



PROGRAM REVIEW 2017

University of Jaffna
Faculty of Arts
Social Sciences ii



**Programme Review Report
Social Sciences Cluster II**

**Political Science
Media Studies
Sociology
Home Economics
Psychology**

**Faculty of Arts
University of Jaffna
2017**

**Prof. P. Hewage (Chair)
Prof. G.D.R.U.U. Abeyrathne
Prof. (Mrs.) S. C. Jayamanne
Dr. (Mrs.) G.A.S. Ginigaddara**

**University Grants Commission
Quality Assurance and Accreditation Council
Sri Lanka**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Pages</u>
Section 1: Brief introduction to the programme	3
Section 2: Review Team's observation on the Self Evaluation Report (SER)	5
Section 3: A brief description of the review process	8
Section 4: Overview of the Faculty's approach to quality and standards	12
Section 5: Judgment on the eight criteria of Programme Review	14
Section 6: Grading of the overall performance of the programme	19
Section 7: Commendations and recommendations	20
Section 8: Summary	23

Section 1: Brief introduction to the programme

This section includes a brief introduction to the study programmes, academic staff, students, infrastructure and facilities available in the faculty. It also includes comments on the response of the faculty to the recommendations made at previous Subject Reviews.

The Faculty of Arts is one of the eight faculties of University of Jaffna and located in the main campus. The faculty was earlier known as the Faculty of Humanities and later renamed as the Faculty of Arts. At present there are fifteen departments offering General Degree and Special Degree programmes in 29 principle subjects namely, BA (General) Degree, BA (Special) Degree, BFA (Fine Arts) Degree and LLB Degree.

The Faculty of Arts accommodates the majority of students who enter University of Jaffna. It offers a full range of Social Science and Humanities degree programmes as well as Fine Arts subjects. At present, the faculty has 137 academic staff, including 02 Senior Professors, 16 Professors, 05 Associate Professors, 71 Senior Lecturers and 43 Probationary Lecturers. More than 42% of the senior staff is local or foreign PhD holders and about 42% of the academic staff are females. Most of the departments extend their support to conduct Postgraduate Programmes leading to Diploma, MA, MPhil and PhD. Out of the fifteen departments of the faculty, only fourteen departments have been reviewed by the QAA panels under Subject Review in 2005-2010.

It is the opinion of faculty members and review team that the creation of Cluster II of Social Sciences is not justifiable. The Cluster II includes the subjects of Home Economics (HE), Media Studies (MS), Political Science (PS), Psychology (PSY) and Sociology (SO).

- The special degree course in Home Economics has been conducted since 2001 with a coordinator under the supervision of Dean. The degree has commenced with four students in 2001.
- In 2007, at the Faculty of Arts, a media studies curriculum was drafted with an emphasis on practical skills as well as the theories of communication with the collaboration of the University of Linnaeus, Sweden. This was recommended as a subject of an Arts Degree, by the Faculty Board and by the Senate and eventually approved by the Council of University

of Jaffna. Later, on 10th October 2013, the University Grants Commission approved this Bachelor of Arts in Media Studies Programms which was the first, and to date, the only degree programms in Media Studies in Tamil medium offered in Sri Lanka and attracts students from various regions.

- Teaching Political Science as a subject commenced since the establishment of the Faculty of Arts. Then it was incorporated as a special degree programme coupling with Sociology. In 2007, Department of Political Science was established as a separate department.
- The Department of Philosophy introduced Psychology as a subject for the first year students in 1998. In addition, the department also offers special and general degree programms in Psychology. A comprehensive syllabus was drafted and implemented in 1997.

Though the internalisation of the feedbacks of the last subject review completed in 2009 is quoted in the SER and the SER, the actions taken to implement the recommendations were not presented.

No evidences were observed to prove that a SWOT analysis has been done at the cluster level or degree programms level. Hence the claim for the same in the SER is not be justifiable.

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

This section has been prepared to indicate whether the SER has been prepared according to the guidelines given in the programmes review manual involving all relevant constituents of the faculty. A further comment will include on whether the evidence has been presented alongside the standards and criteria.

The observations of the review team were limited since the timing of the site visit was inappropriate as many of the academics were not available in the university due to different reasons. The Team was unable to meet students of the faculty in their own choice though the Dean had done his best to arrange a meeting with students because it was the time of vacation of the faculty. In addition, many of the academics had been engaged in the national task of evaluating the GCE Advanced Level Examination. In this context, review team was unable to meet the coordinator of Home Economics. The unit was represented by a very junior probationary lecturer on many occasions. The review team also could not meet a single non-academic staff member of the faculty since they were on strike for an internal matter. However, the review team had a discussion with the Deputy Registrar of the Faculty of Arts representing all the relevant administrative staff of the faculty.

