PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT

Bachelor of Commerce (B. Com)

Faculty of Arts

University of Peradeniya

17th - 20th December 2019

Reviewers: **Dr. K.S.Wanniarachchi**
Dr. AmbalamPushpanathan

Quality Assurance Council

University Grants Commission, Sri Lanka

Signature Page:

1. University : University of Peradeniya

2. Faculty : Faculty of Arts

3. Program : Bachelor of Commerce (B.Com)

4. Review Panel :

No	Name	Signature
1.	Dr. K.S. Wanniarachchi	
2.	Dr. Ambalam Pushpanathan	

Contents

Section 1. Introduction to the Programme 2
Section 2. Observations on the Self Evaluation Report (SER) 5
Section 3. Description of Review Process 7
Section 4. Overview of the Faculty's approach to Quality and Standards 10
Section 5. Judgment on the eight criteria of Program Review 11
Criterion 1. Programme Management 11
Criterion 2. Human and Physical Resources 12
Criterion 3. Program Design and Development 12
Criterion 4. Module Design and Development 13
Criterion 5. Teaching and Learning 14
Criterion 6. Learning Environment, Student Support and Progression 14
Criterion 7. Student Assessment and Awards 15
Criterion 8. Innovative and Healthy Practices 16
Section 6. Grading of Overall Performance of the Program 17
Section 7. Commendations and Recommendations 18
Section 8. Summary 19
Annex 1. Schedule for site visit 21

Section 1.Introduction to the Programme

The University of Peradeniya is the heir of a sixty-year-old University tradition which commenced with the inception of the University of Ceylon, the first institution of its kind, established in Colombo on 1st July 1942 with two faculties. The two Faculties of the University of Ceylon are Faculty of Arts and Faculty of Oriental Studies. In 1952 these Faculties were moved to the banks of Mahaweli River, andthe name was changed from the University of Ceylon to University of Ceylon Peradeniya. During the twenty-year period from 1952 to 1972, the University of Ceylon Peradeniya expanded and was upgraded. In 1972, it was re-named asPeradeniya Campus, University of Sri Lanka. The Peradeniya Campus was upgraded to the University of Peradeniya in 1978. Presently, the University of Peradeniya has nine Faculties. The Faculty of Arts offers 21 special degree programmes, which includes theBachelor of Commerce (BCom) degree programme.

The BCom (Special)degree program was commenced in 1962 under the purview of the Department of Economics, Commerce & Statistics in the Faculty of Arts. It was continued as such until a separate department, the Department of Management Studies, was established in the Faculty of Arts in 2002. From 2002 to 2015, Department of Management Studies offered the BComdegree programme under the Faculty of Arts. Despite the establishment of the Faculty of Management in 2015, the programme is still offered by the Faculty of Arts, with the support of Faculty of Management. The BCom degree is offered in Sinhala, Tamil, and English mediums. The students are admitted to the Faculty of Arts based on their z-score at the GCE Advanced Level examination, and the students are selected based on their academic performance in the first year in the two courses. According to the current curriculum, four compulsory and foundation courses in the First year are offered by four to five Departments in the Faculty of Arts. From the Second year onwards, in each semester, the BCom degree students can choose four compulsory courses from the Management Faculty and one Course from other Departments of the Faculty of Arts.

The number of students in the Faculty and present breakdown of the BCom degree programme are illustrated in Table 1. A total of 94 students are following the degree program at present. The number of students graduated from the last five-year period andthe staff profile of the BCom degree program are illustrated in Table 2 and Table 3, respectively.

Table 1. Number of students in Faculty and present breakdown of the BCom degree programme

Year	**Number of Students in the Faculty**	**Number of Students in BCom Degree**
First Year (2017/2018)	935	-

Second Year (2016/2017)	945	38
Third Year (2015/2016)	922	23
Fourth Year (2014/2015)	1057	33

Table 2. Numbers graduated from the BComprogramme over the past five years

Year		Number of graduates
2017/2018	A/13 Batch	53
2016/2017	A/12 Batch	43
2015/2016	A/11 Batch	54
2014/2015	A/10 Batch	63
2013/2014	A/09 Batch	40

Table 3. The profile of academic staff teaching on the BCom degree program

Faculty /Department	Senior Prof.	Professor	Associate Professor	Senior Lecturer Gr.I	Senior Lecturer Gr II	Lecturer	Lecturer Prob
Management Faculty		01		03	07	06	21
Dept of Economics		05		11	05	01	02
Dept of Law				01	02		
Dept of Sociology		03		03	05		05
Dept of Geography		02		04	10		05
Dept of Political Sciences	01	01		02	04	03	01
Dept of Philosophy/ Psychology				04	08		02

The following infrastructure facilities and other services are available for students on the BComdegree programme.

