



# PROGRAM REVIEW 2017

University of Kalaniya  
Faculty of Humanities  
Cluster - 5

**Programme Review Report  
of  
*Bachelor of Arts (General) Degree***

***Faculty of Humanities  
University of Kelaniya***

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

## Table of Contents

	Page(s)
<b>Section 1: Brief Introduction to the Programme</b>	<b>03</b>
<b>Section 2: Review Team’s Observations on the Self Evaluation Report</b>	<b>09</b>
<b>Section 3: A Brief Description of the Review Process</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Section 4: Overview of the Faculty’s Approach to Quality and Standards (Not Included)</b>	
<b>Section 5: Judgment on the Eight Criteria of Programme Review</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>5.1 Criterion 1: Program Management</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>5.2 Criterion 2: Human and Physical Resources</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>5.3 Criterion 3- Programme Design and Development</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>5.4 Criterion 4: Course / Module Design and Development</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>5.5 Criterion 5: Teaching and Learning</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>5.6 Criterion 6: Learning Environment, Student Support and Progression</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>5.7 Criterion 7: Student Assessment and Awards</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>5.8 Criterion 8: Innovative and Healthy Practices</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Section 6: Grading of Overall Performance of the Programme</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Section 7: Commendations and Recommendations</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Section 8: Summary (Not included)</b>	
<b>Programme Review Team</b>	<b>21</b>

## **Section 1: Brief Introduction to the Programme**

The programme review team appointed by the UGC visited the Faculty of Humanities (FoH) of the University of Kelaniya on 5<sup>th</sup> November 2017 and conducted a three-day review from 6<sup>th</sup> to 8<sup>th</sup> November 2017. The review team consisted of four academic staff members drawn from three universities in Sri Lanka. The mandate of the review team was to review a cluster of study programmes that includes four Bachelor of Arts (BA) General degree programmes, namely, BA (General), BA (General) in Korean Language, BA (General) in Tamil Language and BA (General) in Translation Methods. However, all 4-degree programmes were treated as a single entity in the review process in view of the common SER submitted by the FoH.

### **1.1 History of the University of Kelaniya**

The University of Kelaniya, Sri Lanka is one of the major national universities in Sri Lanka. It is located just outside the municipal limits of Colombo, in the ancient and historic city of Kelaniya. The history of University of Kelaniya, traces back to 1875 which marks the establishment of the historic Vidyalkara Pirivena. It was one of the two great national seats of traditional higher learning. With the establishment of modern Universities in Sri Lanka, the name and structure of the Vidyalkara Pirivena underwent several transformations. In 1959 it became the Vidyalkara University of Ceylon, then in 1972 the Vidyalkara Campus of the University of Sri Lanka, and ultimately in 1978, the University of Kelaniya.

The University consists of seven faculties and 60 departments. The seven faculties are, Faculties of Humanities, Social Sciences, Science, Medicine, Commerce and Management Studies, Computing and Technology, and Graduate Studies,

### **1.2 Faculty of Humanities**

The history of the Faculty of Humanities traces back to the inception of Vidyalkara Pirivena in 1875. The Faculty was established with a vision of disseminating knowledge mainly on language related education.

The Faculty has ten academic departments including an English Language Teaching Department (DELT) and two units, namely, the Visual Arts and Design and Performance Arts Unit and

Drama and Theater and Image Arts Unit. It offers 25 subjects for the Bachelor of Arts degree programme.

Subjects offered by each Department of the Faculty of Humanities are listed below.

