Programme Review Report

Programme Reviews - 2018

Bachelor of Visual Arts

University of the Visual and Performing Arts

August 13th to 16th 2018

Prof. (Mrs.) M. Senthilnanthanan

Prof. N. Shanmugalingam

Dr. G. P. T. S. Hemakumara

Quality Assurance Council

University Grants Commission

University: University of the Visual and Performing Arts

Faculty: Faculty of Visual Arts

Program: Bachelor of Visual Arts

Review Panel:

Name	Signature
Prof. (Mrs.) M. Senthilnanthanan	
Prof. N. Shanmugalingam	
Dr. G. P. T. S. Hemakumara	

Date: 03/10/2018

Contents

1. Brief Introduction to the Programme 01
2. Review Team's Observations on the Self-Evaluation Report 03
3. A Brief Description of the Review Process 04
4. Overview of the Faculty's Approach to Quality and Standards 07
5. Judgment on the Eight Criteria of Programme Review
    - Criterion 1: Programme Management 08
    - Criterion 2: Human and Physical Resources 09
    - Criterion 3: Programme Design and Development 10
    - Criterion 4: Course/Module Design and Development 11
    - Criterion 5: Teaching and Learning 11
    - Criterion 6: Learning Environment, Student Support and Progression 13
    - Criterion 7: Student Assessment and Awards 13
    - Criterion 8: Innovative and Healthy Practices 14
6. Grading of Overall Performance of the Programme 15
7. Commendations and Recommendations 16
8. Summary 18
9. Appendixes 20

Section 1: Brief Introduction to the Programme

The Bachelor of Visual Arts (BVA) Degree programme was started in 2005 with the establishment of the Faculty of Visual Arts at the University of the Visual and Performing Arts. This is the only Faculty in the higher education system in Sri Lanka that offers Bachelor degree programmes in visual arts. The four-year BVA honours degree programme is structured as a semester based, credit valued course unit system and offered in nine areas of visual arts, namely painting, sculpture, visual communication and design, printmaking, multi-disciplinary design, ceramics, textile and wearable arts, multimedia arts and history and theory of arts.

Students, who followed the Arts stream at the GCE(A/L), are permitted to enrol for the BVA honours degree programme based on their performance in an aptitude test conducted annually by the Faculty. The selection of students is carried out by the University Grants Commission (UGC), Sri Lanka. The total number. of students selected for the study programme by the UGC during the last 5 years is given in Table 1.1.

Table 1.1: No. of students selected for the study programme by the UGC from 2014-2018

Year	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
No. of students selected	98	97	101	97	100

At present, a total of 389 undergraduates are pursuing the BVA honours degree programme in the Faculty (Table 1.2) and nearly 20% of the students are specialising in painting.

Table 1.2: No. of students in year 1-4 of each area of specialisation

Area of Specialisation	**No. of Students**				
	Year 1	**Year 2**	**Year 3**	**Year 4**	**Total**
Painting	23	14	19	19	75
Sculpture	08	09	08	15	40
Textile and Wearable Arts	09	13	10	12	44
Visual Communication and Design	11	13	09	11	44
Printmaking	09	08	09	09	35
Multi-Disciplinary Design	09	13	09	10	41
History and Art Theory	09	09	10	08	36
Multimedia Arts	11	11	09	08	39
Ceramics	07	10	10	08	35

The Faculty consists of 41 permanent academic staff members and one instructor (on contract) who teach the students across four years (Table 1.3). In addition, the service of a substantial number of visiting lecturers is obtained.

Table 1.3: Academic Staff Profile

Designation	**No.**
Senior Professor	01
Professor	02
Associate Professor	01
Senior Lecturer (Grade I)	02
Senior Lecturer (Grade II)	13
Lecturer (Confirmed)	01
Lecturer (Probationary)	21
Instructor (on contract)	01

Since the inception of the BVA honours degree programme, ten batches of students have graduated (Table 1.4).

Table 1.4: No. of graduands from 2008-2017

Year	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
No. of Graduands	108	49	105	118	52	52	62	110	137	89

The Faculty comprises student support facilities, such as library, ELTU, IT centre, studios, a gallery (J. D. A. Perera Gallery, the largest gallery in Sri Lanka) and medical centre. Further, the University provides sports facilities and accommodation for students in hostels.

