

Standard 3. Management of Program Quality Assurance

Teaching and other staff involved in the program must regularly evaluate their own performance and are committed to improving both their own performance and the quality of the program as a whole. Regular evaluations of quality must be undertaken within each course based on valid evidence and appropriate benchmarks, and plans for improvement made and implemented. Quality must be assessed by reference to evidence and include consideration of specific performance indicators and challenging external benchmarks. Central importance is attached to student learning outcomes with each course contributing to the achievement of overall program objectives.

Main Components in this Standard

- 3.1 Commitment to Quality Improvement in the Program
- 3.2 Scope of Quality Assurance Processes
- 3.3 Administration of Quality Assurance Processes
- 3.4 Use of Indicators and Benchmarks
- 3.5 Independent Verification of Standards

Comment and General Description of Good Practice

The central focus in the evaluation of the quality of a program is the quality and extent of student learning, considered as outcomes--what students understand and can do as a result of their studies, and whether that learning is appropriate to their field. Other services, facilities and activities are evaluated according to the extent that they contribute to that learning.

The management of quality assurance for a program should involve evidence from a number of sources with mechanisms for interpreting that evidence and using the results in planning for improvement. This evidence should include systematic feedback from students about the quality of the program they have participated in, but this must be considered as only one element in a system that also includes independent assessments of what they have learned. Student assessment tasks are a direct measure of learning outcomes, but use of students' results as evidence of program quality must be combined with other evidence such as comparisons with standards at other good quality institutions. Appropriate external benchmarks should be established as a basis for evaluations of program quality.

Quality improvement strategies should be integrated into normal planning processes in a continuing cycle of planning, implementation, evaluation and review. This involves reports on the teaching of each course with information arising from those course reports considered to assess their significance for the program as a whole. The standard for management of quality assurance and improvement includes the use of conclusions arising from evidence in those reports in planning and implementing progressive improvements over time. It also includes an expectation that appropriate performance indicators will be used for purposes of reporting on quality to senior management within the institution.

Evidence and Performance Indicators

Evidence about the quality of management of quality assurance processes can be obtained by looking at the extent of involvement in quality assurance processes by teaching and other staff and the adequacy of responses made to evaluations that are made in program and course reports and other reports prepared. The outcomes of those processes can be assessed by examining trend data to see whether there has been progressive improvement in the planning and administration and the learning outcomes achieved by students.

Evidence about the quality processes followed can be obtained from surveys or discussions with staff or students and the quality of reports prepared by program administrators, including whether the quality evaluations are evidence-based and appropriately benchmarked in relation to external standards.

The key performance indicators identified by the Commission should be used, but additional indicators linked to the particular mission of the institution and the program should also be used when needed. When goals and objectives are established for the development and improvement of the program appropriate performance indicators should be identified as part of that planning process

The scales below ask you to indicate whether these practices are followed in your institution and to show how well this is done.

Wherever possible evaluations should be based on valid evidence and interpretations supported by independent opinions

Good Practices Relating to This Standard

3.1 Commitment to Quality Improvement in the Program

Program administrators and teaching and other staff must be committed to maintaining and improving the quality of the program.

3.1.1 All teaching and other staff participate in self-assessments and cooperate with reporting and improvement processes in their sphere of activity.

Y
Y

3.1.2 Creativity and innovation combined with clear guidelines and accountability processes are actively encouraged.

Y
Y

**

3.1.3 Mistakes and weaknesses are acknowledged, and dealt with constructively, with help given for improvement.

3.1.4 Improvements in quality are appropriately acknowledged and outstanding achievements recognized.

3.1.5 Evaluation and planning for quality improvement are integrated into normal administrative processes.

Y

Overall Assessment

Comment:

Staff members are extensively involved in the quality improvement processes but they need more training to perform the evaluation, planning, and improvement of quality. The department head should encouraged staff members and employees by offering some kind award. On the other hand staff members must recognized their short comings and weaknesses and try to address them. Finally there are a lot of documents that need to assorted and organized in a database that will make getting information easy for the committee.