<b>Department/Unit</b>	<b>Subjects</b>
Department of Sinhala	Sinhala, Literary Criticism
Department of English	English
Department of Pali and Buddhist Studies	Pali, Buddhist Culture, Buddhist Philosophy
Department of Sanskrit	Sanskrit
Department of Hindi Studies	Hindi
Department of Modern Languages	French, Japanese, German, Chinese, Russian and Korean languages
Department of Linguistics	Linguistics, Translation Methods, Translation Studies, Tamil, Tamil as a Second Language (TASL)
Department of Western Classical Culture & Christian Culture	Western Classical Culture, Christian Culture
Department of Fine Arts	
- Visual Arts, Design & Performing Arts Unit	Drama & Theatre, Image Arts,
- Drama & Theatre and Image Arts Unit	Cinema & Television
DELT	Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL)

Source: Student Handbook, 2015/2016)

The Faculty offers two types of undergraduate degree programmes; three-year BA (General) degree and four-year BA (Honours) degree. A unique feature of the degree programmes is that the programmes are offered jointly by the 2 faculties, the Faculty of Humanities and the Faculty of Social Sciences. The academic programme operates on semester-based course unit and GPA grading system.

### **1.3 BA (General) Degree Programme**

The BA (General) degree is a 3-year study programme and consists of 3 levels (years) and a minimum of 30 credits or a maximum of 36 credits at each level and a total 90-108 credits for the Bachelor of Arts degree.

The programme can be completed by offering three major subjects. The Faculties of Humanities (FoH) and Social Sciences (FoSS) offer many subjects which can be offered as major subjects for the Bachelor of Arts degree. The FoH offers 25 major subjects and the FoSS offers 18 major subjects for BA (General) and BA (Honours) degree programmes. All major subjects offered by

these two Faculties are grouped into 10. Students can select one subject each from any three of the 10 groups. The grouping of subjects is said to be based on the demand for the subjects. The purpose of grouping was to reduce complexities arising in timetabling, scheduling examinations, resource allocation and other administrative matters while providing adequate choices for students to pursue their undergraduate studies with their interests. Each major subject is divided into many course units. There are four types of course units:

1. **Compulsory course units:** Students must follow all the compulsory course units of their major subjects.
2. **Optional course units:** Optional course units of a particular subject are offered to students irrespective of the main subjects.
3. **Auxiliary course units:** Auxiliary course units of a particular subject are offered to students other than those who follow the particular subjects as main subjects.
4. **General Education course units:** The course units that can be followed by all the undergraduates are referred to as General education course units. These could be chosen to fulfill the credits requirement assigned for each level of the degree programme.

The three major subjects can be selected from the subjects offered by one faculty or from both faculties. If a student selects two or more subjects from the same faculty he/she would be considered as a student belonging to that faculty.

A minimum of 30 credits or a maximum of 36 credits should be completed at each level (year) of the BA (General) degree. To complete the degree a minimum of 90 credits should be completed at all three levels of the programme.

#### **1.4 Academic Staff**

According to the Student Handbook of the University (2015/2016), there are roughly about 90 academics in the FoH; 28 Professors, 23 PhDs, 18 MPhils, 17 MA/MSc s and six BA graduates. Data on experience of the academic staff was not available and our attempts to collect more information on the staff during the review was not successful.

#### **1.5 Student Population**

There seem to be an increasing trend in student enrolment in the first year as shown Table 1.1. The female: male ratio also shows an increasing trend (80-90%).

**Table 1.1 Annual intake of students by academic year and gender (Source: SER)**

Academic Year	Female	Male	Clergy		Total
			Female	Male	
2015/2016	1067*	138*	1	61*	1267*
2014/2015	1267*	126	0	22	621
2013/2014	317	71	0	20	408

\*This includes students of both Faculties of Humanities and Social Sciences

Source: Corporate Plan (2017-2021)

**Table 1.2 Annual intake for BA (General) and BA (Honours) Degree Programmes (2014-2016)**

Year	BA (General)	BA Honours	Total
2014	240	169	409
2015	193	149	342
2016	278	122	400
Total	711	440	1151

Source: Corporate Plan (2017-2021)

According to Table 1.2, the number of students enrolling in BA (Honours) degree programmes indicates a decreasing trend while that of BA (General) degree programme records an increasing trend except in 2015. Annual enrollment of students in the Faculty has fluctuated between 342 to 409 over the past three years.