The review team perused the lengthy document submitted by the Faculty of Arts, University of Jaffna, for the Social Science Cluster II covering subjects of Home Economics, Media Studies, Political Science, Psychology and Sociology. The reviewers faced the daunting task of reviewing a SER of 317 pages. The team also observed that the faculty had compiled a common SER for the cluster of subjects and separate SERs for each of the subjects under the cluster. The review team had a difficulty in assessing SER objectively using common SER, since the claims and evidence had been presented using the phrase “Specific for Departments”. Consequently, the only alternative for the review team was to opt to evaluate the programme-wise SERs. However, it was observed by the team that in many of the programme SERs and common SER had not made any claim against the standards and no evidence was provided, putting the review team in a dilemma of objectively judging the marks.

The review team observed that some of the guidelines in the manual for the review had not been properly understood by the compilers of the SERs of the programmes as well as the cluster writers.

They had explained that the training provided was not adequate and they had to work with constraints of time limitations. The team also observed the way the standards were framed had misguided the SER writers. The standard 6.9 can be cited as an example. The considered point of the review team was that the standards could have been better formulated if the writers of the SER had thought of what is science and philosophy of science. The cumulative effect of the above had been making erroneous claims and provision of evidence that were not related to the standards.

The review team observed that there had been no effort made to collect information sources such as Faculty Board Minutes and Senate Minutes. However the team also concluded that the report writers and information collectors had done a praiseworthy job because many departments operate with limited resources. Some departments are without any clerical staff. In some departments cadre positions in few categories have remained vacant for a long period of time. The team observed that the practice of recruitment to above positions from the ministerial list is the cause for the non recruitment to the vacant posts, which has prevented the departments functioning efficiently.

The team observed that the faculty had a systematic approach to collect information at the beginning of the report writing but it had loosened when it reached the final stage.

The review team decided that the SWOT analysis of the SER was not up to the expected standards. The considered judgment of the team is that SWOT analysis has not been done with the participation of the stakeholders of the faculty. The Dean had assigned the responsibility of writing the SER to Committees headed by senior academics. However, there is no evidence to prove that other than the team, rest of the university community has contributed to this process. In the appendix in page no. 05 of the report, it is stated that different stakeholders contributed to the report writing process. Neither the internal dynamics of “Strengths “ and “Weaknesses” of the faculty nor the external dynamics of “Opportunities” and “Threats” had been adequately and sufficiently discussed.

The review team attempted to locate the previous subject review reports to look into whether the suggestion for improvements had been incorporated or not into the study programmes. However, the team was not able to locate them.

It is observed that some departments have developed proper graduate profiles which may be compatible with national and global trends while other departments have not done so and some are lagging behind. The Media Study with limited human resources had made excellent efforts in

this regards. Some of the departmental curriculums are not up to the standard. The syllabus in Home Economics can be cited for instance. It is observed that learning outcomes and the content of the syllabus does not match with the content of the course units. It is also observed that the individual degree programmes had taken some corrective measures to rectify the situation. External expert consultation and stakeholder discussions are required to update the syllabuses of the degree programmes under this cluster. The team also observed that the degree programmes which are conducted by inexperienced junior staff need the guidance of qualified and experienced academics. The junior staff was not aware of subject benchmarking and Sri Lanka Qualification Framework etc.

The Faculty Quality Assurance Cell and University Level Quality Assurance Unit need to pay special attention to the above aspects promptly.

The team also observed that the three months time span given to some of the departments to finalise marking had compelled the academics to compromise the quality of marking. Particularly, this is applicable to degree programmes with a higher number of students and limited number of academics such as in Political Science and Psychology. Related to the same, the team had observed that a student could earn 40% of the marks through continuous assessment while 60% of the marks can be earned at the end semester examination. The prescribed pass mark remained at 40 marks. The only norm in maintaining a delicate balance between the two components of the examination was the compulsory requirements to qualify to register for the final written examination. The team observed that there is a possibility of passing the examination without much effort by the students. Some of the academics had expressed their concern over the above and expressed this practice is promoting rogue learning. It is the view of the team that there should be a mechanism to maintain a delicate balance between the two components.

Section 3: A brief description of the Review Process

This section includes the steps involved in preparation of the programme review by the review team and the relevant departments and faculty.