Priorities for improvement :

- The department head should request the Deanship of Quality to hold a training program for the staff so that academic accreditation issues can be established and updated.
- Encouraging staff members to self-evaluate.
- The head of department should allocate budget for monetary awards as well as certificates of appreciation to staff members.
- Documents should be organized and kept in database by specialist.

Independent Opinion

Comment:

There is sufficient evidence to show that the CFAS and program managers are committed to quality assurance activities. Quality committees have been established and performance indicators have been identified to assess and evaluate quality performance of academic and administrative units.

3.2 Scope of Quality Assurance Processes

Quality assurance activities that are necessary to ensure good quality must apply to all aspects of program planning and delivery including provision of related services, and to all teaching and other staff involved in those processes.

3.2.1 Quality evaluations deal with all aspects of program planning and delivery including student learning outcomes and facilities and services to support that learning whether they are managed by administrators of the program or by others based elsewhere in the institution.

Y

3.2.2 Quality evaluations and reports provide an overview of performance for the program as a whole, including both sections if the program is offered in male and female sections, and all

Y

Y

courses

3.2.3 Evaluations consider inputs, processes, outcomes and processes, with particular attention to learning outcomes for students.

3.2.4 Evaluations include both routine activities and strategic priorities for improvement.

3.2.5 Processes are designed to ensure both that acceptable standards are met, and that there is continuing improvement in performance.

3.2.6 If the program is offered in sections for male and female students detailed evaluations in relation to standards are carried out in a consistent way in both sections and quality reports on those standards are prepared. Any significant differences found and make appropriate recommendations for action in response to those found.

Y

Y

Y

Overall Assessment

Comment:

As part of quality education, the department should do more to secure training for students prior to graduation by continuously sending letters to hospitals, factories, and alumni to request hosting students and solicit their opinions and suggestions regarding the match between what the department has to offer and the market needs. Since the program is offered for male and female students, more cooperation should be established.

Priorities for improvement:

- Hold more meetings between male and female sections to exchange of experiences.
- Hold periodic academic accreditation meeting within the department that should involve all staff.
- Allocate special room for files containing academic accreditation materials
- Advertise for the department among KSU students.
-

Independent Opinion

Comment:

There is sufficient evidence that all faculty, staff and students are involved in the quality assurance initiatives of the program. Quality evaluations are integrated in their normal planning and program delivery.

3.3 Administration of Quality Assurance Processes

Quality assurance arrangements for the program must meet any particular requirements for this program as well as the quality assurance arrangements for the institution as a whole.

3.3.1 Quality assurance processes are fully integrated into normal planning and program delivery arrangements.

Y

3.3.2 Evaluations are (i) based on evidence, (ii) linked to appropriate standards, (iii) include predetermined performance indicators, and (iv) take account of independent verification of interpretations.

Y

3.3.3 Quality assurance processes make use of standard forms and survey instruments for use across the institution with any special additional elements added to meet the particular requirements of the program.

Y

3.3.4 Statistical data on indicators, including grade distributions, progression and completion rates are retained in an accessible central data base and regularly reviewed and reported in annual and periodic program reports.

Y

3.3.5 Responsibility is given to a member of the teaching staff to provide leadership and support for the management of quality assurance processes. The responsible person should involve other staff in planning and carrying out the quality assurance processes.

NA

--

3.3.6 The quality assurance arrangements for the program should be regularly evaluated and improved. As part of these reviews unnecessary requirements should be removed to streamline the system and avoid unnecessary work.

Y

3.3.7 Processes for evaluation of quality should be transparent with criteria for judgments and evidence considered made clear.

Y

Overall Assessment

Comment:

Make information available for accreditation committee members

Priorities for improvement:

- Specify one employee to manage quality as a full time
- Evaluation and planning for quality improvement should be restricted, more cleared and integrated into normal academic and administrative processes.

Independent Opinion

Comment:

Based on interview with the Vice Dean of Quality and Development, quality arrangements meet particular requirements for the program. Evaluations are evidence based; quality indicators are used and evaluated to support quality assurance continuous improvement of the program.