- Main Library
- ELTU (English Language Teaching Unit)
- Students Welfare Centre

- Career Guidance Unit
- Student support system and Management which includes hostels, canteens, gymnasium, medical and sports facilities

Section 2.Observations on the Self Evaluation Report (SER)

The SER has been prepared according to the guidelines given in the Programme Review Manual using a participatory approach involving almost all members of the relevant departments. The evidence has been presented alongside the standards and criteria as shown in the template provided.

Dr. MadurangaKalugampitiya was appointed as the Faculty Coordinator for SER. Mr.V.Tharmathasan, Head, Department of Management Studies chaired the SER writing team for the BCom degree programme. Furthermore, review team noticed that three academic staff members from the Faculty of Arts (Prof.A.S.P Abhayarathne, Mr.S.Vijesandiran, and Dr.A.D.H.K.Kankanamge) and three academic staff from the Faculty of Management (Mr.V.Tharmathasan, Dr.M.G.D.P.Menike, and Mr.D.I.J.Samaranayake) contributed to the development of the SER and review team highly appreciated the team work of the cluster program. However, the review team observed that the faculty had not issued appointment letters with TOR to members stating their roles, responsibilities, and the time frame for accomplishment of activities. The Dean of the Faculty and Heads of the Departments were responsible for overall guidance for the quality assurance process of SER.

The Self-Evaluation Report (SER) was prepared for review of a cluster of two undergraduate study programs offered by the Faculty. The degree programs included in this cluster were Bachelor of Commerce (Honours) Degree and Bachelor of Law (Honours) Degree SER was prepared with four sections: Section 1-Introduction to the study programs; Section 2-Process of preparing the SER; Section 3- Compliance with the Criteria & Standards and the Section 4-Summary.

The introductory section gives an overview of the faculty and explains the program of studies. The analysis of the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) given in the SER is relevant. The process of preparing the SER clearly describes the process with necessary components. The length of the report is fairly good. and prepared aligning with the standards formatting recommended in the manual. Even though there were two degree programmes to be reviewed, only one SER was prepared. However due to unavoidable circumstances, the review team assessed only one degree programme and the judgment was made for the BComdegree programmealone.

Section one of the SER presents details of the BCom degree program: student numbers and the number of academic, academic support, profiles of academic staff details. However, details of non-academic staff were not presented as required in the PR manual (PR manual, page-89).

Section two, which is to explain the process of preparing the SER, contains information regarding the process adopted in preparing the SER. It was mentioned that there were follow up sessions to monitor the progress of SER writing and the drafted SER was discussed in the presence of all cluster members including the Dean of the Faculty, Heads of two

Departments and Assistant Registrar. The review team appreciate the process as the good practices adopted by this cluster.

The review team noted that Section Three: “Compliance with the Criteria and Standards” which is the main section of the SER was also prepared according to the format given in the PR review manual. This section was structured well with the requisite eight criteria and relevant standards. Presentation of the documentary evidence was clear and the unique code numbers were given in proper manner. The way of presenting documentary evidence made the reviewers’ work easy. The review team observed that the Faculty has enough documents but they were not arranged in a proper order, to match the relevantstandard. Each criterion was summarized at the end of the section, as required.

The SWOT analysis given at the end of Introduction,was done in a proper manner. SWOT demonstrates the strengths and weaknesses of the programme of study, including the physical and human resources at the faculty. Evidence for the SWOT were given with the SER documents and were seen by the review team. The important documents such as corporate plan, action plan (faculty) and the strategic plan (faculty) were also presented during the site visit to the reviewers. The team observed that the programme reflects the mission, goals and objectives set out in the corporate plan of the university. The standards and quality are in accordance with agreed national guidelines of the Sri Lanka Qualifications Framework (SLQF) and the used Subject Benchmark Statements (SBS) for Management prepared by the UGC. The review team observed that there was no documentary evidence of remedial measures that have been implemented to rectify deficiencies identified at previous subject reviews.

The last section summarized the SER report and the annexures were attached at the end of the SER. Finally it can be concluded that the overall presentation of the SER was of an adequate standard, indicating the knowledge of the quality assurance program by the members of the BCom degree programme of the Faculty of Arts and the Faculty of Management of the University of Peradeniya.

Section 3.Description of Review Process

3.1 Timeline

The PR process was started in early 2018, but due to unavoidable circumstances,the review of this cluster program dragged oninto 2019. Therelevant dates are as mentioned below.