The programme review process comprised sequence of events which took place during the review process.

The SER pertaining to Social Sciences cluster II of the Faculty of Arts, University of Jaffna included five degree programmes, namely Political Science, Media Studies, Sociology, Home Economics and Psychology. Upon receipt of the SER, the Desk-Based Evaluation was done by the review panel. Later, the review panel met at the UGC to discuss the outcome of the Desk-Based Evaluation and the Review Visit to University of Jaffna.

The review visit took place during the period from 11th to 13th September, 2017.

The team members held a discussion before the site visit and the agenda of the site visit was finalised the day before the site visit. However, the agenda was not finalised in consultation with responsible staff of the university since they did not visit the review team until the site visit by the tem.

In the first day of the visit, the team was welcomed by Prof. G Mikunthan, the Director of Internal Quality Assurance Cell (IQAC) of the University of Jaffna, Dean of the Faculty of Arts and the Coordinator of the Internal Quality Assurance Unit (IQUA) of the Faculty of Arts. A short meeting was held with them to discuss the quality assurance activities of the faculty and the history of the IQAC of the university.

The second meeting was held with the Vice Chancellor of the University. The history of the Faculty of Arts and the infrastructure development activities held during last the ten years were discussed with him. Some common facilities for all the faculties of the university namely the maintenance of the university web site, university calendar, availability of common staff positions in the university (Eg: Proctor) and future development plans for the Faculty of Arts were discussed with him.

The third meeting was held with the Dean of the faculty at Dean's office which was a lengthy discussion. At the meeting clarifications were made regarding the degree programmes, their qualities, infrastructure development, academic support activities, efforts of maintaining the quality of degree programmes and student centered activities. The facilities available for the staff and students and their problems too were discussed. Some of the evidence quoted in the SER was crosschecked at this meeting further.

The fourth meeting was held with the Heads of the Departments and Coordinators of the Units relevant to the five degree programmes. The Heads of the Departments of Political Sciences, Psychology, Media Studies and Sociology attended the meeting. The contributions of each Head/Coordinator of each department /unit in compilation of the SER were inquired and their responses were recorded by the review team. Additionally, the team clarified and discussed the contributions of IQAC and IQAU for maintaining the quality and standards of each degree programme, infrastructure facilities in each department/unit available for both staff and students, funds availability for each degree programme, availability of academic and non-academic staff members in each department/unit, examination procedures and student evaluations, teacher evaluation process by students and peer evaluation process. The gender representation of student community and staff were recorded following the discussion with the relevant Head of Department and coordinators of the units.

The fifth meeting was held with academic staff members of all degree programmes. A considerable number of senior and junior staff members representing all degree programmes attended the meeting. The team discussed with them the facilities and resources available in each department/unit level in the teaching process, their contribution in the SER writing process, communication of top level administration with them, problems and constraints they are facing in teaching process and their satisfaction in working environment and their views in the quality of the degree programmes offered by their department/unit.

Team visited all the departments and units in the first and second day afternoons. The Head/Coordinator's office, staff rooms, laboratories, lecture halls, computer rooms sanitary facilities of each department/unit were visited and photographed. In addition, common facilities for all five degree programmes such as English language teaching center, library, physical education unit, health center, counselling center, career guidance unit, staff development center and student welfare center were visited by the team and relevant staff members met at each location. The facilities available in each unit for academic and non-academic staff and students

were observed. The services/courses offered by each unit were also inquired and reported. The problems encountering by each unit/center with respect to the facilities available, infrastructure facilities, fund allocations and student attendance were inquired and recorded.

In the second day morning, the team was able to meet the Senior Student Counselor and Student Counsellors, Director/IT, Director/Physical Education, Director/Career Guidance Unit, Director/Staff Development Center and Senior Treasurer of the Arts Faculty Students Union in the Dean's office. Team discussed the facilities and resources available in each unit, the services offered by each unit, students' participation for the activities conducted by each unit, problems encountering and suggestion for further improvement in each unit.

The second meeting of the second day was held with students in the seminar room. Though students were on vacation, faculty administration and staff had supported in gathering students from all degree programmes, representing all entry years for the meeting. Team had a discussion with students, programme wise, regarding the facilities available for them, teaching-learning process, conducting laboratory practical and their satisfaction on teaching-learning process and the facilities available. Further, students were inquired on their Alumni Association and their expectations on employment following graduation.

The observations to collect evidence, commenced in late afternoon of the first day. All the observations were compiled and located in one room. The team was assisted by two Computer Application Assistants for locating the required document files. Team continued the same process in the second day as well and completed the task in early evening of the second day.