However, the data provided by the Inter-faculty Centre for Coordinating the Modular System (ICCMS) portrays a different picture as per Table 1.3.

**Table 1.3 Number of registered students- Faculty of Humanities**

Academic year	No. of registered students
2013/2014	346
2014/2015	554
2015/2016	716
Total	1616

The data in Table 1.3 indicates an increasing trend in enrollment, at least during the last 3 years. The increase seems to be achieved by introducing employment oriented new programmes, special intake and recruiting foreign students as reflected in the data provided by the ICCMS. The FoH admit students through several windows and the number students admitted in 2015/2016 academic year through different windows are given below (Table 1.4).

**Table 1.4: Total No. of Registered Students in 2015/2016**

<b>Type of Intake</b>	<b>Number</b>
<b>Normal Intake</b>	530
<b>Special intake</b>	45
<b>Disabled students</b>	06
<b>Foreign students</b>	23
<b>Direct Intake</b>	
<b>Film and Television</b>	49
<b>Teaching English as a Second language</b>	40
<b>Translation studies</b>	23
<b>Total</b>	716

The percentage of students graduated annually during the past 10 years has been in the range of 77% to 91% where the highest achievements have been in the years 2008, 2010 and 2011.

## **1.6 Infrastructure Facilities and Support Services**

### **1.6.1 Learning Resource System**

The FoH has two computer labs of its own, which provide computer access to students in addition to the ICT services provided by the University's main IT Center. These facilities are in addition to computer facilities offered by the Departments of English Language Teaching, Sinhala, Modern Languages, Western Classical Culture and Christian Studies, and Fine Arts. Students of the Faculty also have accessed the main Wi-Fi facility of the university. The Faculty also has dedicated study areas for students, which are also open for students from other faculties and departments. Students have the access to the main library of the University as well as to mini-libraries maintained at department-level, which holds texts and other reading material specific to the subjects and disciplines offered.

The Department of English Language Teaching (DELT) provides classes on Teaching English Language as a Second Language (TESL) to students of all faculties. In their first year, all students follow a 02-credit compulsory course unit in English Language of one semester's



duration. In addition, students of the FoH can also follow the optional TESL courses in levels 2 and 3.

### **1.6.2 Student Support System**

All undergraduates entering the University are provided with university accommodation, and access to sports and Wi-Fi facilities. They are also supported with career guidance and counseling, services as well. There are many common areas in which students can interact freely with each other, conduct meetings, and engage in social and cultural activities. Other facilities include a well-equipped gymnasium, multi-purpose playground, cricket ground with nets, swimming pool, cultural center and an open air theater.

## **Section 2: Review Team's Observations on the Self Evaluation Report**

It is regrettable to state that the preparation for the review process was quite inadequate. The SER was not prepared in accordance to the prescribed guidelines. SER seems to have been prepared in a hurry and there were many shortcomings in its structure, contents and organization. It contains only 3 sections. Most important part, Section 4 which should include the details and comments on the effectiveness of the programme implementation and maintenance of academic standards is missing. Compiling the documentary evidences was in somewhat disarray; either irrelevant documents were produced or many important ones were missing in many instances (such as graduation data of students, TORs of committees, staff profile, cadre requirements and actual cadre, etc.).

The introductory section, Section 1 provided only a part of the required information. Graduate profile given was meant for the BA (Honours) graduates, and the intended learning outcomes of the study programme were written using an incorrect format. Student enrollment data were given, but the data on their choice of subjects were missing. Numbers and profile of academic and non-academic staff were also not reported appropriately. Some of the annexures listed in the report were not attached and also were not made available during site visit.

Details pertaining to learning resources and student support system were included in the report. However, the report failed to include a review of the context within which the Faculty operates in the form of a SWOT analysis. There was no reference in the SER with regard to past reviews or the major changes implemented or initiated after such past reviews.