Section 2: Review Team's Observations on the Self-Evaluation Report

The Self-Evaluation Report (SER) of the Bachelor of Visual Arts degree programme has been prepared by the Internal Quality Assurance Cell ((IQAC) of the Faculty incorporating evidence from all the Departments in the Faculty, Units and Centres in a coherent manner. Recognizing the need for a participatory approach to prepare an acceptable SER, the IQAC had created awareness on the programme review process among the academic staff in the Faculty. Further, the IQAC had separate discussions with the Head of each Department in this regard. During the period from January - February 2018, the IQAC organized more than ten follow-up meetings with staff members of the Faculty to discuss the SER preparation process and to understand each criterion of the programme review clearly.

In general, the SER reflects a genuine self-assessment of the quality of the study programme under review, and its strengths, weaknesses and areas to be improved. The IQAC had appointed two teams for SER preparation, one team had collected the necessary evidence and the other team had written the SER. Lack of proper documentation had led to difficulties in collecting evidence.

The SER is found to be a comprehensive document containing four sections, namely introduction to the study programme, process of preparing the SER, compliance with the criteria and standards and summary. It has given a succinct account of the Faculty and the study programme under review. The prepared SER had been discussed in the Faculty Board and the SER writers had recognized the importance of adopting quality assurance procedures, identified the present-day weaknesses of the study programme and expressed them genuinely in the SER.

Moreover, this programme review report treats the SER just as a point of departure in reviewing all aspects of the study programme. The systematically organized and effectively administered review visit, where the reviewers were able to meet numerous persons who provided important insights into the actual progression of the study programme and the Faculty, has significantly contributed in the preparation of this programme review report.

Section 3: A Brief Description of the Review Process

The programme review team visited the Faculty from 13-16 August 2018 for four days. The proposed schedule of the visit is given in Appendix 1. However, the review team was flexible in adhering to the schedule.

On the first day, the review team arrived at the Faculty at 8 am and began the review process by meeting the chair and members of the IQAC of the Faculty. The chair and nine members of the IQAC participated in this meeting [Appendix 2(i)]. Then, the review team met the Vice Chancellor of the University along with the chair of the IQAC and other review team, that had come to review the Bachelor of Performing Arts degree programme. The Vice Chancellor spoke enthusiastically about the University explaining the history of its establishment. Since the reviewers of the other study programme were also present at the meeting, the discussion was mostly focused on general aspects of administering degree programmes and the unique mission and vision of the University. The review team could not focus on any study programme specific matters during this meeting though the discussion provided insights into various aspects of the study programme to be reviewed. The Vice Chancellor claimed that the curriculum revision of the study programmes are on the pipeline and additional English as a second language (ESL) classes have been introduced to all students and provided the draft updated corporate plan of the University. In addition, he stated that the Faculty of Visual Arts is conducting creative programmes. After the Vice Chancellor's address, reviewers clarified a few aspects regarding the study programme under review with the Vice Chancellor.

Then, the Chair of the IQAC along with the SER preparation team presented the self-evaluation of the study programme briefly explaining the identified weaknesses in the study programme under review which need to be addressed. Sixteen members participated in this meeting [Appendix 2(iii)].

Then, the Heads of Departments met the review team [Appendix 2(iv)]. Though all Heads attended the meeting, only a few expressed their views. Responding to a question by reviewers, some Heads pointed out that the SER preparation process had numerous positive aspects that helped them to assess the quality of the study programme themselves. Also, they described the specific difficulties faced by individual departments in conducting the degree programme.

The review team formally met the Director of IQAU of the University, who is a member of the Faculty as well, and had a brief discussion.

The meeting with the academic and academic support staff, other than those involved in the SER preparation, of the nine departments in the Faculty yielded so much information about the study programme. Several academics eloquently talked about the specific challenges faced by the study programme and the Faculty. 37 staff members attended the meeting [Appendix 2(v)].