The team had a meeting with administrative staff on the third day morning. The Senior Assistant Registrar of the faculty was present for the meeting. The team inquired of the facilities available for the students and staff of the faculty and his suggestions to overcome the prevailing problems.

During the nights of first and second day, at the residing hotel, the team discussed and recorded the observations made and the evidences checked during day time of each day.

In the third day, late morning, the team completed the allocation of final marks to all degree programmes. Thereafter the team prepared a short report on the five degree programmes, to include strengths and weaknesses which may need remedial measures, based on observations made, information gathered and evidences checked.

The final meeting was held on the third day late afternoon (3.00 pm) with the Dean in the absence of Vice Chancellor. The team presented the short report to the Dean, Heads of Departments and other staff who attended and after which the site visit was concluded.

Since the site visit had been scheduled during the vacation period of the students, the team was unable to complete the observations on teaching/learning sessions. Furthermore as a result of the trade union action of non-academic staff members it was not possible to arrange a meeting with them.

Coordinators of some units were on leave (Home Economics unit) and the team was unable to meet them either. Since the site visit of the team was scheduled during A/L paper marking period, staff members of some units were not present at meetings though few of their representatives were available in the units for discussion when the team visited such units.

The arrangements and agenda for the meetings with the faculty administration and others were not communicated to the review team until the team visited the faculty. Neither the arrangements of vehicles for the team was communicated to the team by the faculty representatives. The faculty administration was not punctual in arranging transport in certain days and the team had to waste their valuable time at the hotel with no communication from the administration on the delay either. However, arrangements of food and other logistics for the team were appreciable.

Few staff members of the faculty were with the team throughout the visit assisting the team in many activities including observing the departments and units, which is highly appreciable. A special appreciation is due to the two Computer Application Assistants, for the support rendered in checking for the evidence described in the SER.

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

The review team observed the poor infrastructure facilities in the Faculty of Arts. The lecture halls, venues for the teacher to teacher interaction, student leisure areas and equipment to facilitate the use of modern technologies in teaching are very limited. The academic staff is making a praiseworthy effort to produce best graduates in spite of all of these limitations. The review team also observed the very poor and pathetic conditions of sanitary facilities available for the staff and students. The available sanitary facilities were not properly maintained either. The team observed that in addition to his assigned duties, the Head of Department of Political Science discharging the duties of the peon and clerk. Sanitary facilities of the Department of Sociology were found to be worse. It is reported that there are clashes among the lecturers over the lecture halls and class rooms. In some of the class rooms even a white board was not available. The considered objective view of the review team is that those poor infrastructure facilities had prevented extracting the best out of the abled academics to the Faculty of Arts. In addition, the view of the lecturers was that the faculty had been ignored, marginalized and neglected in resource allocation process by the concerned authorities. Review team found that above growing sense of marginalization and alienation needs to take into serious account in making any attempt at quality assurance of the degree programmes offered by the Faculty of Arts.

The review team observed that the quality assurance process has been ignored due to various reasons. It was observed that the University Level Internal Quality Assurance Unit had been established in late 2016. The faculty level Internal Quality Assurance Cell has also been established very recently. The team felt that the staff members who are assigned responsibilities on quality issues needs training on handling complex issues linked to quality to ensure quality of study programmes. However, it is commendable that some had sought assistance and guidance from experts from within and outside the country. For instance, one of the degree programmes had sought the experts' service from an Indian University to update their curriculum. This indicates that individual departments and units had taken their own initiatives in the sphere of quality assurance which is commendable. What is needed is coordination of those initiatives and facilitating them through Faculty and University Level mechanisms to assure quality of the degree programmes.

The review team found that students' evaluation of the teaching programmes had been carried out by the respective departments, yet such exercises had not resulted in enhancing the quality of the programmes. The review team on analysis, neither found evidence for dissemination of relevant findings to the stakeholders of the degree programmes. The compulsory teaching induction programme had benefited the young academics in many ways. But the issue is the lack of a training mechanism on new teaching/ learning methodologies for the senior academics who are over 50 years of age. The second marking system had helped to maintain the overall quality of the examination process. However, the teachers in some departments with a high student population found that finalising of the marking process within three months as per regulations has pressurised them which would result in erroneous judgments in the longer run. One option to improve the quality of teaching learning process more productively is to adopt participatory approach to the degree programmes of the faculty under cluster II. The review team found no evidence of student participation in the faculty's management process other than the statutory provision for two students' representatives in the Faculty Boards. The Student Associations, except the Association in Political Science seems to be inactive. It is a mechanism to build student- teacher relationship more friendly and cordial manner, which would help in promoting healthy intellectual dialogue within the university community. The SERs of the degree programmes has referred to an academic allowance as a mechanism to motivate academics to engage in innovative research. However, the team observed that only few academics have published their research work. The university and faculty needs to revisit this area to adopt strategies to create a research culture where excellence is recognised and rewarded.