Nonetheless, the SER preparation appears to have followed a participatory approach. However, the programme review team is of the view that the SER writing team should have been given more guidance and support from the higher management and senior academics of the Faculty. The lack of participation and guidance by the seniors and absence of progress monitoring of SER preparation would have contributed to the above-mentioned shortcomings.

### **Section 3: A Brief Description of the Review Process**

#### **3.1 Pre-Site Visit Evaluation**

Self-evaluation report (SER) prepared by FoH was initially handed over to the QAAC of the UGC, apparently somewhat later than the stipulated deadline of July 5, 2017. The SER was forwarded to the individual members of the review team by the QAAC well before the desk evaluation deadline that allowed ample time for them to read it before the site visit. Reviewers were assigned 5 weeks for the desk evaluation. Members of the panel conducted the desk-evaluation independently and the individual desk scores were submitted to QAAC. After completion of desk review, the team had a meeting, organized by the QAAC on 23<sup>rd</sup> of August, 2017 at the UGC, to discuss the outcomes of the desk evaluation. Further clarifications that are needed during the site visit were agreed upon.

Before leaving for the site visit, a schedule prepared for the 3-day site visit was circulated among members of the review team and necessary amendments were made in collaboration with Dean of the Faculty of Humanities and UGC. The team had a brief meeting among themselves at the site to discuss on further details on the review process before commencing the review.

#### **3.2 Site Visit**

The programme of review process during the site visit included separate discussions with the Vice Chancellor, the Deputy Vice Chancellor, the Dean and Heads of Departments of the Faculty

of Humanities, academic staff of the Faculty, Director of the IQAU, Coordinator of the Faculty IQAC, Registrar, Bursar, Librarian, non-academic staff members, and students of the study programmes under review. Observations were made by checking and comparing the documentary evidences cited in the SER and provided by the FoH, and by participating in the lecture-discussion sessions as peer observers of the teaching and learning process. It also included visits to each Department of Study, all Centres and Units cited in the SER in particular, observations of classroom teaching, facilities provided for staff and students, and environment within the university in general and the debriefing meeting held with key members and officers of the Faculty and study programmes under review.

### **3.2.1 Meetings with Key Stakeholders**

The review team had a very productive interactive sessions with different levels of stakeholders of the study programmes. Formal meeting with the Vice Chancellor initiated the discussion on efforts taken and best practices adopted within the University for quality improvement. The Dean, Faculty of Humanities, introduced the key features of the study programmes and incremental improvements achieved by the Faculty over the past few years together with long-term mission and vision of the Faculty. Heads of Departments elaborated the further details of the study programmes under review and their involvement and contribution. Academic staff explained the process of SER preparation and the strengths and weaknesses of the Faculty and its programmes, including their views on students' engagement in studies. Academic supportive/administrative staff explained the fund allocation and disbursements mechanisms. Students representation at their meeting could have been fairer with participation of students from all three years of the programmes under review. They appeared to be satisfied with the learning experience gained through the study programmes.

### **3.2.2 Observation of Documentary Evidences and Facilities**

The documents relating to the evidences cited in the SER were made available to the review team for their perusal. The documents were filed and labelled but not arranged according to respective standard of each criterion. Review team inspected each file to check the evidence with each claim and cross checked with the information cited in the PR Manual. Adjustments to the

individual reviewer's marks assigned previously were made, as and where appropriate. Any issues arising from the scrutiny process was noted for further discussion at the end of each day.

In addition to the above, the review team also made inspection visits to the places of importance. The infrastructure facilities were evaluated by visiting important venues such as the university library and faculty library, lecture theaters, computer facilities, language and teaching labs and, common places of the Faculty, and also the central facilities such as ICT Centre, Library & Information Centre, Health Center, students' hostels, sports complex, and Centre for Gender Equity and Equality (CGEE).