- Appointment of Reviewers (November 2017)
- Training workshop for program reviewers (14th February 2018)
- Pre- review meeting and workshop (21st June 2018)
- Desk evaluation (June-July 2018)
- Pre-site visit Workshop (31st July 2018)
- Site Visit (17th – 20th December 2019)
- Key findings to QAAC (6th January 2020)
- Submission of draft report (3rd February 2020)

3.2 The Panel of Reviewers

The team of reviewers for the cluster of Bachelor of Commerce degree programme and Bachelor of Laws degree programme was appointed by the Quality Assurance Council of the University Grants Commission in consultation with the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Coordinator of the IQAC of the Faculty of Arts, University of Peradeniya. The legal expertincluded in the first review panel was later replaced by Dr. K. Guruparan.

The members of the final review panel are as follows.

1.	Dr. K.S.Wanniarachchi	Faculty of Engineering, University of Ruhuna (Panel Chair)
2.	Prod. M.A.MohamedRameez	Faculty of Arts and Culture, South Eastern University of Sri Lanaka
3.	Dr. AmbalamPushpanathan	Faculty of Business Studies, Vavuniya Campus of the University of Jaffna
4.	Dr. K.Guruparan	Faculty of Law, University of Jaffna

The UGC, in agreement with the Faculty of Arts, University of Peradeniya, entrusted the review task to a team of 4 members selected based on their expertise. Unfortunately, two experts were unable to participate the review process, and therefore the LLB programme was not reviewed. However,with the agreement of the Faculty, review of the B.Com.degreeprogrammewas completed by the two reviewers to volunteered to do so.

3.3 Pre-Site Evaluation

Following appointment of the review panel, a pre-review meeting and a workshop was held at the UGC on 21st June 2018 to brief reviewers on the evaluation process.On the same day, the SER was handed over to the panel members for desk evaluation. Individual desk evaluations were conducted by the panel members and a pre-site visit discussion was held among the members of the evaluation panel on 31st July 2018. However, the site visit was postponed several times due to various unavoidable reasons and finally the team visited the Faculty of Arts with thorough understanding and confidence on the corresponding program based on the information provided in the SER, fora four-day site visit to review the Bachelor of Commerce Honors degree program of the Peradeniya University.

The task to observe the evidence documents in a collective manner at the site visit as well as to write the draft Programme Review Report have been dividedand confirmed with the panel members. The Chairperson prepared the site visit schedule in consultation with the other team members and communicated with the relevant staff of the Faculty of Arts, University of Peradeniya. In addition, list of items such as time table, list of students for each year were requested by the Chairperson from the Faculty prior to the site-visit. Further arrangements to be provided at the site visit such as transport facilities, attendance sheet preparation for each meetings, photograph arrangements along with the copy of CD for the review team, have also been requestedprior to the site visit by the Chairperson of the review team in order to ensure that all was in order for an effective review process.

The site visit to review the BCom degree program of the Peradeniya University was finally fixed to take place from 17th to 20thDecember 2019.

3.4 On-Site Evaluation

Prior to the beginning of this site visit, the team had to face some unavoidable obstacles, but all issues were finally addressed successfully. As stated before, the site visit had to be repeatedly re-scheduled.The faculty responded favorably on each occasion and agreed on the new dates, which is greatly appreciated. On the other hand, two panel members withdraw from the review panel at the last moment due to personal reasons. However,through the collective efforts of the review team and the faculty, the review process continued. The role played by the Director QAC of the University Grants Commission was really admirable, and without her involvement, this review may not have been concluded at all. Finally, the Director, QAC instructed the review panel to evaluate only theBCom Degree program of the Faculty of Arts. Two members of the review panel reached the hotel on 16th December 2019 and had a meeting to planthe site visit to be undertaken during the next four days.

In order to support the evaluation and scoring process of the BComdegree program, necessary information was gathered through documentary evidence, formal meetings and discussions with the relevant stakeholders, physical observations of facilities, and

informaldiscussions with relevant parties.Details of the stakeholder meetings conducted during the site visit are as follows:

- Meeting with Director IQAU and Coordinator FQAC
- Meeting with Vice-Chancellor, Deputy Vice Chancellor, Dean of the Faculty
- Meeting with Heads of the relevant Departments
- Meeting with SER writing team
- Meeting with permanent academic staff
- Meeting with temporary academic staff
- Meeting with student representatives
- Meeting with administrative staff
- Meeting with non-academic staff
- Meeting with academic coordinators and counsellors, Directors of SDC andCGU, academic sub-wardens of the Hostels
- Meeting with Medical Officer

The review team physically observed all the available facilitiesused for the BCom degree program such as lecture hall facilities, computer and ICT facilities, library facilities, sport facilities, canteen facilities etc. The faculty staff enthusiastically assisted the review panel to collect necessary information in all the above aspects. The faculty staff,together with the departmental staff,further supported the review panel in collecting attendance and photographs of important events throughout the review process.The photographs taken at the time of inspection were copied in a pen drive and handed over to the team as per the request made by the team Chair and some of these photographs areincluded in this report.

