

Training Workshop for Reviewers Undergraduate Study Programmes Sri Lankan Universities & HEIs

Program Review Report

Prof. Deepthi C. Bandara
Director - QAAC

PROGRAMME REVIEW
REPORT

Program Review Report

It is the final outcome of an external peer review of a program of study

The PRR, following acceptance by the Faculty/Institute concerned and final approval of the QAAC, will enter the public domain through the UGC website



Purpose of the Program Review Report

to inform the Faculty/Institute and other stakeholders:

- the findings of the external peer review with regard to the quality of the training and learning experiences provided to students by the program
- the standard of the award
- to provide a reference point to support and guide the Faculty in continuing quality assurance activities towards quality enhancement and excellence



Scope of the Report

- A brief introduction and review context of the University/HEI, Faculty/Institute and the Program of Study
- A brief description of the review process (schedule of meetings as an appendix)
- The review team's observations on the Self-Evaluation Report (SER)
- Overview of the approach to quality assurance by the Faculty/Institute
- Assessment of performance of the program based on the standard-wise scores and the actual criteria-wise scores
- Final judgment of performance of the program based on the program score
- Commendations and recommendations



Review Judgments



Program Review involves analysis of claims made in the SER and validation of the evidence presented during the site visit with respect to the eight criteria and standards in a program of study

- Judgments should not be negative but constructive and supported by evidence
- Recommendations should not be prescriptive but stated in a manner whereby the Faculty/Institute will be able to build upon what is already in place and strive towards quality improvement

Format of the Program Review Report

Section 1 - Brief introduction to the program

Section 2 – Review team's observations on the Self - Evaluation Report (SER)

Section 3 - A brief description of the Review Process

Section 4 - Overview of the Faculty's/Institute's approach to Quality and Standards

Section 5 - Judgment on the eight criteria of Program Review

Section 6 - Grading of Overall Performance of the program

Section 7 - Commendations and Recommendations

Section 8 – Summary

Training Workshop for Reviewers of Undergraduate Study Programmes of Sri Lankan Universities & HEI's



Section 1 – Brief introduction to the program

A brief introduction to the program and its relevance in the local/international context

It will give a history of the Faculty/Institute offering the program, the strength, qualifications and experience of academic staff, number of students enrolled, staff student ratio, infrastructure and facilities available for student support as given in the SER and observed by the peer review team during the review visit

**Brief
Introduction**

Section 2 - Review team's observations on the Self-Evaluation Report

This section will indicate whether the SER has been prepared according to the guideline given in the Program Review Manual using a participatory approach involving all constituents of the Faculty/Institute

The review team will comment on whether the evidence has been presented alongside the standards and criteria as shown in the template provided in the Appendix



Section 3 – A brief description of the Review Process

outline the details of the review visit such as the schedule of meetings with different constituents of the Faculty/Institute (which could be provided as an appendix), the personnel interviewed, processes observed, evidence examined and meetings of the review team at intervals during the review visit



SECTION 3

Section 4 - Overview of the Faculty's/Institute's approach to Quality and Standards

This section will describe the key features of the Faculty's/Institute's approach to quality assurance and its capacity to implement measures to remedy weaknesses and seek quality improvement

This section could include the review team's impression of the Faculty's/Institute's commitment towards quality enhancement and excellence



Section 5 - Judgment on the eight criteria of Program Review



This section will present the review team's judgment of the level of attainment of quality under each of the eight criteria of the study program

Standard-wise scores and raw criterion-wise scores will be estimated based on the scoring system given

The review team should provide its observations on the strengths and weaknesses of each criterion and make recommendations for enhancement of quality



Section 6 - Grading of Overall Performance of the program

This will set out the review team's assessment of the level of accomplishment of quality expected of an academic program based on the grading of overall performance under the categories of Grade A,B,C, or D

Section 7 - Commendations and Recommendations

This section will list the commendations on excellence such as the Faculty's/Institute's policy and procedures in

- program management
- human and physical resources
- program design and development
- course design and development
- teaching and learning
- learning environment and learner support
- student assessment and awards
- healthy and innovative practices

This section will also make recommendations for remedial actions needed to bring about quality enhancement leading to excellence



Section 8 – Summary

This will be a summary of the review team's main findings as given under the different sections of the report and will be no longer than 1000 words



Compilation of the PRR

The review chair will take the responsibility for preparing the report for submission to the QAAC

The Chair will assemble the different sections and compile and edit the final comprehensive draft report agreed to by the team

The final draft report should not exceed 6000 words



Procedure for Submission of the Report

The chair of the review team will submit the draft report to the QAAC

The QAAC will send a copy of the draft report to the Faculty/Institute concerned for observations and comments



Request for Discussion

- ✓ The review team would have given an indication of its conclusions at the final meeting held after the review visit
- ✓ This meeting would have given the Faculty/Institute/ Department an opportunity to sort out any factual errors and misinterpretations made by the review team
- ✓ on receiving the draft report from the QAAC, the university may ask for a further discussion with the review team about the contents of the report, prior to publication
- ✓ The university should notify the QAAC of its wish to take up this opportunity within two weeks of receipt of the first draft of the report, highlighting the particular areas it wishes to discuss



- ✓ The meeting to discuss any clarifications should take place within six weeks of the university making the request
- ✓ The meeting should be chaired by a member of the QAAC
- ✓ The chair of the meeting should not be a member of the university concerned, nor should he or she have any other close links with it
- ✓ Detailed notes of the meeting should be taken by a representative of the QAAC
- ✓ Others present at the meeting will be members of the review team (all if possible, but at least two), and representatives chosen by the university, who are likely to be staff who prepared the SER and those who participated in the review visit

