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

Quality Assessment- Standards for Assessment

Prof. Deepthi C. Bandara
Director - QAAC

Standards

The 'standards' are usually established by an authority as regulations, norms, guidelines or principles through general consensus as a basis for comparison

Criteria, Standards, Sources of Evidence and Score Guide

Criterion 1- Program Management

No.	Standards	Examples of Sources of Evidence	Score Guide 0 - Inadequate 1 – Barely Adequate 2 - Adequate 3 - Good
1.1	The Faculty/Institute organizational structure is adequate for effective management and execution of its core functions.	Faculty by-laws; Organogram; ToRs of Standing & Ad-hoc Committees; minutes of the Faculty Board and other Standing & Ad-hoc Committees	0 1 2 3 ○ ○ ○ ○
1.27	The Faculty/Institute practices the policy of zero-tolerance to ragging; it adopts strategies and implement preventive and deterrent measures through coordinated efforts of all stakeholders to prevent ragging and any other form of harassment and intimidation	Documentary evidence of policy and strategy of antiragging/harassment; Student Disciplinary by-laws; report on the past activities geared to prevent ragging and punishments meted out.	0 1 2 3 ○ ○ ○ ○

Criterion 2 – Human and Physical Resources

No.	Standards	Examples of Sources of Evidence	Score Guide 0 - Inadequate 1 – Barely Adequate 2 - Adequate 3 - Good
2.1	The staff of the Faculty/ Institute, in terms of the number, qualifications and competencies is adequate for designing, development and delivery of academic programmes, research and outreach	Faculty Staff Cadre; list of expertise required to deliver the curriculum; HR Profile.	0 1 2 3 ○ ○ ○ ○
2.12	The Faculty/Institute encourages students to engage in multicultural programmes to promote harmony and cohesion among students of diverse ethnic and cultural backgrounds.	Evidence of a coordinating mechanism to promote multicultural activities; records of past events conducted	0 1 2 3 ○ ○ ○ ○

Criterion 3 - Programme Design and Development

No.	Standards	Examples of Sources of Evidence	Score Guide 0 - Inadequate 1 – Barely Adequate 2 - Adequate 3 - Good
3.1	Programme is developed collaboratively in a participatory manner through a curriculum development committee or equivalent body of the Faculty	Curriculum; Curriculum planning documents; minutes of curriculum planning committee; Faculty policy/plan on curriculum development	0 1 2 3 ○ ○ ○ ○
3.24	The effectiveness of the provision for students with disabilities is evaluated and opportunities for enhancement identified	Adoption of policies and procedures of monitoring and evaluation for provision of learning resources for differentially abled students; evidence of remedial action	0 1 2 3 ○ ○ ○ ○

Criterion 4 - Course/ Module Design and Development

No.	Standards	Examples of Sources of Evidence	Score Guide 0 - Inadequate 1 – Barely Adequate 2 - Adequate 3 - Good
4.1	Course design and development is by a course team with the involvement of internal and external subject experts, and each member is made aware of his/her respective roles and responsibilities	Faculty course design and approval policy and procedures; minutes of Faculty curriculum development (CDC) and other relevant committees	0 1 2 3 ○ ○ ○ ○
4.19	Courses/modules are evaluated at the end of each course/module with regard to its content, appropriateness and effectiveness of teaching, achievement of learning outcomes and feedback used for further improvement of the course	Comprehensive course evaluation instruments suitable for feedback from students, teaching staff; external and internal examiners; designers of the relevant course	0 1 2 3 ○ ○ ○ ○

Criterion 5 – Teaching and Learning

No.	Standards	Examples of Sources of Evidence	Score Guide 0 - Inadequate 1 – Barely Adequate 2 - Adequate 3 - Good
5.1	Teaching and learning strategies are based on the Faculty's/Institute's mission, and curriculum requirements	University's Corporate/strategic plan; Faculty Handbook and mission statement; Faculty Action Plan; minutes of action plan; programme/course specifications	0 1 2 3 ○ ○ ○ ○
5.19	The Faculty/Institute uses a defined set of indicators of excellence in teaching to evaluate performance of teachers, identify champions of teaching excellence, and promote adoption of excellent practices	Senate/Faculty approved indicators for evaluating teachers for excellence in teaching; evidence of using the indicators for evaluation; awards scheme for excellence in teaching; evidence of awards	0 1 2 3 ○ ○ ○ ○

Criterion 6 –Learning Environment, Student Support and Progression

No.	Standards	Examples of Sources of Evidence	Score Guide 0 - Inadequate 1 – Barely Adequate 2 - Adequate 3 - Good
6.1	The Faculty adopts a student friendly administrative, academic and technical support system that ensures a conducive and caring environment, and greater interaction among students and staff	Website with FAQs; job description of relevant staff; administrative structure reflecting interaction between students and staff; students feedback; help desk; student satisfaction survey reports	0 1 2 3 ○ ○ ○ ○
6.24	The Faculty networks with alumnus and encourage alumnus to assist students in preparing for their professional future	Evidence of University/Faculty alumnus; minutes of alumni committee; handbook; evidence of close interaction and active participation in Faculty activities	0 1 2 3 ○ ○ ○ ○

Criterion 7 – Student Assessment and Awards

No.	Standards	Examples of Sources of Evidence	Score Guide 0 - Inadequate 1 – Barely Adequate 2 - Adequate 3 - Good
7.1	Assessment strategy of student learning is considered as an integral part of programme design, with a clear relation between assessment tasks and the programme outcomes	Institution/ Faculty/ Institute policy on outcome based programme design; Programme and Course specifications; By-laws; examination rules and regulations	0 1 2 3 ○ ○ ○ ○
7.17	The Faculty/Institute ensures the implementation of examination by laws including those on academic misconduct, and strictly enforces them according to the institutional policies and procedures, in a timely manner	Examination by-laws; evidence of Faculty staff and examination unit's awareness of the by-laws; senate minutes; evidence of implementation and strict enforcement; evidence of results released on time (within 3 months); student discipline by-laws; student Charter	0 1 2 3 ○ ○ ○ ○

Criterion 8 – Innovative and Healthy Practices

No.	Standards	Examples of Sources of Evidence	Score Guide 0 - Inadequate 1 – Barely Adequate 2 - Adequate 3 - Good
8.1	The Faculty/Institute has established and operates ICTbased platform (i.e. VLE/ LMS) to facilitate multimode teaching delivery and learning	Inventory of teaching and learning methods adopted; physical evidence of presence of VLE/LMS; physical verification of use of VLE/LMS; number of courses /documents uploaded into LMS; student feedback	0 1 2 3 ○ ○ ○ ○
8.14	The Faculty/Institute implements a mechanism for the students who do not complete the programme successfully to exit at a lower level with a diploma or certificate, depending on level of attainment (fallback option)	University approved policy and guidelines on fallback option; evidence of implementing fallback option	0 1 2 3 ○ ○ ○ ○

Procedure for Use of Standards for Assessment of Performance of the Programme

The terms mentioned below will be used in the validation and the subsequent judgment on assessment of the Faculty/ Institute.

- ➢ Standard-wise judgement giving 'standard-wise score'
- ➢ Criterion-wise judgement giving 'raw criterion-wise score'
- ➢ Application of weightages to obtain 'actual criterion-wise score'
- ➢ Calculation of 'Overall Study Programme score'
- ➢ Grading of overall performance of the Programme of Study

The procedure is described in a series of steps

Step 1 - The evidence given against each standard by the Programme of Study are carefully and objectively analyzed and assessed

Step 2 - Based on the evidence, assessment of the extent to which each standard has been achieved by the Programme of Study is recorded by placing a tick in the appropriate circle against each standard on a 4 point scale from 0-3

Score	Descriptor	Explanation of the Descriptor
3	Good	No issues/concerns about the strengths and quality of the evidence provided
2	Adequate	Few issues/concerns about the strengths and quality of the evidence provided
1	Barely Adequate	Major issues/concerns about the strengths and quality of the evidence provided
0	Inadequate	No relevant evidence provided