Cessation of Some Good Practices;

1. Shortening of the Orientation Programme for New Entrants had resulted in allocation of only a limited time to the staff to introduce the relevant study programmes and other activities of the departments.
2. The student and staff conflict had resulted in stopping of the Arts Week which had resulted in reducing the number of students taking part in the sports event.

Section 5: Judgment on the eight criteria of programme review

At the site, the members of the review team conducted meetings with different stakeholders as stipulated in the Manual for PR and information gathered. Further, facilities in each department and degree programme were verified by visiting relevant places (Laboratories, SDC Centre, and Sports Centre etc.). Documentary evidence given against each standard by each study programme were analysed carefully and objectively for validation of the evidence presented and appropriate score was given according to the score guide given in the PR manual (Table 3.1, pg. 79, PR manual) based on the evidence provided by the study programme. The review team has revisited the scores given for each standard of the eight criteria at the final meeting held and arrived at a collective judgment for scoring of each and every standard. The scores given for each standard of eight criteria for five study programmes are shown in Annexed Table 5.1, with justification for each decision. Standard-wise scores and raw criterion-wise scores for all five degree programmes are given in Table 5.1. Brief overall judgment on the level of attainment of quality by each study programme is given below.

In preparation of SER the University has submitted standards common to all study programmes and those specific to each study programme separately. For some standards evidence was not available either in common or under specific to departments. In such cases the study programmes lost marks resulting zero standard-wise score and lower criterion-wise scores. All five study programmes lost marks to some extent as a result of this short coming, which could have been prevented by proper coordination among the SER writers.

Criterion 1 – Programme Management

Most of the standards are common to the Faculty of Arts and were addressed under section called common. All five study programmes scored more than the required minimum score. However, inadequacies in updating the website, adopting performance appraisal systems and establishing collaborations with national and foreign universities/HEIs/organizations for research and cooperation was observed. All study programmes except Media Studies, do not use ICT platform and applications for key functions. IQAC has been established but still not fully functional. Code of conduct has been prepared but awaits the approval of the Council. There is little evidence on mentoring and counselling in all study programmes except in Home Economics, where some evidence existed.

Criterion 2 – Human and Physical Resources

All study programmes scored more than the required minimum score in this criterion. The staff numbers are just adequate for delivery of degree programmes but increase of cadres is recommended for effective delivery of the degree programmes. Upgrading the capacity of staff is adequate in Media Studies, Home Economics and Political Science but lacking in Psychology and Sociology. ICT facilities and adequate opportunities for students to acquire ICT skills is provided only by the Media Studies but needs to be incorporated in other study programmes as well. English language, soft skills and harmony and cohesion among students of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds has been addressed adequately by all study programmes.

Criterion 3 – Programme Design and Development

The Media Studies Degree programme scored better compared to other study programmes in this criteria. However, all degree programmes acquired scores higher than the minimum score.

Faculty ensures that programme approval decision is taken after full consideration of design principles and academic standards. However the monitoring mechanism to foster ongoing design and development of the curriculum is not in place. The Media Studies study programmes scored better compared to other study programmes in this criteria although all study programmes acquired scores higher than the minimum score. The Media Studies study programmes has clearly defined appropriate measurable process indicators and outcome based performance indicators which are used to monitor the implementation and evaluation of the programmes. The feedback from employer/professional satisfaction survey was not incorporated in programmes design process of study programmes. There is also no evidence on external stakeholders' participation in programme planning, especially in Psychology and Sociology but some evidence available in other study programmes. Alignment of curricula with Sri Lanka Qualification Framework (SLQF), and guidance by Subject Benchmark Statements is not strong in Home Economics and Political Science but evident in Media Studies. The faculty adopts an Outcome Based Education (OBE) satisfactorily where programme outcomes are clearly aligned with the course/module outcomes but this is poor in Home Economics. It is evident that feedback from stakeholders has been collected but not evaluated and incorporated in the revision of curriculum. Evidence was not provided by Home Economics, Political Sciences and Sociology study programmes on tracer studies. The provision of learning resources for students with special needs is available in all

study programmes except in Psychology. The faculty has initiated IQAC but needs to complete the process to commence activities.

