



Programme Review Report
Programme Reviews – 2018
Bachelor of Education (Honours)
Faculty of Education
University of Colombo
15th to 18th October 2018



Prof. Prasad Sethunga (Chair)
Prof. Charmalie Nahallage
Prof. Janitha Liyanage

Quality Assurance Council
University Grants Commission

Contents

Section 1	Brief Introduction to the Programme.....	01
Section 2	Review team’s observations on the Self – Evaluation Report (SER).....	02
Section 3	A brief description of the review process.....	03
Section 4	Overview of the Faculty’s / Institute’s approach to Quality and Standards.....	05
Section 5	Judgment on the eight criteria of Programme Review.....	06
Section 6	Grading of Overall Performance of the programme.....	10
Section 7	Commendations and Recommendations.....	11
Section 8	Summary.....	13

Section 1 – Brief Introduction to the Programme

The Faculty of Education (FoE) was established in 1973, when the Department of Education attached to the Faculty of Arts (FoA) was elevated as a Faculty. Education departments at Peradeniya, Vidyalankara and Vidyodaya Universities were merged with the FoE, UoE in 1975. Faculty offers Bachelor of Education Honours (BEd) to serve the nation with the vision “to be a centre of excellence in scholarship, teaching and research in education, committees to serve” with the mission “to facilitate the development of a committed professional educator with relevant knowledge, favourable attitudes and useful skills for teaching, research and service to the nation” (SER, p2). The FoE consists of four Departments which are Educational Psychology (EP), Humanities Education (HE), Social Science Education (SSE) and Science & Technology Education (STE). The National Education Research and Evaluation Centre (NEREC) was established in the Faculty.

Table 1.1 - Number of Students in Faculty at present- breakdown in years

Batches	No. Of students medium wise				Teaching Appointments
	Sinhala	Tamil	English	Total	
BEd 2012/13	67	24	17	108	108
BEd 2013/14	51	24	19	94	94
BEd 2014/15	63	23	17	103	103
BEd 2015/16	90	27	21	136	136
BEd 2016/17	63	16	15	93	93
BEd 2017/18	61	24	19	104	104

(Source: SER Annexe 2, p iii)

Table 1 shows the number of students in the Faculty by the academic year since 2012/13. BEd is a four year honours degree and students are selected from the FoA at the end of their first academic year. The student should pass the Foundation Course on Education for Personal and Social Development offered by the FoE and students will be selected based on the first year examination marks and enrolment in specific academic subjects for the BEd. Students shall follow the professional subjects at the FoE from their second academic year (BEd Part I and Part II) while they follow the academic subjects at FoA, before they fully attach themselves to the FoE at the fourth year (BEd Part III). According to the Table 1.1 above, students employability is 100% across past five years.

Section 2 – Review team’s observations on the Self Evaluation Report

The Self Evaluation Report (SER) has been compiled by the Faculty Standing Committee on Self –Evaluation Steering Committee (SEPSC) according to a ToR. The SEPSC consisted of ten academic staff members chaired by the Dean and a clerk from the non-academic staff members. It was observed that the Faculty used a participatory approach to write the SER while appointing twenty one academic staff members for each criterion which was monitored and supervised by the Dean of the Faculty.

The SER has four sections and eighteen annexures including an analysis of the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) according to the Programme Review Manual. The team can agree with many of the SWOT identified in the SER. However, the team had a lengthy discussion about the weakness of “inability to increase the students without increasing the size of the Faculty” that pointed out in the SER. During the period of review visit the team observed the Facility’s classrooms and other facilities and the team felt that the Faculty has a conducive environment and qualified academic staff members to even increase the student intake.

Section 3 – A brief description of the review process

The SER was provided to the review team well before the site visit and individual assessments were reported to the QAC. Members of the review team met at the pre-review workshop held on 23rd of July, 2018, at UGC and discussed the individual assessments, scores and comments and found that they were comparable.