## **Section 5: Judgment on the Eight Criteria of Programme Review**

### **5.1 Criterion 1 - Programme Management**

The organogram of the University or Faculty were not made available in the SER as annexures. Action plan and cooperate plan were made available. The action plan needs updating to meet new trends in education. The Manual of Procedures and Standard Operational Procedures (SOPS) were not available though they are supposed to be developed and circulated among all academics and administrators. Stakeholder consultations had not been sought in past curricula revisions, and last major revision has taken place several years back in 2010. However, the revision of curricula of some disciplines like Pali and Buddhism has been attempted lately. Though, the student feedback assessment has been done, there was no evidence of analyzing such feedback and using the outcome from such analyses for improvement in course contents and delivery.

There was no evidence of existence of faculty-level curriculum development committee which is considered as a must. Student participation at the Faculty Board meetings does not appear to happen in regularly manner, and it appears that the students are invited only when there are issues of importance to students. Disciplinary guidelines, such as Disciplinary by-laws or Student Charters were not available but it appears that some other form of formal disciplinary procedures are followed within the Faculty as and when required. However, reports of past inquiries there were not made available to the review team.

Though the IQAC has been established at the Faculty, the cell is yet to commence its activities. The person in-charge of the IQAC does not appear to be conducting regular monthly meetings, and there was no reporting at the Faculty Board on regular basis on the activities of IQAC. It is imperative that an active and resourceful IQAC is necessary for improving quality aspects of study programmes to meet the expectation of QAAC of UGC.

The Vice-chancellor's award scheme was in place with records available from 2016, but the proper guidelines as regard to the criteria for selection of awardees were not made available. Other than that there were no evidence of existence proper performance appraisal system for academics to reward those who excel in academic, research and allied activities.

The University Handbook, common for all faculties of the University had been distributed to students at the time of registration. However, it is recommended to develop and issue a Faculty Prospectus which could include information specific to the FoH, its study programmes and facilities. It is recommended to update Faculty Web-link with all important information. The ICCMS system maintains the students' records and provides access for students to see their own results via online. Though, it is claimed that the staff is provided with relevant lists of duties, records of such lists were not made available.

Student counseling service is taken over by the "Kalana Mithuru Sevena". The signs of ragging are still there which is not possible to be controlled solely by the academic staff members or counseling services. No records with respect to punishment meted against ragging were produced. The academic counselors or advisors can be placed for a group of students for maintaining regular contacts with students, and through such measures there is a possibility to reduce the incidences of ragging and related matters. The psychological counselor services are provided to address the students' issues, grievances, and needs, but it needs further strengthening.

Though the Centre for Gender Equity and Equality (CGEE) was in existence, the gender equality and equity aspects are not well known to students and staff, and therefore, efforts must be taken to create adequate awareness among students and staff members on this topic.

## **5.2 Criterion 2 - Human and Physical Resources**

The majority of the lecture halls are provided with multimedia and overhead projectors. However, there is a need for more lecture halls as per the increase of student intake. Some laboratories are used temporarily as lecturer halls implying the need for lecture halls. Lack of adequate number of lecture halls was identified as a threat to implement the outcome-based education and practice student-centered teaching and learning. For some courses such as translation studies, the cadre of academic staff is not adequate. The language laboratories are well equipped with audio and video facilities to stimulate interactive learning in German, Roman, Japanese and English.

The induction programme by the SDC is available for the probationary lecturers but the evidence for providing continuous professional development programmes was not available. The University provides the induction programme for all new recruits as probationary or temporary lecturers. The career guidance services for students are not well implemented except organizing few career fairs and some common programmes to all faculties.