A major part of the review process consisted of inspecting the documentary evidence listed in the Self - Evaluation Report submitted by the Faculty of Arts, University of Peradeniya.The documents had been arranged in a separate room in the IQAC of the Faculty of Arts.It was well-organized and the review team were able to findmost of the required documents easily. However, it was observed by the panel that some of the required documents were not available at all or placed somewhere else with irrelevant files. Some of the required documentary evidence was not available at the allocated placebutwere available elsewheresuch as in the administrative section, examination section, finance section,etc.

The panel followed the pre-planned program scheduled for each day with some minor changes to address the current situation. The review team spent time on site from 8.00 am to 5.00 pm on average each day. In addition to on-site evaluations, the review team spent several hours at night in the hotel to discuss and agree on the modalities for scoring of standards. There were no disagreements between team members regarding the modalities to be adopted for observance of documentations or physical facilities.

Section 4.Overview of the Faculty's approach to Quality and Standards

The Internal Quality Assurance Unit of the University of Peradeniya was established in 2016 in accordance with guidelines stipulated in the newly issued University Grants Commission Circular no 04/2015.Currently, Prof. Prasad Sethunga is leading the Unit. The review team understood that the Vice-chancellor, Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Deans of both Faculties, Heads of Departments, Coordinators of Units, academics, and administrative staff have supportedthe Director IQAU in running the activities of the Unit. The IQAU oversees all quality assurance activities of the University of Peradeniya. The Faculty-level Internal Quality Assurance Cell (IQAC) was established for running the Faculty level quality assurance activities smoothly.

The Internal Quality Assurance Cell (IQAC) of the Faculty of Arts is functioning in a satisfactory manner under the leadership of Dr.MadurangaKalugampitiya. The faculty has allocated an office space with some office equipment. However, no human resource support is provided to the office work of the IQAC unit.The Assistant Registrar of the Faculty supports the activities of the IQAC. Faculty needs to provide support staff and facilities to do QA work in a proper manner.

It is also worthwhile to note that the discussion with the Vice Chancellor, Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Deans of the Faculties and the Director of IQAU revealed that all parties at the Faculty of Management along with other top administrators of the University of Peradeniya are striving to commit themselves to achieve and implement the quality standards specified in the manual of the quality assurance.

It was also noted that the filing system which is being implemented by the Faculty of Artswas good and all required documents were kept in properly prepared filing boxes. However, it would have been much better if the filing was done as per the order of quality standards given in the manual. The review team experienced some difficulty in accessingthe relevant evidence with the current filing system, particularlywithin the shorter time available to the two-member review panel.

During the review process, the team observed that the checks and balances and transparency of the teaching and learning are improving. It was noted that procedures are followed by the Faculty of Management and Faculty of Arts to maintain fairness and transparency of student assessment. Remedial measures recommended in the previous subject and institutional reviews have not been implemented to a large extent.

Overall, the review team is happy about the quality and standard of the BComdegree program offered by the Faculty of Arts, University of Peradeniya. The review team have reason to believe in the sustainability of good practices currently adopted by the Faculty.

Section 5.Judgment on the eight criteria of Program Review

Criterion 1. Programme Management

Among the 27 standards, 12 scored 3 indicating good adoption, 6 scored 2 indicating adequateadoption with a few issues, 1 scored 7 indicating barely adequate adoption with major issueseither in the degree of adoption or the strength of evidence provided. Two of the standard scored 0 which indicates inadequate adoption or irrelevant evidence being provided. The study program achieved a raw criterion-wise score of 55 and hence an actual criterion-wise score of 102 out of 150.

Strengths:

- The Faulty has adopted an adequate effective management procedure system to support the degree program.
- The strategic management plan, action plan, and standard operational procedures for good governance and better management of the program are available.
- The University has a well-established IQAU which implements the internal quality assurance system through FQAC.
- The student's disciplinary procedures are well informed by the Faculty
- New students are well-informed about the study program at the beginning of study program.
- The monitoring measures and surveys have been undertaken to monitor students' satisfaction at the exit point.

Weaknesses:

- Students' feedback about the orientation programme was not taken.
- There is no properly set up Management Information Systems (MIS) in the faculty.
- The work norms and duty lists of academic staff are not available.
- The performance appraisal mechanism for academic staff is not available for the last five-year period.
- The Students Charter and code of conduct for students are not delivered to the students
- No substantial documentary evidence is available for Outcomes Based Education and Student Centred Learning.
- Minutes of Departmental meetings are available, but theyare notendorsed by the respective authority.
- Mechanism for the discontinuation of old curricula with the start of new programmes is not clearly explained.
- The IQAU regularly conducts the meetings but attendance records were not available in the IQAC.

