



නන්ව්ව ආරක්ෂණ කවුන්සිලය
தர உறுதிப்படுத்தல் கவுன்சில்
QUALITY ASSURANCE COUNCIL

94/10 ආනන්ද රාජකරුණා මාවත කොළඹ 8, ශ්‍රී ලංකාව
94/10, ஆணந்த ராஜகருணாரத்ன மாவத்தை கொழும்பு 8, இலங்கை
94/10 Ananda Rajakaruna, Mawatha, Colombo 8, Sri Lanka



Code Of Conduct

For Institutional And Program Reviewers

WORKSHOP FOR TRAINING REVIEWERS FOR PROGRAMME REVIEWS
2020

Prof Ranjith Pallegama
16th June 2020

From 2020 the QAC of the UGC introduces a Code of Conduct for Reviewers in order to tackle pertinent issues

This will be known to the faculties /institutes that are under review as well



Content in the Code of Conduct

- Preamble
- Definitions
- Core values of the process
- Code of Conduct (the Principles)
- Guidelines for Conduct During Site Visit
- Guidelines on Report Writing



Preamble

- Introduces the document
- Explains how binding this is
- Explains the significance of the Code of Conduct
- Defines the external review process
- Outline the duties of the reviewer

Definitions



Confidential information

Information that is obtained as a consequence of conducting the review and that is not publicly available

Conflict of Interest

a. Real Conflict of Interest:

b. Apparent conflict of interest:



Impartial

Absence of prejudice towards any party



Independent

Free of external pressure and staying neutral



Integrity

Being trustworthy, consistent, responsible for action and uncompromising adherence to strong moral and ethical principles and values

Misconduct

Intentional or negligent failure to observe the rules of conduct set by this Code

Core Values: Uphold at all times

- A. Persistent effort to achieve the highest level of standards
- B. Conscientious and continuous pursuit of excellence in one's work
- C. Honesty, integrity and objectivity in all involved procedures
- D. Responsibility for one's actions and conduct
- E. Respect for rights, differences and dignity of stakeholders of the process
- F. Accountability to the public
- G. Transparency in all dealings
- H. Impartiality and independence in all dealings

Code of Conduct: Principles

Objectivity

Evidence
Presented by the
Faculty during
Review



Requirements
stated in the
Review Manual

Objectivity

1. Decisions must be **on first-hand evidence**
2. **Go by definitions in the PR/IR manual**
3. When definitions are not provided/clear
 - 3.1. Arrive at interpretations as a team
 - 3.2. Include those in the report to be transparent
4. **Avoid,**
 - 4.1. Personal/subjective ideas/interpretations
 - 4.2. Interpretations used in your own institutions to assess practices adopted by the reviewee
5. **Judgements must be fully supported by evidence / can be defended**

Confidentiality

1. Never disclose any **confidential information** acquired to any third party
2. Don't disclose **any information concerning the evaluation process**
3. Don't disclose **anything relate to the review to a colleague in the institution under review**
4. The Review Chair may communicate with the Dean/ Director-QA with the awareness of the Director/QAC/UGC

Conflict of Interest

1. **Identify & declare** any **real/apparent** conflict between YOUR personal interests (direct or indirect) and interests of QAC and reviewee, **that will undermine objectivity**
2. Inform the QAC immediately **of any change in interest** that may conflict with that of the QAC
3. Consider that all parties/groups that YOU discuss/meet with are equally important stakeholders
4. Never use the encounter with reviewee **for personal advantage**

Integrity

1. Never behave/ create a suspicion that you are behaving in a particular manner of **personal interest or advantage**
2. Exercise maximum honesty
3. Avoid any direct/indirect gift, hospitality or undue extra attention which can **put /may appear to put you under obligation and compromise impartiality**

(Discuss such situations in the team or consult the Director, QAC immediately)

Integrity *cont.*

1. Don't offer any favour or undue extra attention to any party/individual
2. Avoid behaviours that could be interpreted as dishonest, unethical and unprofessional
3. **Reflect on your own conduct, and question and analyse the your underlying motives**

Conduct During Site Visit

Evaluation during site visit



1. Don't **demand / insist** on further evidence or any other requirement during the site visit
2. May **seek clarifications** on ambiguous matters with documents or verbal explanations

Relationship with the reviewee

1. Site visit **is a full-time assignment**
2. Behave/ be perceived to behave **as a peer (equal)** of the reviewee
3. **Refrain from adopting a position of 'superiority'** over the reviewee
4. Be **polite and courteous** to all stakeholders

Relationship with the reviewee *cont..*

1. Don't assume another role. For example,
 - 1.1. Don't try to teach. [You are the reviewer](#)
 - 1.2. Refrain from trying to show that you have a good practice , but the reviewee does not have it. (***i.e., revealing “I have done it but you have not”; “I have it but you don't” attitude***).
 - 1.3. Can make constructive suggestions



Relationship with the reviewee *cont..*

1. Tolerate and show respect for rights, differences and dignity of all stakeholders
2. Create a pleasant and productive working environment for all parties

Commitment to competency and professionalism

1. Maintain **professional competence** at all times
2. **Be prepared**, and **pay full attention in the task**
3. Participate in the **full schedule**
4. **Keep careful records** of all meetings and tasks
5. **Be punctual** and adhere to the schedule
6. Dress appropriately

Communication

1. Purposeful & focused on the task
2. Open and clear
3. Question in a friendly & constructive manner
4. Create a conducive environment, minimizes stress & builds trust and respect
5. **Refrain from being sarcastic and intimidating**
6. **“No” personal questions, and deal carefully with sensitive data**
7. Entertain all views, and foster exchange of opinions
8. **Avoid prescriptive language**

Providing feedback in meetings & in the report

1. be constructive and qualitative
2. Honesty and fairness
- 3. Judgements**
 - 3.1. Accurate and reliable
 - 3.2. Reflect ground level operations of the institution/program
- 4. Remember: specific outcomes (grade, scores) should be confidential till the report is released**

Conduct within the Review Panel

1. Each panel member is an equal partner
2. Take responsibilities under the guidance of the Chair
3. All reviewers should attend private meetings of the RT
4. Ensure that the final outcomes are decided collectively by RT
5. When different opinions exist in RT, the majority's view is final

Review Chair: **A Team Leadership**

1. Use authority in a fair & responsible manner in the RT and with reviewee
2. Oversee the process in an all-inclusive manner
3. Create and keep schedules
4. Communications with the QAC and the reviewee
5. Entertain views of all participants
6. Foster open exchange of opinions
7. Make stakeholders comfortable with the RT

REPORT WRITING



1. Stay in regular contact with the Team until the Final Report is submitted
2. Contribute timely through email/online
3. Be responsible for the full content of the final report
4. Meet deadlines of the Team and of the QAC

**Please, carefully go through
the entire document..**

MATERIAL REFERENCED

- ENQA Code of conduct, accessed at https://enqa.eu/wpcontent/uploads/2016/09/ENQA-Agency-Reviews_Code-of-Conduct.pdf
- <https://www.eurosai.org/handle404?exporturi=/export/sites/eurosai/.content/documents/materials/Quality-Assurance-Review-Handbook-2012.pdf>
- <https://www.must.edu.mo/images/QA/CODE%20OF%20CONDUCT.pdf>
- Manual for Review of Undergraduate Study Programmes of Sri Lankan Universities and Higher Education Institutions. UGC, 2015
- Manual for Institutional Review of Sri Lankan Universities and Higher Education Institutions. UGC, 2015.

Thank you