The site visit of the programme review commenced on Monday 15th of October, 2018 with the arrival of the review team at the College House by 7.45 am. Dean welcomed the team and guided to the Internal Quality Assurance Unit (IQAU) of the University. The Director/IQAU briefly explained the institutional approach and commitment to institutionalize quality culture, organizational arrangement of internal quality assurance system.

Following the briefing by the Director/IQAU, the PR Team met the Vice Chancellor of the University and the Vice Chancellor emphasized the importance of quality culture in higher education institutes and his personal commitment towards quality enhancement, and explained the progressive measures taken by the university administration in fostering quality culture within the University. Especially the team impressed about his instructional leadership towards the quality development of the teaching learning process.

The team met all four Heads of Departments of the Faculty and they explained about their involvement for the degree programme and the current situation of the Departments. Following the meetings with the higher management, the team had a meeting with the academic staff, administrative, technical, and academic support staff. At the meeting with academic staff, the Dean made a presentation which provided an overview of the Faculty and the processes and procedures internalized for fostering quality culture within the Faculty.

Assistant Registrar of the Faculty explained the routine activities carried out by the Dean's office including student registration, scheduling time tables and maintaining student records confidentially while explaining the procedures followed in handling the examination matters. At the meeting with the technical and support staff, the review team discussed their contributions toward the teaching, training and providing support services for learning activities.

Finally, Review team had the opportunity to meet a group of students representing all 3 years with more representation from 2nd years. In general, students expressed their satisfaction with academic programmes offered, with respect to both components. Nevertheless, they felt that if they had more detailed information at the orientation, prior to streaming into specialization components as it would have helped the students to make some informed choices on specialization and medium of instruction. Some of the students in Tamil medium were disappointed about shortage of books in Tamil in the Library. There are some evidences of practicing student-centred teaching and learning by some academics in delivering some

courses across all specialization programmes. Further, the students are well aware of assessments tools and procedures, and they are satisfied with the fairness and accuracy of assessments at examinations.

In addition, the review team had made visits to observe facilities of the Faculty which are conducive for conducting lectures and also the team observed there was a room for counseling. The team felt the need of more facilities for the students with special needs and disabilities, even though they don't have disabled students are currently enrolled.

Section 4 – Overview of the Faculty’s / Institute’s approach to Quality and Standards

The UoC has established the IQAU with Internal Quality Assurance Cells (IQACs) according to the UGC Circular 2015, and it was functioning well towards the development of a quality culture in the university. The Faculty has appointed its Coordinator and the representatives in 2017 and a ToR is available for the IQAC in order to maintain the quality and the standards of the Degree Programmes. The Subject Review has been completed during the period of 2006 to 2010 and the Faculty is in the process of curriculum revision adhere to the SLQF guidelines.

The Faculty has mechanisms for decision making via regular committee meetings and the Faculty Board meeting. The student representatives are invited to the Faculty Board meeting to discuss student matters. Graduate Profile is developed and included into the SER while referring to the Subject Benchmark Statement in Education in the Sri Lankan context published in 2011, and the K-SAM model. The graduate profile of the BEd degree consisted of five key generic skills and subject specific skills that are considered as programme level learning outcomes.

During the period of review visit the team felt that the ownership of the BEd study programme by two Faculties effects badly towards the fulfilment objectives of the study programme. Students had a view that they are struggling to move between two for getting their services and attending lectures etc. The development of a common framework by the Faculty and strategically designed timeline of intervention events that would be appreciably improve the students’ sense of belonging. If the Faculty of Education could start the study programme from the beginning it will be more effective in order to produce “a committed professional educator with relevant knowledge, favourable attitudes and useful skills for teaching and service to the nation” (Mission of the Faculty).