## **5.3 Criterion 3- Programme Design and Development**

No evidence on the existence of committee at faculty level on curriculum related matters. The lesson plans with clear alignment of lesson objectives with those of course and program ILOs are not available except for few courses where the revision has been done recently. It is suggested to comply with SLQF guidelines and adopt the concept outcome-based education and student-centered teaching and learning (OBE\_SCL) approach in future curricula revision so as to align the course ILOs with those of study programme ILOs and also to ensure the alignment of programme outcomes with those of employment market needs.

It appears that internal quality assurance process within the Faculty has not been fully formalized yet. Therefore, initiation of quality enhancement activities by the Faculty-level IQAC needs immediate and speedy attention.

#### **5.4 Criterion 4 - Course/ Module Design and Development**

As mentioned earlier also, the faculty-level committee on curriculum related matters is not in operation to date, and this deficiency indeed needs the attention of the Faculty Board. It appears that the courses were designed by the staff of the Faculty without any assistances from the subject experts from other universities or higher educational institutions. Further, as stated in the previous section, the course ILOs are not aligned with Programme ILOs. Hence this needs to be addressed and it is recommended to rectify the situation by adopting OBE-SCL approach to map course ILOs with programme ILOs.

#### **5.5 Criterion 5 - Teaching and Learning**

Teaching and learning strategies are in alignment with the vision and mission of the University and Faculty. Teachers encourage students to contribute to creative work, relate the theoretical learning into appropriate practice and to present their research and creative work in conferences and seminars, and publish the same in journals and other types of publications. The collections of essays and publications in student magazine are available on the University Website for the students to use for their reference. Communication between student and staff regarding semester schedules, lecturer schedules, group activities, etc. is relatively poor. The lesson plans are not available for most of the courses.

Peer evaluation has been done only for junior teachers by senior members but not vice-versa and even that is also done only for few subjects only. The differently-abled students are given some assistance; most buildings are fitted with elevators, wheel chairs are supplied as and when required, and some concessions are given at examinations.

Multimedia projectors are used for the teaching, but LMS is not regularly or heavily used for their teaching. Only some teachers have uploaded the teaching material to LMS for the use of students. The use of the LMS service is very limited due to slow internet or Wi-Fi connections and it has to be rectified. Students have their undergraduate research symposium, but whether it is a regular event for each year is not known. The innovative practices used by staff for teaching is very minimal. Student-centered teaching and outcome-based education practices are also minimally observed. Evidences of using the key performance indicators for evaluation of teachers and rewarding teachers for excellence in teaching, research and outreach activities were not observed. However, evidence on CVCD awards and many awards/certificates (about 9) won

mainly by a single academic at the national level was reported. E-repository holds the research publications of both staff and students.

## **5. 6 Criterion 6 -Learning Environment, Student Support and Progression**

The Faculty offers all incoming students a very informative orientation programme regarding the rules and regulations of the University and its facilities. The students were provided with the Student Handbook on the first day at the University at the orientation programme. The Faculty promotes active interaction between the academic staff and students (eg. through special cultural programmes). Industrial experience is given for student in translation study programme, but the period of training is limited. However, the success and appropriateness of these programmes should be carefully monitored by the academic staff. No evidence was made available regarding departmental-level staff meetings. Students have been engaging in extracurricular activities and have brought credit to the university in the form of awards at national competitions. The Faculty needs to gather information regularly about the satisfaction of students with the teaching programmes offered and support services provided. The information from such assessments should be incorporated for continuous improvement of the curriculum of study programmes and courses.

University Health Center at present operates just with two doctors in shift duty, and after-hours emergency cases are transferred to nearby hospitals. There is only one matron, two nurses with a pharmacist and a technician. The laboratory is equipped to perform basic tests. The services are free for students and limited fee is charged for the staff as the case with other residential universities. The infrastructure and service facilities at the Health Centre should be expanded, considering the gradual increase of student numbers.

Monitoring committees for hostels and canteens are available but whether the functions are regulated by administration is not known to the review team. The availability of committees is a positive aspect. Students are provided with field trips to enhance student interactions with society.

