to recognize and the importance and role of external examiners.

Recommendations

- Design examination rules and regulations including the procedures for dealing with misconduct in assessments and examinations.
- Implement a mechanism to provide timely feedback to students on formative assessments.
- Implement a systematic method to review and amend assessment strategies periodically.

5.8 Criterion 8: Innovative and Healthy Practices

Strengths

- Attracting external funds for research at least by few senior academic staff and providing opportunity for the student to engage in research activities.
- Wider student engagement in co-curricular activities.
- Revision of programme and course curricula in every five years.
- Providing multiple exist points; general degree in three years and honours degree in four years.
- University Research Committee's involvement in fostering research culture through facilitation, monitoring and dissemination.
- Inclusion of requirement of research-based dissertation into Honours Degree Programmes.
- Establishment of at least few international collaborations

Weaknesses

- Failure to install and use ICT platform and tools (such as LMS) to adopt multimode/blended teaching and learning approach.
- Failure to use OER to supplement teaching and learning process.
- Absence of appraisal and reward systems for promoting excellence in research and outreach activities.
- Inadequate priority given to 'industrial training' component in the programme curriculum.
- Inadequate involvement by academics in research and innovations, and outreach activities.

- Non-alignment of qualifications at the exit point of general degree with the requirements specified by the SLQF.
- Heavy dependency on government funds for improving the teaching and learning facilities for the students and failure to explore income generating activities.
- Absence of a credit transfer policy to facilitate student exchange programmes.

Recommendations

- Install ICT platform with required tools (such as LMS) and promote the use of multimode/blended teaching and learning approach in programme delivery.
- Introduce a university research grant scheme to promote the engagement of young academics for research and innovations.
- Introduce an appropriate appraisal and reward mechanism to encourage the academics to engage in research and developmental activities.
- Design and introduce the industrial training component into the programme curricula of all study programmes.
- Initiate close links with public and private sector and open up more opportunities for the students to engage with ‘world of work’ through industrial placement programmes and other relevant activities.
- Promote student engagement in extracurricular activities by finding the ways to support them, and by implementing a mechanism to recognize their talents and achievements.

Section 6: Grading of Overall Performance of the Programme

For each of 5 study programmes under review, the 156 standards prescribed under 8 criteria were divided into two groups: 113 as common for all study programmes and 43 as programme specific. When allocating marks for each of the standard, the review team carefully studied the claims made in the SER with respect to each standard and documentary evidence provided in support of the claims. As required, claims and evidences were verified at the meetings and discussions held with staff and students.

According to the guidelines and directives of the Director of the QAAC, the review team agreed not to consider the standard 7.6 as it is not applicable to the respective study programmes. Accordingly, the criterion-wise scores for each study programme was calculated leaving out the above standard.

Based on the guidelines given in Chapter 3 of PR Manual, gradings of overall performance of the study programmes under review are given in the table below.

Table 6.1: Actual Criterion-wise Score and Final Grade

Criterion No.	Assessment Criteria	Archeology	History	Economics	Geography	Planning
1	Programme Management	100	98	98	104	100
2	Human and Physical Resources	52	55	48	73	55
3	Programme Design and Development	50	63	67	67	75
4	Course/ Module Design and Development	76	66	76	79	82
5	Teaching and Learning	77	73	103	113	143
6	Learning Environment, Student Support and Progression	64	51	51	62	58
7	Student Assessment and Awards	74	74	71	76	62
8	Innovative and Healthy Practices	24	23	18	30	25
Total on a thousand scale		517	503	532	604	600
Total as a Percentage (%)		51.7	50.3	53.2	60.4	60.0

	Grade	D	D	D	C	C
	Performance Descriptor	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	satisfactory	satisfactory

As indicated in the Table 6.1, the B. A. (Hons) degree programmes of Geography and Planning scored 60.4% and 60.0%, respectively. Therefore, the overall performance of these two degree programmes, BA (Hons) in Geography and BA (Hons) in Planning is graded as “C” with the performance descriptor of “Satisfactory” which is interpreted as minimum level of accomplishment of quality expected of a programme of study which requires improvements in several aspects.

The other three degree programmes, namely, the B. A. (Hons) in Archaeology, BA (Hons) in History and BA (Hons) in Economics scored 51.7%, 50.3%, and 53.2%, respectively. Therefore, the overall performance of each of the above study programmes is graded as “D” and with the performance descriptor of “Unsatisfactory”. The overall score of the study programmes indicates unsatisfactory level of accomplishment of quality expected of a programme of study which require improvement in all aspects.

Section 7: Commendations and Recommendations

Since Section 5 presents the strengths, weaknesses and recommendations under each of the criteria in detail, in this section, we present commendations and recommendation that are considered most important.

7.1 Commendations

- Establishment of internal quality assurance system within the University; IQAU at the centre and IQACs at faculty level.
- Qualified staff, specialized in diverse fields with international collaborations.
- Establishment of the Faculty Curriculum Evaluation Committee in 2015.
- Obtaining student feedback on the effectiveness and quality of teaching and learning.
- Availability of an exit pathway as a fallback option for honours degree programme students.
- Encouragement given for students to engage in extracurricular activities by holding annual sports, art and cultural events – ‘Colour Awards’ and ‘Arts Week’ and numerous religious and cultural events.
- Introduction of a Gender Equity and Equality policy and by-laws to deal with gender-based sexual harassment, approved by the Senate and the Council.
- Establishment of a ‘Well Being’ Centre to help students with psychological issues and mental stresses.

1.2 Recommendations

- Improve physical resources of the Faculty; faculty needs more new buildings and improvements in existing physical resources both in teaching and common amenities.
- Take urgent measures to address academic staff shortages faced by several BA (Hons) degree programmes, particularly the newly introduced degree programme in Planning.
- Adopt SLFQ guidelines and OBE-SCL approach in future curricula revisions.
- Conduct training programmes/workshops for academics on application of SLQF guidelines and OBE-SCL approach in programme and course design and development and delivery.
- Encourage academic to adopt modern and student-centered teaching, learning and assessment strategies in programme delivery.
- Design and institutionalize a suitable mechanism to obtain student feedback, and conduct peer assessments on regular basis, graduate satisfaction surveys at exit points, employability studies, employer feedback surveys, etc., and to utilize information derived from such assessments for further improvement of programmes curricula, teaching and learning and assessment strategies and learner support services.

- Install the ICT platform and required applications/tools to facilitate teaching and learning.
- Provide required training to academics on multimode/blended teaching and learning approach in programme delivery.
- Promote the staff to use multimode / blended delivery methods with full use of ICT platform for teaching and learning, and assessments.
- Introduce field work, internship programmes and courses/programmes in soft skill development into curricula in order to enhance the quality of degree programmes.
- Encourage the staff and students to use of available library and ICT facilities.
- Consider gradual switch of medium of instruction from Tamil to English medium.
- Design and introduce an appropriate staff appraisal and reward mechanism to encourage the academics to adopt best practices in teaching and engage in research and developmental and outreach activities.
- Expand and strengthen the internal quality enhancement activities in order to foster quality culture within all spheres of the Faculty activities and its academic programmes.

Section 8: Summary

The programme review of the five BA (Hons) degree programmes in Social Sciences (Cluster 2) of the Faculty of Arts of the University of Jaffna was successfully completed with the site visit held from 10-12 January 2018. The on-site review visit consisted of meetings with University and Faculty administration, academic staff members, Heads of the Centers and Units, non-academic staff members and students, evaluation of documentary evidences, visiting departments, observation of facilities and observations of teaching and learning.

The programme review was conducted in accordance the guidelines prescribed in the PR Manual and judgment on study programmes were reached by making evidenced-based assessment of the degree of internalization of prescribed best practices and extent of achievements in respective, standards defined under the 8 review criteria.

The SER was prepared by a team appointed by the Faculty Board of the Faculty of Arts, and the team had adopted a participatory and inclusive approach in compiling the SER. However, the SER had shown many shortcomings; failure to provide evidences to support many claims, incompatibility of claims with the evidences provided, citing same documents as evidences for several claims, failure to capture major deficiencies and shortcomings by the SWOT analysis, contextual and typographical errors, etc., to name few. However, the Faculty was well prepared for the site-visit of the programme review. The Dean of the Faculty, Coordinator, IQAC, Heads of the Departments and academic staff members extended their fullest cooperation during the site visit.

It was clearly evident to the review team that human and physical resources and facilities available are insufficient to conduct the study programmes efficiently and effectively. Also the quality of the existing physical resources, particularly teaching facilities and resources, and ICT network and internet facilities were not satisfactory. Furthermore, almost all the curricula of the study programmes were implemented few years ago, and hence conceivably were not in alignment with current SLQF Guidelines and OBE-SCL approach. Further, the programme delivery still follow very conventional teaching, learning and assessment methods. Though the Faculty has established its Internal Quality Assurance Cell with well-defined functions and operational procedures in 2016, it is yet to commence quality enhancement activities in more effective manner.

As of the evidenced-based assessment of eight criteria and judgement made, the degree programmes of Geography and Planning have attained “minimum level of accomplishment of quality expected of a programme of study” requiring improvement in several aspects while the degree programmes of Archaeology, History and Economics have attained “unsatisfactory level of accomplishment of quality expected of a programme of study” requiring improvement in all aspects.

Therefore, it is recommended that the Faculty must address the inadequacies of human, physical and technical resources, introduce reforms into curricula of study programmes, adopt blended, and multimode delivery methods, and institutionalize internal monitoring mechanisms such as student feedback assessments, peer reviews, graduate exit and employability surveys and employer satisfaction surveys to ensure that academic experience provided to students are up to date and relevant, and of high quality. The highest priority must be given to following areas; addressing staff shortages and physical resource limitations, building required competencies of the academic staff in application of SLQF and OBE-SCL concept and approach in programme and course curricula design and development, and use of blended/multimode teaching and learning and assessments methods with ample use of ICT-based tools, and institutionalizing quality culture by internalizing the best practices prescribed in the PR Manual of the QAAC.

The review team wishes to acknowledge the cooperation and support extended by the Dean of The Faculty, Heads of Departments, Heads of the Centers and Units, Director of IQAC, Coordinator of IQAC and all academic and non-academic staff members and students of the Faculty during the entire process of the programme review.

Programme Review Team

.....

Chairperson

Professor Anoma Abhayaratne

University of Peradeniya

.....

Team Member

Dr. J. M. B. S. Jayasundrara

Rajarata University of Sri Lanka

.....

Team Member

Dr. P. I. Prasanthi Perera

Wayamba University of Sri Lanka

.....

Team Member

Dr. P. Elango

Eastern University of Sri Lanka