The team strongly felt that the Faculty has potential human resources and conducive environment to offer the study programme by themselves. Then the Faculty will be able to offer the study programme according to the global standards as implementing the teaching practicum while introducing Block Teaching which could be started from the 2nd year. The team had special meetings with the Vice Chancellor and the Dean Faculty of Arts to discuss this matter and both of them fully agreed about the direct intake and offer the BEd by the FoE. This is recommended by the Subject Review Team which was completed in the year 2010 as well. Once it is implemented, based on the needs assessment the Faculty could be able to offer more specialized Bed degrees to cater the school needs.

Section 5 – Judgement on the eight criteria of Programme Review

5.1. The raw criterion-wise scores for each study programme

No	Criteria	Weighted minimum score*	Actual criteria wise score
01	Programme Management	75	128
02	Human and Physical Resources	50	89
03	Programme Design and Development	75	98
04	Course / Module Design and Development	75	105
05	Teaching and Learning	75	126
06	Learning Environment, Student Support and Progression	50	79
07	Student Assessment and Awards	75	132
08	Innovative and Healthy Practices	25	44
	Total on a thousand scale		801
	80.1 %		

Observations made by the review team on the strengths and weaknesses of each criterion along with the recommendations for enhancement of quality in the study programmes.

Criteria 1: Programme Management

Strengths:

1. The Faculty operates satisfactory approaches towards the effective delivery and management of the study programme.
2. The University has developed the Strategic Plan 2017 to 2021 based on Six Goals and the Action Plan has been compiled according to Seven Goals.

3. Adherence to the University Quality Assurance (QA) mechanism Faculty QA Cell has been established.
4. Revision and update of the curriculum started.
5. By-laws are available separately for the BEd Programme.

Weaknesses:

1. Faculty Organogram is not available.
2. Separate Handbook with necessary information (student learning resources at the faculty level, student charter, code of conduct etc.) is not provided.
3. No formal feedback regarding the orientation.
4. Adoption of ICT in teaching and learning is only for few course units.
5. OBE implementation and staff training on OBE are not fully practiced
6. Formal mechanism for staff appraisals is not available.
7. Policy document for differently able students is not available.

Criteria 2: Human and Physical Resources

Strengths:

1. Academic staff members have been newly recruited and opportunities for professional development provided.
2. Well-equipped conducive learning environment is available are provided.
3. Differently able students' friendly toilet facilities are available.
4. Free access for Wi-Fi facilities is available at the Faculty.

❖ **Weaknesses:**

1. No stakeholder feedback on OBE-SCL and usage of ICT facilities are available.
2. No credit value for English Language programmes for students.

Criteria 3: Programme Design and Development

Strengths:

1. High employability rate.
2. Incorporation of soft skills to the teaching learning process.

Weaknesses:

1. Faculty policy document is not available for CD and CP.
2. No stakeholder feedback for programme designing process and graduate performance.
3. Graduate profile, programme learning outcomes are not available in the Handbook.
4. No choice of elective or optional courses.
5. Evidence of use of SBS in determination of awards and qualifications are not available.

6. Documents related to criteria for programme approval process are not available.
7. Programme design and evaluation reports are not available.
8. Stakeholder feedback is not available.
9. Evidence incorporating of survey results to foster ongoing design and development of the curriculum not available.

Criteria 4: Course / Module Design and Development

6. Strengths:

1. On time graduation.
2. Less dropout rate.

❖ Weaknesses:

1. Evidences for the course design, development and policy approval procedures are not available.
2. Clear course specification with concise description of the ILOs is not available.
3. Evidences are not available regarding the process of course approval.
4. Course codes are not self-explanatory.
5. No smart classrooms for the students to practice the new applications before going to practicum.

Criteria 5: Teaching and Learning

Strengths:

1. Student centred teaching learning strategies are in practice.
2. Obtaining feedback on the effectiveness of teaching from students especially by newly recruited academic staff members.

Weaknesses:

1. Incomplete compliance with SLQF guidelines.
2. Absence of an established process for peer observation of teaching for improvement of teaching and learning.
3. Low level use of blended learning to maximize student engagement with only a few lecturers using it.