There were evidences of existence of co-curricular activities such as students involvement in drama festivals, cultural and social activities and engagement with near-by communities.



## **5.7 Criterion 7 -Student Assessment and Awards**

Students are assessed using the given criteria, and procedures, and these are communicated to students at the time of enrollment via the Student Handbook. Appropriate arrangements are made available by the Faculty regarding examination requirements for students with disabilities. Graduation requirements are ensured in the degree certification process and the transcript accurately reflects the stages of progression and student achievements. A complete transcript indicating the courses followed, grades obtained and the aggregate GPA/grades, and class secured is made available to all students at graduation. Students residing far away from the University can retrieve the above-mentioned information and their examination results via ICCMS without a delay.

Method of evaluation of individual courses is not provided in course specifications. There were no evidences of the use of external examiners. The comments from the moderators and external examiners are useful in revising curriculum for future.

## **5.8 Criterion 8 - Innovative and Healthy Practices**

The Faculty has established coordinating and facilitating mechanisms for fostering research and cultural activities and also for promoting community and industry engagements. The Faculty has established and operationalized strong links with various international and national institutes. MoU's were in place for some of the collaborations.

### **Strengths, weaknesses and constraints faced by the Faculty with regard to delivery and sustainability of the study programmes**

The Faculty offers a large number of subjects including academic as well as employment-oriented subjects with the aim of providing broad-based educational experience and life enrichment for the students. The programme consists of a range of compulsory, optional, auxiliary and general education courses to cater for the diverse of needs of the students. The demand seems to be high for employment-oriented subjects and languages (Sinhala and some foreign languages).

The sustainability of the programme appears to be dependent on many factors. Inclusion of employment-oriented subjects and modern languages in the curriculum are prominent among them. The programme design that allows BA students to offer subjects from both Faculties of Humanities and Social Sciences is another factor contributing to the sustainability. Grouping of subjects into ten groups and allowing students to select only one subject each from any three groups also seems to be contributing to sustainability (especially of the less popular but academically important subjects) while allowing the students to choose causes of their choice.

The programme expects the students to select three main subjects and acquire minimum of 90 credits from a range of compulsory, optional, auxiliary and general education courses. However, the lack of indication of minimum number of credits needed to be acquiring from each of the main subjects and other courses seems to affect the uniformity and the standard of the study programmes. The high female: male ratio of the student population is another concern of the programme. However, the reviewers observe that the Faculty has little or no control over the root causes of this situation. Another weakness in the programme management that needs to be addressed by the Faculty is the apparent negligence in maintenance and utilization of an up to date MIS for handling management information.

## Section 6: Grading of Overall Performance of the Programme

The BA (General) Degree Programme offered by the Faculty of Humanities of University of Kelaniya was reviewed in accordance with the procedures prescribed by the PR Manual. The cumulative score obtained for each criterion was based on the claims made and evidences provided for each standard of the respective criterion. The achievements realized individually for each of the eight criteria is provided in Table 6.1 and the overall performance of the study programme in terms of actual criterion-wise scores, overall score, grade and interpretation of the grade are given in the Table 6.2. Each of 8 criteria did score more than the minimum weighted score.

**Table 6.1 Assessment of Individual Criterion and Level of Performance Achieved**

Criterion	Assessment Criteria	Performance descriptor
1	Programme Management	Satisfactory
2	Human and Physical Resources	Good
3	Programme Design and Development	Unsatisfactory
4	Course/ Module Design and Development	Unsatisfactory
5	Teaching and Learning	Unsatisfactory
6	Learning Environment, Student Support and Progression	Satisfactory
7	Student Assessment and Awards	Good
8	Innovative and Healthy Practices	Good