Criterion 4- Course module Design and Development

All study programmes scored well in this criterion. Most of the standards are commonly adopted by the faculty. Student centered learning and outcome based education has been considered by all the study programmes in course module design and development. Accommodation of internship, gender, cultural and social diversity, ethical issues has been considered in design and development of course modules is evident. The courses had clear course specifications that provide concise description of the ILOs, contents, teaching learning and assessment strategies and learning resources and has been made accessible to all students. Staff members were also well aware of the criteria against which the course proposals/specifications are assessed in the course approval process. Implementation of IQAC and course approval needs to be completed.

Criterion 5 – Teaching and Learning

The study programmes adopt diverse teaching/learning methods aligned with ILOs but the diversity varies depending on the study programme. Timely delivery of time tables and course specifications to students is evident. The students are engaged in research, group work, publishing journals appropriate to study programmes and documentary films (MS). Adoption of a mechanism to evaluate performance of teachers and identify champions of teaching excellence is yet to be implemented and this mechanism is expected to promote adoption of excellent practices in teaching and learning.

Criterion 6 - Learning Environment, Student Support and Progression

It is evident that the faculty adopts mechanisms to develop student-friendly administrative, academic and technical support systems ensuring a greater interaction among students and staff. Effective learning environment is ensured by providing library facilities, lecture halls with multimedia, health care and security services. The faculty offers all incoming students an obligatory induction programme where the rules and regulations of the institution, student-centered learning, outcome based education and technology based learning are addressed. Co-curricular activities are conducted by all study programmes but internships and gender equity and equality activities are currently practiced only by Media Studies study programme. Other study

programmes are planning to develop such activities in future. Students are motivated to use the library and information resources for independent learning, information retrieval, literature review and reference. The inadequacy of relevant books for reference is emphasized by Home Economics and Media Studies study programmes. The teachers in partnership with library and information resources personnel ensure that the use of library and information resources is integrated into the learning process. Fallback options are available for students who wish to leave at the end of third year. Links with alumni is yet to be developed.

Criterion 7– Student Assessment and Awards

The faculty practices common assessment strategies for all study programmes that are aligned with programme outcomes and confirms with the descriptors of the SLQF and SBS. Examination By-laws where regulations for appointing both internal and external examiners were available but ToRs are available only for the internal examiners. The marking of external examiners is systematically accommodated in calculation of results. Appropriate facilities regarding examination requirements for students with special needs were available only in Political Sciences study programme. All study programmes failed to provide evidence for transcripts and timely issue of results.

Criterion 8 – Innovative and Healthy Practices

The faculty has not yet established an ICT- based platform (i.e. VLE/ LMS) to facilitate multi-mode teaching delivery and learning. Use of OER to supplement teaching and learning is practiced only by Media Studies study programme. The faculty has established coordinating and facilitating mechanisms for fostering research and innovation and promoting community and industry engagement but there is no implementation of a reward system to encourage academics for achieving excellence in research and outreach activities at present. All study programmes conduct an undergraduate research project as a part of the teaching and learning strategy but industrial training placements are not yet fully practiced by study programmes other than Media Studies. Income-generating activities are not in practice at present except for Home Economics, study programme and needs to be strengthened. A mechanism is available for the students who do not wish to complete the four year course to exit after three years.

Table 1. Raw Criterion-wise Score for five Degree programmes

Criterion	Home Economics	Media Studies	Political Science	Psychology	Sociology
1	60	61	55	56	54
2	26	30	27	23	25
3	36	49	39	39	40
4	38	43	43	40	44
5	30	42	32	28	34
6	42	51	43	37	37
7	29	30	34	27	27
8	17	26	21	21	21

Table 2. Overall study programme Score for five Degree programmes

Criterion	Home Economics	Media Studies	Political Science	Psychology	Sociology
1	111.11	112.96	101.85	103.70	100.00
2	72.22	83.33	75.00	63.89	69.44
3	75.00	102.08	81.25	81.25	83.33
4	100.00	113.16	113.16	105.26	115.79
5	78.95	110.53	84.21	73.68	89.47
6	58.33	70.83	59.72	51.39	51.39
7	85.29	88.24	100.00	79.41	79.41
8	20.24	30.95	25.00	25.00	25.00
Total	601.15	712.08	640.19	583.59	613.84
Grading	C	B	C	D	C

Section 6: Grading of overall performance of the programme

Grading of overall performance of the programmes is given in Table 3.