The discussion with the two administrative staff members in the Faculty revealed their difficulties in dealing with academics with regard to procurement of goods and services. During the meeting with Technical Officers and other non-academic staff, lack of training for continuing professional development, delays in procuring equipment and consumables, inadequate laboratory space and risky storage of chemicals were pointed out.

The last meeting for the day was with the Dean of the Faculty and it lasted until 4.45 pm. He demonstrated the challenges faced by the study programme and remedial actions that need to be taken and his understanding on the significance of the programme review process.

On the second day, the review team scrutinized the documentary evidence related to criterion 1-4 from 8-11 am and observed the teaching learning activities from 11 am – 12 noon.

The discussion with the senior student counsellor, student counsellors and student advisers were held around 12 noon and 8 persons attended [Appendix 2(ix)]. It was noticed by the review team that even though the current student population comprises 70% female students, no female student counsellor is available in the Faculty and Heads of Departments are serving as student advisers.

A relatively inclusive group of 35 students was randomly selected by the reviewers for discussion [Appendix 2(x)]. In addition, the reviewers informally gathered information from students. The concerns raised by the students have been incorporated in this report. Further, a questionnaire- based study programme evaluation was conducted among a selected number of students and their responses have been analyzed and incorporated in the report. The model questionnaire is given in Appendix 3.

During the meeting with alumni, it was noticed that many of them are serving as visiting lecturers in the Faculty. It was pointed out that a proper coordinating mechanism is required to obtain the assistance of alumni with regard to funds, industrial training, etc.

Then, eight members of the student union met the review team and their concerns regarding the study programme have been incorporated in the report.

On the third day, the review team scrutinized the documentary evidence related to criterion 5-8 from 8-11 am and observed the teaching learning activities from 11 am – 12 noon.

Then, the review team observed the common facilities, such as library, IT Centre, ELTU, J. D. A. Perera Gallery, Physical Education Unit, Medical Centre, Staff Development Centre, Gymnasium and the nearest Hostel and met the Directors of the Gender Equity & Equality Unit and Career Guidance Unit.

On the final day of the review visit, the review team prepared the key findings report in the morning and conducted the debriefing session with the senior management of the study programme under review at 11 am. The session was well attended with the participation of Dean of the Faculty, Heads of Departments, Director of the IQAU of University, Chair and Members of the IQAC, senior academics and student representatives [Appendix 2(xiii)] and the review process was concluded by 1 pm.

The review team is satisfied with the logistic arrangements made to facilitate the conduct of the review visit. The Faculty’s commitment in this exercise is commendable.

Section 4: Overview of the Faculty's Approach to Quality and Standards

The Internal Quality Assurance Cell ((IQAC) of the Faculty was established and the Chair was appointed in January 2018. The IQAC was operating without an office space since its establishment and the Chair of IQAC was functioning without a letter of appointment.

Preparation of SER of the Bachelor of Visual Arts degree programme was the first task of the IQAC. The SER was developed through a participatory approach and the process had allowed the members of IQAC to identify the strengths, weaknesses and areas to be improved in the study programme. Also, the members of IQAC have recognized that quality assurance is an ongoing process with the best practices being internalized within the curriculum and thus ensuring an embedded quality culture in the Faculty.

The IQAC is working in liaison with the Internal Quality Assurance Unit ((IQAU) of the University. The IQAU is well established and conducts regular monthly meetings. The Chair of IQAC has been attending the meetings of IQAU on invitation since June 2018.

Section 5: Judgment on the Eight Criteria of Programme Review

The review team's judgment on the level of attainment of quality by the study programme under each of the eight criteria is described below.

Criterion 1: Programme Management

The Faculty holds an appropriate organizational structure and is developing it towards effective governance and management of its core functions. A draft of the updated university strategic plan up to 2021 is available along with the Faculty Activity Plan even though the existing one is up to 2018.

The Faculty adopts a participatory approach in its governance and management to a certain extent. It is evident from the minutes of Faculty Board meetings and Canteen Committee meetings that student representatives are incorporated in the Faculty Board and Canteen Committee.