**Table 6.2 Grading of the Overall Performance of the Study Programme**

No	Criterion	Weighted Minimum Score	Actual Criterion-wise Score
1	Programme Management	75	98.1
2	Human and Physical Resources	50	77.8
3	Programme Design and Development	75	83.3
4	Course/ Module Design and Development	75	79.0
5	Teaching and Learning	75	86.8
6	Leraning Environment, Student Support and Progression	50	63.9
7	Student Assessment and Awards	75	108.8
8	Innovative and Healthy Practices	25	35.7
Total in Thousand Scale			633.4
Total as a Percentage (%)			63.34
Grade Awarded			C
Performance Descriptor			Satisfactory
Interpretation of Performance Descriptor			
<i>Minimum level of accomplishment of quality expected of a programme of study; requires improvement in several aspects.</i>			

## **Section 7: Conclusions and Recommendations**

### **Comments, Commendations and Suggestions for Improvement**

It is commendable that University of Kelaniya articulated its own quality framework (UKQF). But it has to be revised and improved in compliance with the SLQF guidelines which is now accepted as the national qualification framework.

To a certain extent, the Faculty has taken measures to assure and maintain quality. The University and Faculty appear to be committed to enhance the infrastructure facilities, improve and train the academic and non-academic staff members, increase the computer facilities and internet and Wi-Fi facilities etc. Use of LMS for teaching and learning appears to be improving.

The student representation at the management should be more and formalized. At present, they are occasionally invited to the Faculty Board meeting only when the special student matters are tabled for the discussion.

Competent academic and non-academic staff of the cluster is the key to maintenance of quality standards in the programme. Nonetheless, the staff should to be motivated to pursue their postgraduate studies in high ranking universities overseas.

The Faculty encourage the students in creative works and co-curricular activities; video productions, drama festivals, student's drama staging, etc., to foster their talents and enhance student interactions among themselves and also with near-by communities. Undergraduate student research symposium and staff publications are well established within the Faculty. The Faculty is developing its excellence reputation in language-related studies.

Facilities and services offered at the Health Center should further be expanded. E-repository possesses research publications of both staff and students. Evidence of collecting student feedback and conducting peer observation was there. However, no indication of the use of such feedback in programme improvements.

The ICCCM system offers a strong support and great assistance in running the programme smoothly, and it is highly commendable. ICCMS handles well over 1500 students and 1500 course units of the Faculty of Humanities and over 3100 students and 900 course units of the Faculty of Social Sciences, for each and every academic year. It deploys the ICT platform in management with

high level of security of the information as regard to student registration, examination time tables, examination data, etc., which helps in timely release of examination results and adherence to programme schedules, and finally allowing the undergraduates to complete the study programmes on schedule.

Establishing of faculty-based committee for curriculum related matters and revitalizing Faculty-based IQAC are strongly recommended. Depending heavily on the Senate-level committee (i.e. CULTEC) appears to limit the participation of the academic staff in one of the most important aspects of university education, and thus creating a communication gap between the decision making and implementation.

There was no Faculty-specific Student Prospectus and the Faculty is appears to depend heavily on the Common Hand Book published by the University. The course unit booklet alleviates complexity to a certain extent, but coherence and sequence of courses was not shown effectively

A detailed and well-compiled document on constructive alignment of course ILO's with those of programme ILO's was not available. This missing link creates gray areas with respect to aligning course ILOs with those of programme ILO's.

“Kalana Mithuru Sevena”, the counseling arm of the University amply serves the student community. However, signs of ragging, is still there and it appears that this menace is not possible to be controled solely by the academic staff members or counseling services

MoU's were in place for some collaborations (for Confucius Institute, and Philip Koller Center for Marketing). The Faculty is encouraged to establish more collaborative links, with local institutes and foreign universities, particularly for language-related courses and study programmes.

### **Programme Review Team**

Prof. Ariya Sumanasinghe (Chair) - University of Peradeniya

Prof. P. Vinobaba- Eastern University

Dr. Subashini Wijesundera - University of Peradeniya

Dr. MIM. Jazeel – South Eastern University