Table 3. Final assessment of the overall performance of the degree programmes.

Degree programme	Grading obtained	Judgment
Home Economics	C	Satisfactory
Media Studies	B	Good
Political Science	C	Satisfactory
Psychology	D	Unsatisfactory
Sociology	C	Satisfactory

Study Programme 1: Home Economics

Home Economics study programme scored marks higher than the minimum score for all criteria except for criteria 8 – Innovative and healthy practices. However, according to the guidelines given in the PR Manual (3.5, pg. 83) the study programme receives “C” grade as they score >60% and a score higher than weighted minimal score for more than six criteria.

Study Programme 2: Media Studies

Media Studies study programme scored marks higher than minimum score for all criteria and obtained a score >70% and received grade “B”.

Study Programme 3: Political Science

Political Science study programme scored marks higher than minimum score for all criteria and obtained a score >60% and received grade “C”.

Study Programme 4: Psychology

Media Studies study programme scored marks higher than minimum score for all criteria and obtained a score <600 hence received grade “D”.

Study Programme 5: Sociology

Media Studies study programme scored marks higher than minimum score for all criteria and obtained a score >600 and received grade “C”.

Section 7: Commendations and Recommendations

7.1 Commendations on excellence

Programme management

All five study programmes scored more than the required minimum score. IQAC has been established and the Code of conduct has been prepared.

Human and Physical Resources

All study programmes scored more than the required minimum score in this criterion. Upgrading the capacity of staff is good in Media Studies, Home Economics and Psychology study programmes. ICT facilities and adequate opportunities for students to acquire ICT skills are provided only by the Media Studies. The English language, soft skills and harmony and cohesion among students of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds have been addressed adequately in all study programmes.

Programme Design and Development

Only Media Studies Degree programme scored better in this criterion. The faculty has ensured that programme approval decision is taken after full consideration of design principles and academic standards. The Media Studies study programme has defined appropriate measurable process indicators and outcome based performance indicators. Alignment of curricula with Sri Lanka Qualification Framework (SLQF), and guidance by Subject Benchmark Statements is also evident in Media Studies study programme. The faculty adopts an Outcome Based Education (OBE) satisfactorily. The provisions of learning resources for students with special needs are available.

Course Module Design and Development

All study programmes scored well in this criterion. Most of the standards are commonly adopted by the faculty. Student centered learning and outcome based education have been considered by all study programmes. Accommodation of internship, gender, cultural and social diversity, ethical issues is also evident. The courses had clear course specifications.

Teaching and Learning

The study programmes adopt diverse teaching/learning methods aligned with ILOs. The delivery of Time tables and course specifications to students is evident. The students are engaged in

research, group work, publishing journals appropriate to study programmes and documentary films.

Learning Environment and Learner Support

The adoption of a mechanism to develop student-friendly administrative, academic and technical support system is evident. Effective learning environment is ensured by providing library facilities, lecture halls with multimedia, health care and security services. The faculty offers all incoming students an induction programme. Several co-curricular activities are conducted by all study programmes. Students are motivated to use the library and information resources for independent learning, information retrieval, literature review and reference. Fallback options are available for students who wish to leave at the end of third year.

Student Assessment and Awards

The faculty practices common assessment strategies for all study programmes that are aligned with programme outcomes and confirms with the descriptors of the SLQF and SBS. Appointment of both internal and external examiners was incorporated in Examination By-laws. The marking of external examiners is accommodated in calculation of results. Appropriate facilities regarding examination requirements for students with special needs were available only in Political Science study programme.

Healthy and Innovative Practices

The use of OER to supplement teaching and learning is practiced only by Media Studies study programme. The faculty has established coordinating and facilitating mechanisms for fostering research and innovation and promoting community and industry engagement. All study programmes conduct an undergraduate research project.

7.2 Recommendations for remedial actions

- Updating the website
- Adopting performance appraisal systems
- Establishing more collaborations with national and foreign universities/HEIs/organizations for research and cooperation
- Using ICT platform and applications for key functions in all study programmes
- Strengthening of IQAC functioning
- Starting the operation of Code of conduct