Step 3 - Performance of each Criterion is derived by totalling the scores gained in all the standards in respect of the Criterion. The value obtained is the 'raw criterion-wise score'

Weightages of Criteria

Recognizing the variance in their relative importance in a Programme of Study, different criteria have been allotted differential weightages on a thousand scale

Criterion No.	Assessment Criteria	Weightage on a thousand scale
1	Programme Management	150
2	Human and Physical Resources	100
3	Programme Design and Development	150
4	Course/ Module Design and Development	150
5	Teaching and Learning	150
6	Learning Environment, Student Support and Progression	100
7	Student Assessment and Awards	150
8	Innovative and Healthy Practices	50
	Total	1000

Step 4 - Based on the weightages listed in Table 3.2 and the formula given in Box 1, the 'raw criterion-wise score' is converted into an 'actual criterion-wise score'

Box 1 - Formula for converting 'raw score' to 'actual score' on the weighted scale

Maximum raw score for each criterion = total number of standards for the respective criterion x 3 which is the maximum score for any criterion.

Raw criterion-wise score x weightage in a 1000 point scale = 'actual criterion-wise score'

Example: Criterion 8 with weightage of 50 (Table 3.2) and 14 standards

Raw criterion-wise score (given by the peer team) = 24

Maximum Score = (14 standards x 3) = 42

Weightage on a 1000 scale = 50 (as in Table 3.2)

Actual criterion-wise score = (24/42)* 50 = 28.6

Step 5 - The Overall Program of Study score is derived by totaling all the 'actual criterion-wise scores' of the eight criteria and converting the total to a percentage

No	Criteria	Weighted minimum score*	Actual criteria-wise score
1	Programme Management	75	75
2	Human and Physical Resources	50	80
3	Programme Design and Development	75	70
4	Course/ Module Design and Development	75	50
5	Teaching and Learning	75	60
6	Learning Environment, Student Support and Progression	50	70
7	Student Assessment and Awards	75	65
8	Innovative and Healthy Practices	25	29
	Total on a thousand scale		499
	%		49.9

*Represents 50% of the values given in Table 3.2

Grading of Overall Performance of a Study Program

Study Programme score%	Actual criteria-wise score	Grade	Performance descriptor	Interpretation of descriptor
≥ 80	Equal to or more than the minimum weighted score for each of all eight criteria (Table 3.3).	A	Very Good	High level of accomplishment of quality expected of a programme of study; should move towards excellence
≥ 70	Equal to or more than the minimum weighted score for seven of the eight criteria (Table 3.3)	B	Good	Satisfactory level of accomplishment of quality expected of a programme of study; requires improvement in a few aspects

Study Programme score%	Actual criteria-wise score	Grade	Performance descriptor	Interpretation of descriptor
≥ 60	Equal to or more than the minimum weighted score for six of the eight criteria (Table 3.3)	C	Satisfactory	Minimum level of accomplishment of quality expected of a programme of study; requires improvement in several aspects
<60	Irrespective of minimum weighted criterion scores.	D	Unsatisfactory	Inadequate level of accomplishment of quality expected of a programme of study: requires improvement in all aspects

Final Assessment of the Performance of a Program of Study

For a Program of Study to receive an **'A' Grade**, the following conditions are applicable.

i) Overall Program of Study Score of ≥ 80%   and

ii) A score equal to or more than the weighted minimum score for each of all eight criteria

For a Program of Study to receive a '**B' Grade**, the following conditions are applicable.

i) Overall Program of Study Score of ≥ 70%   and

ii) A score equal to or more than the weighted minimum score for at least seven out of the eight criteria

For a Program of Study to receive a **'C' Grade**, the following conditions are applicable.

i)   Overall Program of Study Score of ≥ 60%
     and

ii) A score equal to or more than the weighted minimum score for at least six out of the eight criteria

For a Program of Study to receive a **'D' Grade**, the following conditions are applicable.

i) Overall Program of Study Score of < 60% irrespective of weighted minimum criterion scores.