

PREPARATION FOR THE SITE VISIT

QUALITY ASSURANCE COUNCIL OF THE UGC
Workshop for Self Evaluation Report Writers for
Programme Reviews
26 November 2019

Outline of the Presentation

- Initial Attitude and Perception
- Our approach
- Decisions made
- SER writing process
- Preparation for site visit
- Results
- Observations and concerns on the QA Mechanism
- Concluding Remarks

Initial Attitude and Perception

- Bad experience of the IR Result
- Rigid attitude of the UGC
- Felt like that QAC was trying to find faults with us
- Thought of possible consequences
- Could tarnish the image of the Faculty
- Took it as a big challenge

Thus, Decided to face it as a team with the attitude of
“Comply and Complain”

Our approach

- QA committee of the Faculty studied the complexity of the process

And

- Realized the need of
 - *A collective and collaborative work*
 - *A team work*
 - *The contribution of all academics*
 - *An action plan with clear deadlines*

Decisions made

Faculty QA committee had lengthy discussions to take decisions on following matters

- *Clusters or Degree Programmes*
 - Responsibility
 - Uniqueness of DPs
- *Identified common criteria and standards*
 - E.g. Programme management
 - Certain standards were common
- *Identified common facilities*
 - Library, CG unit, ITRC, English unit, Welfare etc.
- *Evidence file maintenance*
 - Soft or hard copies
 - Criteria or standards

SER writing process

- Criterion 1 was written collectively by the QA committee members
- DP/departments separately wrote other criteria i.e., 2 to 8
- Frequent QA meetings to be consistency (discussions on each criteria)
- At Departments
 - *SER writing Team (everyone was given a responsibility)*
 - *Divided criteria among the members*
 - *Draft report was developed*
 - *Department meetings to finalize each criteria*
- QA consultant went through the SERs of each department
- Final report was prepared and sent

Preparation for site visit

- Decided to have 156 files
- Junior members with the supportive staff prepared evidence files with the guidance of the seniors
- Communicated with reviewers in advance to develop an action plan
- Made arrangements to schedule meetings with relevant parties
- Members were assigned with responsibilities (i.e. food arrangements, guiding, arranging evidence files etc.)
- Arranged computer and other room facilities for reviewers
- Provided other needed assistance to reviewers on their request

Result

- 12 As for all departments
- We are happy but not very happy
- We shared our best practices and learnt a lot and found some areas to be improved.
- Cost (Rs. 6m + stationery + refreshments + academic labor)
- After all, felt like that,
 - “It was not worth the cost and effort”
- In fact, we have a doubt whether we can get the same contribution next time unless the mechanism is simplified

➤ Observations on the current QA Mechanism

- Need of a collaborative effort
- Concept of SLQF Curriculum Mapping and QA Mechanism
- QA Guidelines, Criteria and Standards
- Self-Evaluation Report (SER)
- Involvement of academics (lack of trained supportive staff)
- Review Teams and Review Process

Concluding Remarks

- While appreciating the initiations made by the QAC to introduce a systematic mechanism to Assure the Quality of our degree programmes
- Our advise is that engage actively with the current QA process and realize the pros and cons of the current mechanism and come up with your constructive comments to improve the QA mechanism (Comply and Complain)

AND

- Then collectively make a strong request from the UGC to start a constructive dialog with the broader participation of stakeholders to come up with a comprehensive action plan to review and improve the QA mechanism to rectify the issues of the current mechanism.

AND

- To develop a more relevant, practical and simple mechanism equipped with clear guidelines for all relevant parties.



THANK YOU