- Initiating mentoring and counselling in all study programmes
- Increasing the academic and non-academic cadres
- Upgrading the capacity of staff in all departments
- ICT facilities and adequate opportunities for students in all study programmes
- Further improving English language, soft skills and harmony and cohesion among students of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds
- A mechanism to foster ongoing design and development of the curriculum
- Developing appropriate measurable process indicators and outcome based performance indicators
- Incorporating feedback of employer/professional satisfaction survey
- Participation of external stakeholders in programme planning
- Strengthening the alignment of curricula with Sri Lanka Qualification Framework (SLQF), and guidance by Subject Benchmark Statements
- Adopting the Outcome Based Education(OBE) satisfactorily
- Evaluating and incorporating the feedback from stakeholders
- Conducting tracer studies
- Implementation of IQAC and course approval needs to be completed
- Adoption of a mechanism to evaluate performance of teachers and identify champions of teaching excellence is yet to be implemented
- Examination By-laws and ToRs are to be made available to external examiners as well
- Appropriate facilities regarding examination requirements for students with special needs should be made available to all programmes
- All study programmes should assure providing transcripts and timely issuing of results
- Establishing an ICT- based platform (i.e. VLE/ LMS) to facilitate multi- mode teaching delivery and learning
- Using OER to supplement teaching and learning
- Implementation of a reward system to encourage academics for achieving excellence in research and outreach activities
- Industrial training placements are to be fully practiced
- Income-generating activities are yet to be practiced.

Section 8: Summary

This Report of the Programme Review was prepared according to the assignment given to the review team by the Quality Assurance and Accreditation Council, University Grants Commission of Sri Lanka, on Programme Evaluation in the Faculty of Arts, University of Jaffna.

The evaluation covered the “Cluster of Social Sciences II” which included five study programmes:

1. Political Science
2. Media Studies
3. Sociology
4. Home Economics
5. Psychology

The evaluation process was carried out between 11th to 13th September 2017.

The members of the review panel were:

1. Prof. P. Hewage (Chair)
2. Prof. G.D.R.U.U. Abeyrathne
3. Prof. (Mrs.) S.C. Jayamanne
4. Dr. (Mrs.) G.A.S. Ginigaddara

Though the review team was expected to evaluate a single Self Evaluation Report (SER) under the Cluster II, it was decided to evaluate five study programmes separately, with the purpose of providing a split-assessment.

A summary of the Review Team’s main findings are given in the following sections:

Section 1: Observing the documents provided by the faculty and departments

The Self Evaluation contained two separate arrangements.

1. The standards, study programme’s claims of compliance, the documentary evidence to support each claim of compliance and codes of evidence used are common to all five programmes.

2. The standards, study programme's claims of compliance, the documentary evidence to support each claim of compliance and codes of evidence used are specific to each of the five programmes.

However the review team observed that there had been a lack of coordination in the final compiling of the report. The coding was different from that of the report and the actual content of the file. While some programmes had attempted their best to compile all possible evidence, some programmes had not compiled documents systematically. The Standard 6.8 had not been properly interpreted. There are some learning resources which are considered to be included in laboratories and the report writing team has considered that this standard is not applicable to Humanities and Social Sciences study programmes.

Section 2: Observing the facilities and resources

The panel of reviewers noticed that the degree programmes were operated with insufficient human resources and physical facilities. Nevertheless, the available facilities have not been properly maintained either.

The review team also observed the prevailing sense among members of the faculty that resource allocation had not been done according to the principle of necessity and fairness. Some members of the faculty felt that the faculty had been neglected and ignored by the administration.

Section 3: Meeting with stakeholders

The review team met all the stakeholders within the university to explore the efficacy and effectiveness of the study programmes. However, the observing of lectures or class room activities was not possible because the students were on vacation. Furthermore, the non-academic staff was on a protest campaign and therefore, a meeting to discuss with them was not possible.

Section 4: Clustering

The review team has found that related subjects had not been clustered rationally. For instance, it was noted the clustering of Psychology under cluster II, while Philosophy is excluded though the two subjects are hosted in the same department.

Section 5: Curriculum

The curriculum is not updated and needs rigorous revisions. There shall be a proper mechanism to develop syllabi in consultation with experts and stakeholders. Subject Bench Marking and SLQF need to be addressed in syllabus revision.

Section 6: Final Analysis

Degree programme	Grading obtained	Judgment
Home Economics	C	Satisfactory
Media Studies	B	Good
Political Science	C	Satisfactory
Psychology	D	Unsatisfactory
Sociology	C	Satisfactory

The review team appreciates the work undertaken by the academic, administrative and supporting staff of the faculty to conduct the degree programme under the cluster II with many challenges and difficulties. The review team also wishes to thank the Dean, Heads of Departments, Centers and Units, Director of QA and all academic and other members in the faculty for facilitating the Programme Review and providing the support during our stay in Jaffna.