The reviewers were able to observe evidences (programme schedules, handouts and feedback forms) related to the conduct of orientation programme for new entrants. The Faculty distributes a printed Student Handbook that includes useful information, such as code of conduct and student charter, to all new entrants. However, the questionnaire- based study programme evaluation revealed that 57.1% of the respondents were not aware of the university code of conduct. A printed study programme prospectus is available; but the discussion with students revealed that it is not accessible to students.

The study programme lacks policy, strategy and action plan aiming at differently abled students and the questionnaire- based study programme evaluation confirmed it.

Though an annual academic calendar is prepared, it is not promptly adhered to enable the students to complete the degree programme on time. This was further confirmed by the study programme evaluation where 92.8% of the respondents agreed.

The Faculty website exists; but not up to date as revealed by 85.7% of the respondents of the questionnaire- based study programme evaluation. Use of ICT for programme management was not evident.

Presently, the Faculty does not possess a performance appraisal mechanism for rewarding best performing academics other than issuing letters of appreciation for their dedicated work.

An Internal Quality Assurance Cell (IQAC) in the Faculty exists (letters of appointment of members and minutes of the IQAC meetings) and adopts the relevant UGC guidelines.

Though a Curriculum Development Committee exists, it does not function efficiently and in a timely manner with regard to revising the curriculum, obtaining necessary approvals and monitoring implementation of the revised curriculum.

The review team observed MoUs of collaborative partnerships with national and international organizations for student and staff exchange programmes and visual art performances.

The student support mechanism is operating moderately with the assistance of student counsellors (letters of appointment), Medical Centre and Physical Education Unit; but, 50% of the respondents of the questionnaire- based study programme evaluation were uncertain about these services. Cultural and aesthetic activities of students are promoted utilizing the J.

D. A. Perera Gallery of the University. Almost all the students are provided residential facilities.

The faculty adopts and practices University approved by-laws pertaining to examinations and student discipline. The relevant documents and minutes of the Disciplinary Committee were made available to the review team.

The measures to ensure gender equity and equality (GEE) amongst staff and students are in practice. The review team met the Director of GEE Unit and observed GEE policy and annual plan of GEE activities for the period from 2018-19.

The questionnaire-based survey revealed that 57.1% of the respondents were pessimistic about being employed after graduation while 35.7% were uncertain.

Criterion 2: Human and Physical Resources

The Faculty comprises enriched heritage and nationally and internationally recognised competent staff who perform their duties with limited resources. However, a few courses, such as Multimedia Arts, Multidisciplinary Design and Textile & Wearable Arts, heavily depend on visiting lecturers due to lack of qualified permanent lecturers with relevant experience / training. Of the permanent academic staff, only 12% are PhD holders.

The Faculty ensures that all newly recruited staff members undergo an induction programme conducted by the Staff Development Centre (SDC) of the University even though a policy requiring such action does not exist. The SDC offers in-service, continuing professional development (CPD) programmes to continuously upgrade and enhance the capacity of academic staff. However, the impact of these programmes is not monitored carefully. The outcome-based education (OBE) and student-centered learning (SCL) approach are the two important aspects that have drawn attention recently in the higher education system and SDC of the University plays a vital role in creating awareness about OBE and SCL among the academic staff by conducting workshops.

The existing infrastructure facilities for administration, teaching and learning are somewhat inadequate. As it is a degree programme in visual arts, students need appropriate specialized training facilities, such as studios, workshops, laboratories and relevant tools, to learn and develop the necessary skills. Further, the review team observed that the chemicals were stored in an inappropriate manner. According to the questionnaire- based study programme evaluation, 71.4% of the respondents indicated that infrastructure facilities in the Faculty are not adequate.

The library is well organized. It possesses a collection of 60,000 books along with rare books on visual arts, 42 periodicals and access to 15 online journals, stated by the Librarian. It is networked and provides electronic services as well. According to the Librarian, only 50% of the students utilize the library facilities. As per the questionnaire- based study programme evaluation, 50% of the respondents agreed that the library is well equipped, networked and holds up to date printed and electronic titles.

The IT Centre of the Faculty has two computer laboratories and provides adequate opportunities for students to acquire ICT skills. 57.1% of the respondents of the study programme evaluation survey confirmed it.

The Vice Chancellor of the University is committed to improve English language proficiency of students and hence introduced additional compulsory English as a second language (ESL) classes. The ELTU of the Faculty provides adequate guidance to students in learning and use of ESL in their academic work. However, the discussions with the students and student union revealed that many of the students are not satisfied with the ESL course.

The core curriculum of the study programme ensures to a certain extent that students are provided with adequate training on soft skills. In addition, tailor-made programmes are offered by the Career Guidance Unit (CGU) of the University.

Criterion 3: Programme Design and Development

Programme design and development process of the Faculty of Visual Arts reflects its own evolution from traditional school of aesthetic education to the modern university system. It is commendable that the University, while preserving and cherishing the aesthetic education through its existing curricula, has commenced the process towards current expectations of higher educational quality and standards.

The faculty practices an Outcome Based Education. By nature, the Faculty offers programs with professional practices in Visual Arts. These programs include a variety of supplementary, cross disciplinary and self-learning courses. Inbuilt collaborative and group work is visible in the curriculum. Integrating multicultural arts forms and genres in the curriculum are commendable.

Programme design is in compliance with the SLQF to a certain extent. In the meantime, Programme design does not describe the graduate profile and identify appropriate ILOs; as revealed in the SER, teaching, learning and assessment process and subject description are not clearly defined.

One of the key elements of best practice in programme design is needs analysis. In this respect, it is observed that only a few tracer studies have been conducted. Stakeholder participation in the curriculum development process is inadequate. Routine monitoring and review of the study programme based on recommendations of external reviews is poor.

Review team wishes to reiterate the need for relaxing the compartmentalization that exits among the departments and avoiding duplication of courses. This had also been highlighted by the earlier IR reports. This will enrich the programme and lead to efficient utilization of human resources as well as physical resources.

Gender equity and equality and other social justice aspects have been considered in an informal manner in the Faculty. It is noted that even though the Faculty accepts differently abled students, no clear policy or effective provisions are made for such students.

Present programme design and development procedures do not provide any fallback options to the students. These gaps should be addressed during the revision of the study programme.

Concern of quality assurance (QA) is common to all disciplines; in the meantime, any special concerns of the Faculty in relation to the QA policies for visual arts can be addressed in proper forums, such as standing committees and other related bodies of representation.

Criterion 4: Course/Module Design and Development

Faculty has established a Curriculum Development Committee (CDC) which includes all the professors, Head of the Departments, and senior academics in each discipline of the Faculty. The CDC does not have external subject experts. As underlined in the SER, the functional nature of the CDC, its operational mechanism and progress are not satisfactory.

Anyhow, the review team noted that an outline for guidance to a detailed curriculum for the Faculty of Visual Arts had been nicely planned. The curriculum mission is clearly revealed as 'Faculty of Visual Arts prepares students to enter the field of fine arts and applied visual arts'

As per the mission, four- year special degree programmes are structured. Concerns regarding the fundamentals of each course have been duly considered. Emphasis is given on cultural and historical development, present-day international trends, relevant industry related principles and interdisciplinary art. Historical perspectives in the curriculum are commendable. Integration of related disciplines in the curriculum is also noteworthy. As stated in the criterion 3, the Faculty can have an open discussion on integrating the common course units for all programmes and reducing the duplication of such exercises with an interdisciplinary and trans-disciplinary perspective.

The review team further observed that the course designs are aligned with the credit values and notional learning hours of the SLQF. Course design integrates learning strategies for development of self-directed and collaborative learning, creative and critical thinking and team work. Yet, course details are not properly drafted with clearly defined ILOs. Course specifications are not accessible to students. Studio-based course content is structured with both practical and theoretical components.

In this context, it is observed by the review team as well as stated in the SER that the studio–based courses do not take place within the intended time frame.

Internal monitoring strategies and processes to evaluate, review and improve course design, development and operationalization are inefficient.

Assessment criteria of the practical/studio-based subjects are not informed to the students in advance. As per the review team's observation, students are highly disturbed in this regard. Further, though the courses are designed for semester-a based system, practical evaluations are conducted at the end of the year. This discrepancy has to be seriously reviewed and a semester- based assessment should be ensured.