Criterion 2.Human and Physical Resources

Among the 12 standards, 4 scored 3 indicating good adoption, and6 scored 2 indicating adequate adoption with a few issues, one of the standard scored 1 which indicates no barely adequate adoption with major issues either in the degree of adoption or the strength of evidence provided, and also one of the standards scored 0 which indicates no inadequate adoption or irrelevant evidence being provided. The program achieved a raw criterion-wise score of 25 and hence an actual criterion-wise score of 69 out of 100.

Strengths:

- The faculty has well qualified and competent academic staff to develop and deliver the academic programme.
- Availability of well-maintained infrastructure facilities.
- Presence of a very active Career Guidance Unit (CGU) to train for soft skills and life skills of students.
- Provision of opportunities for students to engage in various multi-cultural activities

Weaknesses:

- Lack of academics with PhD qualification in the teacher list.
- Records on HRD policy, recruitments details, comparison of expertise with the national and international norms, induction program, CPD programs, internship program are not properly maintained.
- The 3-credit internship program is not sufficient to gain comprehensive industrial exposure

Criterion 3.Program Design and Development

Among the 24 standards of criterion 3, 10 scored 3 indicating good adoption, 5 scored 2 indicating adequate adoption, 7 scored 1 indicating barely adequate adoption with major issues either in the degree of adoption or the strength of evidence provided, and twoscored 0 indicating no inadequate adoption or irrelevant evidence being provided. The program achieved a rawcriterion-wise score of 47 and hence an actual criterion-wise score of 98 out of 150.

Strengths:

- The program complies with SLQF standards and the university's goals, vision and mission
- The curriculum has been logically structured including field visits, internship training, research, elective course units, intellectual, numerical, analytical, IT, communication, and soft skills of the students.

- Course specifications including ILOs are delivered to students before starting the semester.
- Facilitating disabled students to carry out their studies smoothly

Weaknesses:

- Fall back option is not available in the curriculum
- ILO's, objectives and references of the subjects are not included in the student handbook.
- Feedback from external and internal reviewers, employers and alumni have not been used in program design process
- The internship training program is included in the curriculum but ILOs for the Internship training are not defined.
- No evidence of Senate and Council approval of the program

Criterion 4. Module Design and Development

Among the 19 standards of criterion 4, 10 scored 3 indicating good adoption, 5 scored 2 indicating adequate adoption, 4 scored 1 indicating barely adequate adoption with major issues either in the degree of adoption or the strength of evidence provided, and none scored indicating no inadequate adoption or irrelevant evidence being provided. The program achieved a raw criterion-wise score of 44and hence an actual criterion-wise score of 116 out of 150.

Strengths:

- The courses satisfy program objectives and are in compliance with the SLQF definitions.
- Course specifications are delivered to students on time
- Credit weight, volume of learning, and mode of assessment are indicated in each course.
- Course delivery incorporates appropriate media and technology
- Presence of IQAC to evaluate, review and improve the course design, development, approval.

Weaknesses:

- The external experts and other stakeholders have not been invited for the development or revision of curriculum.
- Lack of SCL strategies incorporated in curriculum to align OBE
- Insufficient evidence on course and program approval process to ensure decisions of approval are taken after full consideration of design principles.

- Lack of evidence on involvement individual staff in the curriculum design, development, or revision.

Criterion 5.Teaching and Learning

Among the 19 standards, 7 scored 3 indicating good adoption, 6 scored 2 indicating adequate adoption with a few issues, 5 scored 1 indicating barely adequate adoption with major issues either in the degree of adoption or the strength of evidence provided and one standard scored 0 indicating inadequate adoption or irrelevant evidence being provided. The study program achieved a raw criterion-wise score of 38 and hence an actual criterion-wise score of 100 out of 150.

Strengths:

- Presence of UG research symposium to present and publish students' research.
- Academic staff involvement in research and development is commendable
- Essential industrial skills are provided through an internship program embedded in the degree program.
- Availability of infrastructure facilities for students with special needs.
- Availability of up-to-date communication and ICT systems
- Presence of a policy on Gender Equity and Equality

Weaknesses:

- No evidence that teachers integrate their research outcomes and scholarly work into their teaching
- Unavailability of course evaluation reports and student performance statistics to justify improvement of teaching learning methods.
- No documentary evidence for external examiners reports
- Nonexistence of award scheme to recognize excellence in teaching
- Non implementation of work norms for academic staff
- No records being maintained on peer evaluation

Criterion 6.Learning Environment, Student Support and Progression

Among the 24 standards, 15 scored 3 indicating good adoption, 7 scored 2 indicating adequate adoption with a few issues, 1 scored 1 indicating barely adequate adoption with major issues either in the degree of adoption or the strength of evidence provided and one scored 0 indicating inadequate adoption or irrelevant evidence being provided. The study program achieved a raw criterion-wise score of 60 and hence an actual criterion-wise score of 83 out of 100.