Criteria 6: Learning Environment, Student Support and Progression

Strengths:

1. Qualified counsellors.
2. Dedicated space for counselling.
3. Supportive services for differently able students.

Weaknesses:

1. Database of students with up to date records on is not available.

2. No evidence for formal Alumni Association

Criteria 7: Student Assessment and Awards

Strengths:

1. Timely release of results is ensured by adherence to the evaluation mechanism.
2. Proper evaluation procedure for the practicum.

Weaknesses:

1. Traditional assessment strategies in terms of OBE concept.
2. No policy document on appointment of external examiners.
3. No records of taking into consideration external examination report.
4. Curriculum development committee reports on assessment strategies.

Criteria 8: Innovative and Healthy Practices

Strengths:

1. R&D activities in collaboration with NEREC.
2. MoUs with stakeholder organizations.
3. Faculty magazine with articles by the academics and students.
4. Zero ragging.

Weaknesses:

1. Limited Utilization of NEREC.
2. Lack of proper interfaculty coordination.
3. Limited stakeholder feedback for curriculum revision

Section 6 – Grading of Overall Performance of the programme

Study programme score expresses as a %	Actual Criteria-wise score	Grade	Performance descriptor	Interpretation of descriptor
80.1	801	A	Very Good	High level of accomplishment of quality expected of a programme of study; should move to excellence

Section 7 – Commendations and Recommendations

Commendations

1. The University has developed the Strategic Plan 2017 to 2021 based on Six Goals and the Action Plan has been compiled according to Seven Goals.
2. Adherence to the university Quality Assurance (QA) mechanism Faculty QA Cell has been established.
3. Academic staff members have been newly recruited and provided opportunities for professional development.
4. Well-equipped conducive learning environment is available for the students.
5. Office space especially for the academic staff members including rooms for Emeritus Professors are provided.
6. High employability rate.
7. Incorporation of soft skills to the teaching learning process.
8. Student centred teaching learning strategies are in practice.
9. Obtaining feedback on the effectiveness of teaching from students especially by newly recruited academic staff members.
10. R&D activities in collaboration with NEREC.

Recommendations

1. Offer BEd study programme to students of Direct Intake by the UGC and not to recruit students from the Faculty of Arts.
2. Offer more specialized BEd study programmes according to the needs of the education sector.
3. Culminating or Exit Learning Outcomes which are the broad abilities or competencies that define the graduate, produced by the BEd study programme should be developed and include to the Student Handbook.
4. Course wise Intended Learning Outcomes should be developed while adhering to the Twelve Categories of Learning Outcomes identified in the SLQF and should be included to the Student Handbook.
5. Separate Student Handbook for the BEd students should be designed while including the Exit and Course Intended Learning Outcomes.
6. Adapt blended learning and activity-based learning into the teaching learning process for all subjects.

7. Implement a needs assessment or a survey that would collate information from available rich stakeholder groups and the results should be considered especially when developing culminating outcomes.
8. Update and maintain the Database of present and past students.
9. Promote R&D activities with the NEREC.

Section 8 – Summary

The team recognized number of strengths and weaknesses of the study programme and these are listed in the Section No. 5. The team also made recommendations under each criterion in the same Section.

Overall commendations and recommendations are given based on the strengths and the weaknesses given in the Section No 5. These recommendations have been made after having gone through in-depth analysis of collected documents, and observations, discussions and interviews throughout the review visit.

As the pioneering and only Faculty that offer a BEd study programme in Sri Lanka, it can be a role model for other Faculties in Social Sciences and Humanities in the National/ State Universities, towards the commencement of BEd programmes in such faculties.

The team was very concerned about the implementation of the Recommendation No 8 to get the maximum utilization of the potential human resources and the conducive learning environment of the Faculty towards the development of the school education in the country.

The team observed a close collaborative relationship of the academic and non-academic staff. This collaboration should be maintained well in to the future in terms of implementation of the recommendations given in this report.