Criterion 5: Teaching and Learning

The present-day scope of the teaching and learning process must be student-centered in line with the outcome-based education (OBE) concept and philosophy. The main theoretical underpinning of the outcome-based curriculum is the model of constructive alignment, which

is defined as coherence and alignment between the content, intended learning outcome, teaching and learning strategies and assessment of an educational programme. In this context, it is expected that the external examiner's reports play an important role. However, it is not a regular practice in the Faculty except in a few departments. The review team enlightened the staff on the importance of external peer review and emphasized that it is the general practice in the university system.

Review team was impressed with the vibrant teaching-learning sessions of individual student-based teaching-learning (ISBTL) practices and studio- and practice-based teaching-learning activities, opportunities given to work in groups to promote collaborative learning, lively performances of students and their enthusiastic engagement in learning. Review team too had the opportunity to experience students' innovative creations of visual art/artifacts.

As SER report reveals some of the studios as well as class rooms do not support a healthy teaching–learning environment.

Access to present-day education by differently abled students is of prime concern. The review team noted that although the Faculty admits those students, necessary facilities are not available. During our interaction, Faculty promised to take appropriate action at the earliest. In this context, it was suggested to provide elevator (lift) facilities to the first and second floors of the building where library and laboratories /class rooms are located.

It is expected to have diverse delivery modes to maximize the student engagement in learning at group and individual levels. Innovative teaching and learning give life to the curriculum. Faculty provides adequate IT facilities and services to all the students. Resource materials placed at the library are available to all teachers and students. The library and IT centre conduct induction and user education programmes to generate awareness with regard to effective use of such resources. Also, library has set up an e-portal to access a large corpus of publications in local and foreign collections and established and operates a Library Information Management System. However, it is noted that the use of LMS in teaching, learning and assessment processes is poor. Use of LMS facilities should be promoted among all the academics.

Under the present-day outcome-based education, it is necessary to assess the expected shifts from teaching to learning; skills to thinking; content to process; and teacher instruction to student demonstration. In this regard, students' feedback / peer's feedback as well as direct teaching practice observations are important to arrive at the correct path. In this context, the review team wishes to focus on one of the student's feedback which revealed that the assessment criteria for the evaluation of practical skills of students in each course unit are not communicated to them in advance. Faculty should address such issues and ensure the internalization of best practices. In this regard, regular internal monitoring by the IQAC is necessary to foster and promote widespread adoption of best practices.

While appreciating the students' contribution to scholarships and discovery of knowledge through creative visual productions, exhibitions and students' research symposia, the review team wishes to underline that it is necessary to encourage intensive engagement of students in research, especially in the studio-based research.

Distribution of workload among the academic staff is relatively fair. However, some of the departments do not have adequate permanent academic staff, where temporary staff members have been compelled to teach major portions of the course modules.

The University recognizes the value of creative and innovative approaches in teaching; however, no progressive step has been taken to institutionalize a teacher appraisal system to reward the staff who excel. It is necessary to keep performance data of teachers and to develop a teacher appraisal system. This will encourage staff engagement in training programmes as well as curriculum development. It is really a constant transformational process.

Criterion 6: Learning Environment, Student Support and Progression

Learning environment and student support can be upgraded based on the subjects offered by the Faculty and location. Even with limited facilities, co-curricular activities conducted by the Faculty contribute immensely to social and cultural dimensions of the educational experience.

However, there are several weaknesses as well. Faculty website is not up to-date and it does not contain essential information, such as student hand book, course prospectus and by-laws. Appropriate infrastructure, delivery strategies and academic support services aimed at students with special needs are inadequate; regular student satisfaction surveys on the study programme offered and support services provided are not conducted at Faculty level; fall back options for students who do not complete the degree programme successfully are not available; and networking with alumni to assist students professionally and financially is at the preliminary stage. However, it is noted that the study programme has much potential to establish an alumni association if efficiently coordinated by the Faculty. Another important aspect is that Faculty has not monitored retention, progression, completion/graduation rates, employment rates and per student cost in relation to national targets where available.

Criterion 7: Student Assessment and Awards

Assessment strategy of student learning is considered as an integral part of the programme design with a clear relation between assessment tasks and the programme outcomes. However, many aspects of this criterion have been maintained at a minimal level with the following weaknesses: As ILOs of many course units are not yet formulated, assessment strategy is not aligned constructively; though the study programme has a modularized credit valued, semester based course unit system, it is not adhered to completely especially with respect to conduct of examinations; assessment criteria and marking scheme of practical examinations are not revealed to students. As the marks are not handed over to the Examination Branch after the practical examinations, students do not know their results of such examinations before the theory examination. Marking scheme of the question paper along with model answer was not available to assess the quality of marking; it is essential especially when the examinations are handled by external examiners. Feedback on assessments and results of examinations are not provided to students in a timely manner and they are not documented properly. Therefore, it is highly recommended that the above stated lapses in the assessment strategy need to be addressed at the earliest by the Faculty.

Criterion 8: Innovative and Healthy Practices

The internet, LMS and MIS facilities are not operated satisfactorily and need to be improved. Faculty holds an ICT based examination recording system which needs to be more sophisticated and necessary training needs to be given to non-academic staff that is very rarely seen in the Faculty.

Faculty promotes engagement of students and staff in co-curricular activities, such as social, cultural an aesthetic pursuits, and it has the potential to widen these innovative and healthy practices. Also, J. D. A. Perera Gallery is located in an ideal place for publicising such activities and promoting income generation to the Faculty.

Faculty needs to address the following weaknesses with regard to innovative and healthy practices: Industrial training as part of the teaching and learning strategy is operationalized in three departments (Visual Communication & Design, Ceramics and Textile & Wearable Arts) only which needs to be incorporated into the curriculum of other disciplines. The ICT based multi-mode teaching delivery and learning through VLE/LMS is not widely practised; it is recommended that Faculty needs to take steps to ensure usage of ICT by students and staff at an acceptable level. Regular revision of the curriculum and close monitoring of its implementation are not exercised. The CDC must meet on a regular basis, monitor implementation of the existing curriculum and carryout curriculum revisions whenever necessary.

.

Section 6: Grading of Overall Performance of the Programme

No.	Criteria	Weighted minimum score	Actual criteria wise score
01	Programme Management	75	107
02	Human and Physical Resources	50	69
03	Programme Design and Development	75	75
04	Course / Module Design and Development	75	95
05	Teaching and Learning	75	87
06	Learning Environment, Student Support and Progression	50	65
07	Student Assessment and Awards	75	74
08	Innovative and Healthy Practices	25	27
Total on a thousand scale			600
Overall marks (%)			60
Grade			**C**

The study programme under review has attained the minimum level of quality expected of a programme of study and requires improvement in several aspects.

Thus, the Bachelor of Visual Arts study programme is awarded Grade C.

Section 7: Commendations and Recommendations

Commendations

- ✓ As the unique leader of visual arts, the Faculty is sustaining aesthetic education and producing competent creative artists through its curriculum for a long period of time.
- ✓ Integrating learning strategies for development of self-directed and collaborative learning, creative and critical thinking and team work in the course design is commendable.
- ✓ Vibrant teaching-learning sessions of individual students-based teaching-learning practices and studio- and practice-based teaching-learning activities and opportunities given to work in groups to promote collaborative learning are commendable.
- ✓ Students' enthusiastic involvement in creative endeavors is unique.

Recommendations

- ✓ Towards a new direction for aesthetic education, identifying a more in-depth review of presentday curriculum is necessary. The most substantial change involves redefining aesthetic education as the study of creative visual thinking including design, visual communication, visual and performing culture, and fine/studio art.
- ✓ Curriculum should be redesigned with a clear vision of an interdisciplinary approach and concern of a holistic and interdisciplinary perspective.
- ✓ must be addressed through constant open discussions within the Departments of the Faculty.
- ✓ Operationalization of the policy and procedures with respect to curriculum design in alignment with SLQF should be prioritized.
- ✓ Stakeholder participation in the curriculum development process must be ensured.
- ✓ Graduate profile and study programme ILOs must be developed in close alignment with each other.
- ✓ Course ILOs, teaching learning strategies and assessment strategies should be developed with constructive alignment and regular monitoring strategies and processes to evaluate, review and improve. Course design and development must be ensured by the Faculty with a time schedule.
- ✓ Course specifications should be included in the student handbook and course prospectus must be made available to all students.
- ✓ Studio–based courses must be completed within a stipulated time frame.
- ✓ The study programme must have a research component and engagement of students in research must be encouraged.
- ✓ Use of LMS in teaching, learning and assessment processes must be improved.
- ✓ Since the study programme has a semester-based course unit system, all examinations (theory/practical) must be conducted semester wise and the workload must be equally distributed among the semesters in the academic calendar.
- ✓ Assessment method of each course unit, especially assessment criteria of the practical / studio-based course units, should be communicated to the students in advance.

- ✓ The Faculty has to implement 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 their level of attainment.
- ✓ Review team wishes to reiterate the need for relaxing the compartmentalization that exists among the departments and avoiding duplication of courses. This will lead to efficient utilization of human as well as physical resources.
- ✓ Conditions of the studios as well as the class rooms must be improved to support a healthier teaching–learning environment.
- ✓ Faculty should develop policy and ensure facilities for inclusive education of differently abled students without further delay. In this regard, lifts must be built to access the library and studios/class rooms in the first and second floors.
- ✓ A regular mechanism to obtain feedback from students and peers on the quality of teaching must be ensured.
- ✓ A consistent system of rewards should be established to identify the best performer.
- ✓ Links with alumni of the study programme need to be improved and potential entrepreneurship must be introduced.
- ✓ Attention must be given to previous IR reports, views of the professional experts and stakeholders.

Section 8: Summary

Since the previous sections of this report give the review team's findings on the level of attainment of quality by the study programme under each criterion in detail, only a few salient points are reiterated in this section.

The review team finds that the Faculty holds an appropriate organizational structure and is developing it towards effective governance and management of its core functions. The staff profile of the study programme consists of nationally and internationally renowned competent staff. However, a few courses, such as visual communication & design and textile & wearable arts, heavily depend on visiting lecturers due to lack of qualified permanent lecturers with relevant experience/training.

The study programme design is in compliance with the SLQF to a certain extent and ensures outcome- based education and student- centred learning. However, graduate profile and appropriate ILOs are not available and a holistic and interdisciplinary perception is lacking in the curriculum. Further, fall back options for students who do not complete the degree programme successfully are not available.

Course design integrates learning strategies for development of self-directed and collaborative learning, creative and critical thinking and team work. Internal monitoring strategies and processes to evaluate, review and improve course design and development are inefficient and course ILOs of many course units are not yet formulated.

Industrial training as part of the teaching and learning strategies is operationalized in three departments (Visual Communication & Design, Ceramics, Textile & Wearable Arts) only. Also, ICT based multi-mode teaching delivery and learning through LMS are not widely practiced.

Regarding assessment strategies, assessment criteria and marking scheme for practical examinations are not revealed to students; feedback on assessments and results of examinations are not provided to students in a timely manner; quality of marking could not be assessed as marking scheme of the question paper and the respective model answers were not made available.

Although students with special needs are allowed to enroll in the study programme, the Faculty does not have a policy, strategy and action plan aimed at differently abled students. Further, appropriate infrastructure and academic support services are also inadequate.

Conducting regular student satisfaction surveys on the study programme offered and support services provided are vital to improve the quality of education. However, the review team noted that such surveys are not conducted in the BVA study programme.

Though students and staff are actively involved in co-curricular activities, such as social, cultural and aesthetic pursuits, students' engagement in research is found to be minimal.

The Faculty has established a Curriculum Development Committee (CDC) for regular monitoring, revision and updating of the curriculum, courses and teaching and learning methods of the study programme. However, the review team noted that the operation of the CDC is not satisfactory.

At the end of the review process, the members of the review team felt that although several aspects of quality education need to be enhanced in the current study programme, the Faculty has taken steps in the right direction to improve the relevance and quality of BVA degree programme offered.