Strengths:

- Presence of a conducive environment with good relationshipsbetween students and staff.
- In general, communication skills of students are highly commendable
- Availability of mentors, senior student counsellors, deputy proctor, management assistants etc. to assist students
- Self-access to PCs for software and internet use
- Facilitating training for students and staff through SDC, IQAC, CGU, ART
- A well-equipped library with all the facilities
- Release of examination results within stipulated period.

Weaknesses:

- Unavailability of a helpdesk to get information about the Department / Faculty.
- Difficulty faced by students in moving from one faculty to other for lectures
- Underutilization of LMS facilities both by students and staff.
- Lack of tracer studies/surveys to justify suitability and effectiveness of degree program.
- Involvement of Alumni Association in the curriculum development process is minimal.

Criterion 7.Student Assessment and Awards

Among the 17 standards, 13 scored 3 indicating good adoption, 2 scored 2 indicating adequate adoption but with a few issues, 1 scored 1 indicating barely adequate adoption with major issues either in the degree of adoption or the strength of evidence provided and one scored 0 indicating inadequate adoption or irrelevant evidence being provided. The study program achieved a raw criterion-wise score of 44 out of 51 and hence an actual criterion-wise score of 129 out of 150.

Strengths:

- The assessment methods are explained to students through course specifications.
- An examination manual is available.
- The weightage relating to the different assessment components are defined in course specification.
- Faculty has a clear policy and infrastructure facilities to support students with special needs.

Weaknesses:

- There is no evidence of feedback from the moderators and second examiners either internally or externally, on question papers.
- Delay in issuing transcripts
- Students survey was done but the gathered information is not utilized fruitfully.

Criterion 8.Innovative and Healthy Practices

Among the 14 standards, 5 scored 3 indicating good adoption, 5 scored 2 indicating adequate adoption with a few issues, 1 scored 1 indicating barely adequate adoption with major issues either in the degree of adoption or the strength of evidence provided and three scored 0 indicating inadequate adoption or irrelevant evidence being provided. The study program achieved a raw criterion-wise score of 26 and hence an actual criterion-wise score of 31 out of 50.

Strengths:

- Availability of MIS and LMS platform to support academic and administration purposes.
- Presence of UG research project in the curriculum and organizing of UG research symposium
- Inclusion of industrial training component to the curriculum.
- Availability of credit transfer system

Weaknesses:

- No evidence ofthe involvement of academics with industry, in R & D, innovations or community support.
- No award system in place to encourage academics for achieving excellence in research
- Insufficient evidence of students' participation in competitions like IQ, innovation, sports etc.
- No fallback option is available

Section 6. Grading of Overall Performance of the Program

The evaluation given here is the review team's assessment of the level of accomplishment of quality expected of the Bachelor of Commerce degree program, based on the grading of overall performance as per guidelines given in Chapter 3, Table 3.4 of PR manual.

The overall performance of the study program is graded as follows:

Criterion No.	Assessment Criterion	Weighted Minimum Score	Actual Criterion-wise Score
1	Programme Management	75	102
2	Human and Physical Resources	50	69
3	Programme Design and Development	75	98
4	Course/ Module Design and Development	75	116
5	Teaching and Learning	75	100
6	Learning Environment, Student Support and Progression	50	83
7	Student Assessment and Awards	75	129
8	Innovative and Healthy Practices	25	31
	Total Score		729
	Total Score Percentage		72.9
	Final Grade		B

Section 7.Commendations and Recommendations

Commendations

- Communication skills of students are highly commendable
- Presence of well-managed, well-administered, and well-maintained library, IT, and English learning facilities
- The University has a well-established IQAU which implements the internal quality assurance system through FQAC.
- The program complies with SLQF standards and university goals, vision and mission
- Faculty has clear policy and infrastructure facility to admit the students with special needs.
- Availability of a credit transfer system
- The faculty has well qualified and competent academic staff to develop and deliver the academic programme

Recommendations

- Find an amicable solution to address the hardship faced by students due to moving between the Faculty of Arts and the Faculty of Management.
- Establish a separatedepartment to conduct theBCom degree program
- Implement astaff appraisal and reward system to recognize excellence in teaching and research
- Student feedback should be analyzed and discussed at meetings of the Curriculum Development Committee and changes necessary to improve the programmeshould be implemented
- Establish work norms for academic staff and a duty list for other staff
- Adopt performance appraisal mechanism for academic staff to recognize their excellence in teaching and research
- Increase the credit weight of the internship program in order to give a comprehensive industrial exposure for students.
- Involve external experts and other stakeholders in the process of development and revision of the curriculum
- Implement a fallback option for those who are unable to complete the degree program

Section 8.Summary

The Bachelor of Commerce (Honors) degree programme offered by theFaculty of Arts, University of Peradeniya was evaluated by areview team comprising Dr. K.S. Wanniarachchi (Chairperson) and Dr. AmbalamPushpanathan,according to guidelines prescribed by the Manual for review of undergraduate study programmes of Sri Lankan Universities and Higher Education Institutions. This Programme Review Report (PRR) contains the findings of the review team based on observationsmade during the site visit and claims made in the Self Evaluation Report (SER) submitted by the Faculty of Arts, University of Peradeniya.

The site visit of the programme review was successfully conducted from 17th-20thDecember 2019.The schedule of activities during the site visit consisted of stakeholder meetings, observations of infrastructure facilities, evaluation of documentary evidence, observationof class room teaching, health service, sports facilitiesand finally wrap up meetings with Dean of the Faculty, Heads of relevant departments and the academic staff together with IQAC Coordinator.Though, the planned scheduled activities were slightly modified due unavoidable constraints, it didn't have any impact on the evaluation process because of the team's proactive planning as well as the fullest co-operation given by the staff of the faculty of arts. The overallarrangements for the site visit organized by the staff of the Faculties of Artsand Management were excellent, considering the easy access of evidence documents, neatness and the continuous support provided to the review team with the friendly environment.

The scoregiven for each standards of eight (8) criteria for the review process was not only based on the evidence provided by the department but also the formal as well as the informal discussions with the relevant stakeholders during the stay at the University of Peradeniya for four days. In addition, available facilities at the faculty and the services provided by the relevant departments to the public were also considered. The Chairperson of the review team conveyed the observations at the final wrap up meeting which made collectively by the reviewer's panel.

The University has a well-established Internal Quality Assurance Unit (IQAU) in terms of the infrastructure and the internal Quality Assurance Cells (IQAC) at faculty levels. TheIQAU of the University has already started to maintain the files according to the performance score card system developed by the Quality Assurance and Accreditation Council (QAAC) in the University Grant Commission (UGC).

Though they have already started to internalize the best practices, and to implement them within the University and among faculties, the IQAC of the Faculty of Arts needs to take further actionto implement good practices at Faculty level. As the guardian of the BCom program,IQAC of the Faculty of Arts needs to consider suitable procedures for the continuous monitoring and implementation of good practices to enhance the quality of the degree programme.

The student handbook made available by the Faculty for incoming students provides most of the essential information. However, it would be good if a separate handbook with more details about the assessments and the examinations in theBCom program is provided to BCom students. TheFaculty of Artsas the guardianof the BComprogram, plays an excellent role in maintaining the standard of the degree program, and there is no doubt that the Faculty of Management also gives an excellent service to run the program. However, due to the geographical separation between the two Faculties, students find it hard to operate within the current system. This must be discussed among all relevant parties,in order to come to a suitable solution.Lapses were seen in the out-come based teaching and learning practices in the degree program. This tooneeds attention from academic staff to implement good practices to uplift OBE system with the program. The academic staff/ faculty should develop strong links with industry and the alumni and bring the advantages of that exposure and feedback to the students by developing curricula in an OBE model with more LCT approaches. The links may also be used for establishing student-industry and staff-industry research collaborations and to provide a better industrial training for students. Contribution of the CGU, student counselling service, ELTU and other support service are functioning well at present yet there are room for further developments.

Based on the final assessment made by review team, the BComdegree program earned atotal actual score of 72.9%, with scores above the minimum weighted score in all 8 criteria. Therefore, the BCom degree program received an overall grade of ‘B’, which is described as “Satisfactory level of accomplishment of quality expected of a programme of study; requires improvement in a few aspects”.

Annex 1. Schedule for site visit

Day 1: 17th Dec., 2019 (Tuesday)

Time	Activity and Venue	Contact
8.00 – 8.30	Meeting with Director IQAU and Coordinator IQAC Venue : IQAC	Dr. S. Dorabawila
8.30 – 8.45	Meeting with VC/DVC Venue : VC's Office	Dr. S. Dorabawila
8.45 – 9.15	Meeting with the Deans of Faculty of Arts and Faculty of Management Venue : Arts Faculty Seminar Room	Dr. S. Dorabawila
9.15 – 10.15	Meeting with Heads of the relevant academic departments [*presentation of each academic program to the review team by Heads of Departments*] Venue : Arts Faculty Seminar Room	Mr.V.Tharmathasan (B.Com)
10.15 – 10.30	Tea Break	Dr. N.M. Kalugampitiya
10.30 – 11.00	Meeting with SER Writing team Venue : Arts Faculty Seminar Room	Mr.V.Tharmathasan(B.Com)
11.00 -11.30	Meeting with all permanent academic staff members Venue : Arts Faculty Seminar Room	Mr.V,Tharmathasan (B.Com)
11.30 – 12.00	Meeting with all temporary academic staff and academic support staff Venue : Arts Faculty Seminar Room	Mr.Tharmathasan (B.Com)
12.00 – 12.30	Meeting with student representatives of relevant student associations and unions Venue : Arts Faculty Seminar Room	Ms.Hanshani (B.Com)
12.30 – 1.30	Lunch Break	Dr. N.M. Kalugampitiya
1.30 – 2.00	Meeting with administrative staff (AR/AB/CAA etc)	Mr.V.Tharmathasan(B.Com)
2.00 – 3.00	Document observation Venue : IQAC	Ms. R. Katugaha/Ms. C. Karunatilaka (LLB) Dr. Anurudha Dr.Menike, Ms,Hanshani(BCom)
3.00 – 3.15	Tea Break	Ms. S. Wijekoon
3.15 – 4.30	Document observation Venue : IQAC	Ms. R. Katugaha/Ms. C. Karunatilaka (LLB) Dr. Anurudha Dr.Menike, Ms,Hanshani(BCom)
4.30	Departure site	Dr. N.M. Kalugampitiya

Day 2: 18th Dec., 2019 (Wednesday)

Time	Activity and Venue	Contact Person
8.00 – 8.30	Meeting with a sample of general students Venue : Arts Faculty Seminar Room	Mr. Hanshani (BCom)
8.30 – 9.00	Meeting with student support services (Directors / Unit Coordinators / Librarian / Hostel Wardens, etc.) Venue : Arts Faculty Seminar Room	Ms.Sherin (B.Com)
9.00 – 9.30	Meeting with Student Councilors, deputy proctors, senior treasures Venue : Arts Faculty Seminar Room	Mr.Hanshani(B.Com)
9.30 – 10.00	Meeting with technical and non-academic staff Venue : Arts Faculty Seminar Room	Mr.Thilanka(B.Com)
10.00 – 10.15	Tea Break	Dr. N.M. Kalugampitiya
10.15 -12.00	Document observation Venue : IQAC	Ms. Kolongahapitiya/Ms.Liza/ Ms.R.M.C.Kumari (BCom)
12.00 – 1.00	Departmental tour (LL.B and B.Com) Venue : Faculty of Management, Department of Economics, Dept.of Law	Mr.Tharmathasan (B.Com)
1.00 – 2.00	Lunch Break	Dr. Menike
2.00 – 3.00	Observation of teaching and learning sessions (B.Com) Venue : Faculty of Management	Dr. Menike(B.Com)
3.00 – 3.15	Tea Break	Dr. N.M. Kalugampitiya
3.15 – 4.30	Document observation Venue : IQAC	Mr.V.Tharmathasan/Ms.Weerakotuwa Ms.Sherin (B.Com)
4.30	Departure site	Dr. N.M. Kalugampitiya

Day 3: 19Dec., 2019 (Thursday)

	Activity and Venue	Contact
8.00 – 10.30	Document observation Venue : IQAC	Dr. Anuruda /Dr.Menika/Mrs Hanshani (BCom)
10.30 – 10.45	Tea Break	Dr. Menike
10.45 – 12.00	Observation of physical facilities (Canteens / Library / IT, Sports, ELTU etc.)	Mr. Ilham
12.00 – 12.30	Meeting with Alumni members Venue : Arts Faculty Seminar Room	Dr.Menike(B.Com)
1.00 – 2.00	Lunch Break	Ms. S. Wijekoon
2.00 – 3.00	Document observation Venue : IQAC	Me. Kolonghapitiya/ Ms.Liza/ R.M.C.Kumari (BCom)
3.00 – 3.15	Tea Break	Dr.Menike(B.Com)
3.15 – 4.30	Document observation Venue : IQAC	Mr.Tharmathasan/Ms.Weerakotuwa/Ms.Sherin (BCom)
4.30	Departure site	Dr.Menike(B.Com)

Day 4: 20 Dec., 2019

Time	Activity and Venue	Contact Persons
8.00 – 10.00	Document observation Venue : IQAC	Dr. Anurudha/Dr.Menika/Ms.hanshani (BCom)
10.00 – 10.15	Tea Break	Dr. N.M. Kalugampitiya
10.15 – 11.30	Confidential meeting of review team	Dr. N.M. Kalugampitiya
11.30 – 12.30	Wrap up meeting with Deans, Heads of the Department, Academic staff, Director IQAU, Coordinator IQAC Venue : Arts Faculty Seminar Room	Dr. N.M. Kalugampitiya Mr.Tharmathasan(B.Com)
12.30	Departure site	Dr. N.M. Kalugampitiya