3.4 Use of Performance Indicators and Benchmarks

Specific indicators must be identified for monitoring performance and appropriate benchmarks selected for comparative evaluation of the achievement of goals and objectives and quality of performance more generally.

3.4.1 Information is provided regularly on key performance indicators that are selected for all programs in the institution.

Y

**

3.4.2 Additional performance indicators relevant to the particular program are also identified, used for program evaluations and regularly reported on.

Y

3.4.3 The additional benchmarks for the program are approved by the appropriate senior committee or council within the institution (eg. senior academic committee, university council).

Y

3.4.4 Benchmarks for comparing quality of performance (for example with past performance or comparisons with other institutions) are established and achievements in relation to those benchmarks are regularly monitored.

Y

3.4.5 The format for indicators and benchmarks is consistent with that adopted for the institution as a whole.

Y

Overall Assessment

Comment:

Information is not clear and provided irregularly on key performance indicators for all standards.

Priorities for improvement:

- At KSU deanship level, seminars and workshops should be held to clarify any confusion in regards to SSR format.
- Students should spend some time in Canada or any other country before their graduation so that to enrich their experiences.
- The department has established a new program, which included some courses in English, but this idea should cover all courses.

Independent Opinion

Comment:

There is sufficient evidence in the use of performance indicators to monitor and evaluate performance for continuous program development.

3.5 Independent Verification of Standards

Evaluations of performance must be based on evidence (including but not restricted to predetermined performance indicators and benchmarks) and conclusions based on that evidence must be independently verified.

3.5.1 Self-evaluations of quality of performance are checked against several related sources evidence including feedback through user surveys and opinions of stakeholders such as students and faculty, graduates and employers.

Y

3.5.2 Interpretations of evidence of quality of performance are verified through independent

Y

advice from persons familiar with the type of activity concerned and impartial mechanisms are used to reconcile differing opinions.

3.5.3 Institutional policies and procedures are adhered to for the verification of standards of achievement by students in relation to other institutions and the requirements of the National Qualifications Framework.

Y

Overall Assessment

Comment:

Make more use of the students' feedback, graduates, and employers to improve the program. Advices and comments from external reviewer about indicators of quality performance must be considered and developed to become appreciable.

Priorities for improvement:

Evidences of quality performance have to be interpreted through independent advice and more than one external reviewer panel.

Independent Opinion

Comment:

Program requirements and policies adhere to the National Qualifications Framework of the NCAAA. There is also evidence that program courses are reviewed and verified by an independent reviewer external to KSU. In 2010, the Agriculture Institute of Canada recommended full accreditation equivalence to the FSN program. This is commendable.

Overall Assessment of Management of Program Quality Assurance

3.1 Commitment to Quality Improvement in the Program

3.2 Scope of Quality Assurance Processes

3.3 Administration of Quality Assurance Processes

3.4 Use of Performance Indicators and Benchmarks

3.5 Independent Verification of Standards

Combined Assessment

Comment :

- ✓ Development of the performance of the faculty staff through specialized courses in modern teaching methods.
- ✓ Participation of all members of the faculty staff, employers, graduates in self-evaluation.
- ✓ Making of more cooperation between male and female staff members.
- ✓ Develop of database quality.
- ✓ Benefit from the feedback which is used to improve the program.
- ✓ The relationship between quality committee and other administrations must be restricted and cleared.

Independent Opinion

Comment:

There is strong commitment to quality assurance and improvement in the program. By and large, under the supervision of the Vice Dean for Quality and Development, the academic quality unit provides assistance to the department to meet standards and requirements for quality assurance. There is however, a need to improve the physical resources of the quality assurance unit in the college. In addition, a more systematic and organized system of quality assurance database should be set-up not only at the program level but also for the college. Moreover, additional seminar-workshops may be required for program managers and faculty to obtain more knowledge about the quality assurance system of the NCAAA.

Indicators Considered

- ✓ Reports of the College, Department and Accreditation unit.
- ✓ Questionnaires of students, staff members, and graduates.
- ✓ Advices and comments from an external review panel about quality performance indicators.

Priorities for Improvement: