



هيئة جودة التعليم والتدريب
Education & Training Quality Authority
Kingdom of Bahrain - مملكة البحرين

Directorate of Higher Education Reviews

Programme Follow-Up Visit Report

**Bachelor of Science in Computer Science
College of Computer Studies
AMA – International University Bahrain
Kingdom of Bahrain**

Second Follow-up Visit Date: 19 November 2017

First Follow-up Visit Date: 2-3 June 2015

Review Date: 28-30 January 2013

HC106-C2-Fb001

Table of Contents

The Programme Follow- up Visit Overview	2
1. Indicator 1: The Learning Programme.....	4
2. Indicator 2: Efficiency of the Programme.....	6
3. Indicator 3: Academic standards of the graduates	10
4. Indicator 4: Effectiveness of quality management and assurance.....	13
5. Conclusion	16
Appendix 1: Judgement per recommendation.....	17
Appendix 2: Overall Judgement.	18

The Programme Follow-up Visit Overview

The follow-up visit for academic programmes conducted by the Directorate of Higher Education Reviews (DHR) is part of a cycle of continuing quality assurance reviews, reporting and improvement by the Education & Training Quality Authority (BQA) in the Kingdom of Bahrain.

The second follow-up visit applies to all programmes that have been reviewed using the 'Programmes-within-College Reviews' Framework, and received a judgement of 'limited confidence' or 'no confidence' during the review and received a judgement of 'Inadequate progress' during the first follow-up visit.

This follow-up visit Report is a key component of this programme review follow-up process, whereby the Bachelor of Science in Computer Science (BSCS), at AMA International University Bahrain (AMAIUB) in the Kingdom of Bahrain was revisited on 19 November 2017 to assess its progress, in line with the published review Framework and the BQA regulations.

A. Background

The programme review of the BSCS programme, at AMAIUB in the Kingdom of Bahrain was conducted by the DHR of the BQA on 28-30 January 2013.

The overall judgement of the review panel for the programme was that of '**no confidence**', where the panel's judgement for each indicator was as follows:

Indicator 1: The learning programme; '**satisfied**'

Indicator 2: Efficiency of the programme; '**not satisfied**'

Indicator 3: Academic standards of the graduates; '**not satisfied**'

Indicator 4: Effectiveness of quality management and assurance '**not satisfied**'

A follow-up visit was conducted in June 2015 in which the overall progress of addressing the recommendations of the review report was judged 'Inadequate progress'. Consequently, the main purpose of this follow-up visit is to assess the progress the institution achieved in addressing those recommendations judged 'partially addressed' and 'not addressed' in the first follow-up visit report and as a result reach an overall judgement about the institution's progress. To this end, the DHR constituted a Panel consisting of two members to conduct a second follow-up visit which incorporates the review of the progress report and its supporting materials submitted by AMAIUB, in addition to the documents submitted during this follow-up visit and those information extracted from the interview sessions. In its judgement, the Panel adhered to the rubrics stated in Appendices 1 and 2.

B. Overview of the Bachelor of Science in Computer Science

The BSCS is the only programme that was being offered by the College of Computer Studies at the time of this follow-up visit. The programme was first offered in September 2002 and the total number of students enrolled in the programme since inception accumulates to 783 of whom 512 have graduated from the programme. The programme curriculum was last revised in 2016-2017 with two study plans (V1 & V2) being released in the same academic year.

The BSCS programme is managed by the Department of Computer Science, which at the time of this follow-up visit employed nine full-time faculty members, including the Dean and Head of Programme and one part-time faculty member, in addition to an administrative staff member. The current study plan consists of a total of 198 credit units distributed over 11 trimesters and grouped into general education courses, mathematics courses, science courses and computing courses, including ethics in computing, research project, practicum and three elective courses. At the time of the follow-up visit there were 129 students enrolled in the programme, 35.66% of which were students employed in a full-time job.

1. Indicator 1: The Learning Programme

This section evaluates the extent to which the BSCS programme of AMAIUB, has addressed the recommendations outlined in the programme review report of January 2013, and not fully addressed during the first follow-up visit of June 2015 under Indicator 1: The learning programme; and as a consequence, provides a judgment regarding the level of implementation of each recommendation for this Indicator as outlined in Appendix 1 of this Report.

Recommendation 1.3: *Revise the mapping of science courses' ILOs with the programme ILOs.*

Judgement: *Fully Addressed*

Evidence provided indicate that the College of Computer Studies' Review Committee (CRC) met on 09 June 2017 to review the course specifications and mapping of all science courses offered as part of the BSCS study plan. The committee agreed that chemistry courses (CHEM400, CHEM401) and physics courses (PHYS400, PHYS401, PHYS402) are appropriately mapped to Programme Intended Learning Outcomes (PILOs) A2, D1, D2. Interviewed faculty emphasised that these courses are covering the science knowledge in PILO A2 'An ability to apply knowledge of computing, mathematics and science appropriate to the discipline'. Moreover, the committee suggested that examples related to computer studies could be used in the course contents to enrich the alignment to the aforementioned PILO. During interviews with science faculty, the Panel was informed that the chemistry and physics courses are both laboratory-oriented, which require group work and presentations that contribute to addressing the PILOs related to teamwork, PILO D1 'An ability to function effectively in teams to accomplish a common goal' and PILO D2 'An ability to communicate effectively within a range of audiences'. There is evidence from the course files that these PILOs are being addressed. In addition, the CRC suggested Green ICT topics to be added to the environmental course (EVES400), and mapped to PILO A2 to enrich students' knowledge of the environmental science field. The College then organised a joint meeting on 13 June 2017 between the CRC and Math & Science Department members, to revise the mapping and content of science courses based on the outcomes from the annual course review by the CRC. In the joint meeting, all parties agreed after discussion to implement the changes requested by the College. During the site visit, the Panel learned that the external examiner finds the distribution of science courses appropriate to the BSCS programme. In addition, the College performed informal benchmarking with Gulf University of Science and Technology in Kuwait, University of Bahrain, and Arizona State University in USA. The results suggested that AMAIUB has higher science courses than those institutions (4,3,4 respectively compared to 7 (21 credits) in AMAIUB). During the site visit, the faculty justified this as a requirement to address the Accreditation Board for Engineering and

Technology (ABET) criteria for accreditation. Interviewed students are also finding these science courses useful to establish their scientific principles. In interviews with the Programme Industrial Advisory Panel (PIAP) members for the BSCS programme, the Panel learned that the council suggested to reduce the science courses and replace them with elective courses that were discussed in one of its meetings. The College agreed, based on the outcomes of the informal benchmarking, to drop the biology courses starting from 3rd Trimester 2017-2018. Hence, the Panel encourages the College to revise the number of science courses in line with the outcomes of the benchmarking activity and the suggestion from the PIAP. Nonetheless, the Panel is satisfied with the level of addressing this recommendation.

2. Indicator 2: Efficiency of the Programme

This section evaluates the extent to which the BSCS programme of AMAIUB, has addressed the recommendations outlined in the programme review report of January 2013, and not fully addressed during the first follow-up visit of June 2015, under Indicator 2: Efficiency of the programme; and as a consequence, provides a judgment regarding the level of implementation of each recommendation for this Indicator as outlined in Appendix 1 of this Report.

Recommendation 2.1: *Ensure that its admission examinations are valid and designed based on international norms and practice.*

Judgement: *Not Addressed*

The progress report states that University has revised its admission criteria based on a benchmarking exercise conducted with local private higher education institutions operating in the Kingdom of Bahrain. As a result, AMAIUB has limited its admission examinations to one examination only that evaluates the applicants' competency level in English language. The Panel is concerned that the benchmarking is limited to local private institutions only, most of which have received recommendations in BQA's review reports to improve their admission criteria and only two of these institutions offer Bachelor Degrees in Computer Science. Moreover, no benchmarking was conducted with similar programmes offered by regional or international institutions. Furthermore, it is not clear why AMAIUB has decided not to subject the students to mathematics admission examination although its benchmarking exercises indicated that 'other universities examined computer science candidates based on their English and mathematics skills', as stated in the progress report. Interviewed staff did not give sufficient reasoning for this action, especially with the University accepting students from high schools' general stream without clear attention to the courses taken by the students in high school.

The current admission criteria stipulate that the mathematics cut-off score is 70% for the science and technical tracks high school graduates while it is 80% for the commercial track. However, the policy does not clearly specify how the high school course scores are considered. During interview sessions, the Panel was informed that the admission office only looks at the score attained by the applicant in the last mathematics course taken in high school, with no regard given to the different types and backgrounds of mathematics courses students complete in high school, especially those coming from private schools with different study programmes. Provided evidence clearly illustrates the different mathematics background of the general, science and technical streams of the high school students admitted to the programme. The Panel is concerned that limiting the admission examination to evaluating English language competencies only, along with the current requirements for mathematics,

has caused the programme to be less selective in ensuring that the admitted students are suitable for the needs of the programme, and that the current practice does not assess the applicants in an equivalent manner. Hence, the Panel considers the recommendation not addressed.

Recommendation 2.2: *Review the length of study needed for completion of the BSCS for full-time working students.*

Judgement: *Not Addressed*

The progress report and evidence provided indicate that in order to provide students with options, AMAIUB, through the CRC, developed two study plans for the revised 2016-2017 programme curriculum. In the first plan, students are expected to undertake 18 credit units per trimester and as a result finish the programme in 11 trimesters, while in the second plan students should be able to finish the programme in 16 trimesters with at least 12 credits unit per trimester. During interview sessions, the Panel was informed that these plans have been effective since the 1st trimester of the academic year 2017-2018. While the progress report states that working students enrolled in the programme are offered an option of completing the programme ‘in 11 trimesters with 18 credit units per semester or 16 trimesters with at least 12 credit per trimester’, evidence provided indicates that all students enrolled in the 1st trimester of the academic year 2017-2018 have opted for version 1 of the plan, despite their employment status (working/nonworking), which indicates that the suggested solution is not effective. Moreover, interviewed students explained that although they had signed on the 11 trimester plan, this was not binding as the current regulation allows them to register in less credits per semester and hence move between the two study plans. The Panel is concerned that the solutions suggested by the programme management do not differ, by any means, from what was available during the review conducted in January 2013 nor of what was available during the first follow-up visit in June 2016. Moreover, no evidence was provided of any detailed study of cohort performance in this regard that would enable informed decision-making and lead to practical solutions that can be adopted. Hence, the Panel recommends that the College should conduct a thorough study and utilise all relevant stakeholders’ feedback to consider the length of study allowed for full-time working students.

Recommendation 2.3: *Recruit experienced computer science PhD holders with appropriate specializations taking diversity into account.*

Judgement: *Partially Addressed*

At the time of this follow-up visit, the College of Computer Studies had employed nine full-time faculty members including the Dean and the Head of Programme; seven of whom hold a PhD degree and two MSc holders – one of whom was on three months

unpaid leave. The Panel studied the profile of the current faculty members and notes that collectively they provide the specializations needed for the delivery of the programme within the current size of the student body. Nonetheless, during the first follow-up visit, the College had 11 faculty members. The Panel is concerned that the reduction in the faculty size is mainly due to the fact that AMAIUB bases its needs of faculty primarily on students-to-staff ratio, as was confirmed by the interviewed staff during the site visit, which is not a sufficient measure and is more business oriented rather than academic oriented. Moreover, out of the nine faculty members, three had joined the programme after the first follow-up visit. From the progress report and interviews conducted during the second follow-up visit, the Panel learned that the changes in academic staff recruitment is mainly to replace MSc holders' faculty members with PhD holders. Nonetheless, data provided indicates that at least three PhD holders who were employed by the College during the first follow-up visit were not part of the faculty responsible for the delivery of the programme at the time of this visit. Therefore, the Panel is - as was in the first follow-up visit – concerned with the instability within the college's faculty. This raises a concern in the ability of the College and the University to retain its faculty members and ensure that there are sufficient faculty members with appropriate specializations to deliver the programme and support the continuous implementation of the programme's improvement plans. Hence, the Panel considers this recommendation partially addressed.

Recommendation 2.4: *Implement suitable plans to improve the quality of research output of its faculty members.*

Judgement: *Partially Addressed*

Goal 6 of AMAIUB's 2016-2021 strategic plan is to 'foster a research culture in the university delivering a consistent stream of applied research'. To this end, the progress report states that the Computing Technology Research Group (CTRG), which was established in the 2nd Trimester 2015-2016, has conducted a number of workshops to support and build the research capacity of junior faculty members. This was confirmed by faculty interviewed during the follow-up visit. Moreover, the Research Centre, which operates at the institution level, also conducts activities to improve the faculty members' skills in performing research and writing scientific papers. During interview sessions, the Panel was informed that the college's operational plan is aligned with the institutional five-year strategic plan that emphasises the importance of research. Minutes of meetings show how the annual planning of college's research activities is conducted in a collaborative manner. The College also has developed a research agenda and is in the process of implementing it. Interviewed faculty members indicated that they are expected to allocate at least nine hours per week for their research activities and report on these for their annual appraisal. Moreover, they are expected to publish at least one paper each academic year. This is achieved through

encouraging group and multi-disciplinary research. There is an adopted strategy for group research and evidence provided indicates that this strategy is resulting in improvement of research outcomes, especially in relation to group and multi-disciplinary research activities that, if maintained, can lead to the university's research profile being enriched. This can be achieved if the stability of faculty members is maintained within the College (see paragraph under Recommendation 2.3). Hence, the Panel considers the recommendation partially addressed.

3. Indicator 3: Academic standards of the graduates

This section evaluates the extent to which the BSCS programme of AMAIUB, has addressed the recommendations outlined in the programme review report of January 2013, and not fully addressed during the first follow-up visit of June 2015, under Indicator 3: Academic standards of the graduates; and as a consequence, provides a judgment regarding the level of implementation of each recommendation for this Indicator as outlined in Appendix 1 of this Report.

Recommendation 3.1: *Ensure that assessments meet the set course ILOs.*

Judgement: *Partially Addressed*

The programme adopts a formal mechanism to align assessments with the Course Intended Learning Outcomes (CILOs) through specializations' coordinators and different approval levels that involves the Dean, Head of Programme and course coordinator as evident from the course files. The course coordinator prepares the Table of Specification (TOS) for each assessment method where questions are mapped to specific Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs), topics covered and the type of measured knowledge and/or skills. The TOS identifies the marks allocated for each ILO to determine the weight of measuring a particular ILO within an assessment instrument. The TOS is endorsed by the Head of Programme, and the Dean. An internal pre-assessment moderation is then conducted by the specialization coordinator in order to ensure that the designed assessment tools have collectively addressed all CILOs. The Panel notes that interviewed faculty members were aware of this mechanism and the course files show a consistent implementation of this mechanism. There are currently six specialization coordinators responsible for conducting internal pre-assessment moderation of all courses' examinations, including courses delivered by the Head of Programme and the Dean. The six specializations are categorised according to the Association for Computing Machinery (ACM) knowledge domain. The Panel studied the CVs of specialization coordinators and found them appropriate and possess a variety of expertise in computer science sub-specializations. However, the Panel is concerned with the current mechanism in place to calculate the attainments of the PILOs. In interviews with faculty, the Panel learned that the faculty members take the average of students' achievements for each course and then group courses mapped to a specific PILO and take the average of these courses to calculate the attainment of this PILO. The Panel, however, finds this process inaccurate and does not provide the full picture with regard to students' performance and attainment. For example, students' outcomes from an assessment in a course might be reported low but this will not be captured because of the averaging mechanism with other courses mapped to the same PILO. Hence, the Panel considers this recommendation partially addressed and recommends that the College, in collaboration with the University, revise the

mechanism in place to calculate the attainment of PILOs to ensure that assessments meet the set CILOs.

Recommendation 3.3: *Review its assessment policies to ensure that all assessments are checked internally for correctness and conformance to the ILOs before being used.*

Judgement: *Fully Addressed*

The College revised its internal moderation process to exclude the Dean and the Head of Programme from the specialization coordinators list because of the administrative load to manage the programme. Furthermore, the number of specialization coordinators increased since last follow-up visit to six coordinators starting 2nd Trimester of the academic year 2016-2017, as discussed in the previous recommendation (3.1). The Panel also noted that each specialization coordinator is assigned a maximum of six courses with three examinations each. In meetings with the faculty, they explained that this workload is high but extending the time of the pre-assessment moderation from two weeks to three weeks has provided them with adequate time to comment on the assessment tool before setting the examinations. The Panel; however, encourages the College to investigate this issue and propose a more effective solution to further improve the moderation process. The specialization coordinators ensure consistency amongst their evaluation process using a similar template as presented in the course files. During the site visit, faculty members expressed their satisfaction with the comments provided by the moderators and the impact of the suggestions received from the moderation process to improve their assessment tools. Students have also noticed improvements in the assessment tools, as reported during interview sessions. During the site visit, the Panel studied the pre-assessment moderation documents and found that many assessments had to be revised more than once for correctness and conformance to the ILOs before being used. Moreover, the pre-assessment moderation process is currently covering all written examinations including prelim, midterm and final examinations. There is also a post-assessment moderation process to ensure that the first marker has made a correct and accurate decision when grading the student's examination paper and that it is graded according to the assessment criteria. Hence, the Panel is satisfied with the level of progress achieved in addressing this recommendation.

Recommendation 3.5: *Review its policy so that the external examiner takes a more active role in the moderation instruments and assessment results.*

Judgement: *Fully Addressed*

As stated in the progress report, there is a developed and implemented external moderation process across the University. Moreover, during the follow-up visit, the

Panel confirmed that all assessments from prelim to final periods are externally moderated starting the 3rd Trimester of the academic year 2016-2017. In addition, the College appointed two external examiners to cover wider range of specializations within the programme. The CVs provided indicate that both examiners possess wide experience in the computer science fields. The Panel scrutinised the course files and the sample of submitted external reports and found them of benefit to improve the assessment tools used in the BSCS programme. For example, in one of the reports, the external examiner has recommended a complete revision for the used rubrics in some courses to ensure consistency of students' assessments. Interviewed faculty members also expressed their gratitude toward the feedback received from the external examiners, and the specialization coordinators explained how these reports helped to strengthen the internal moderation process. Hence, the Panel is satisfied with the level of progress in addressing this recommendation. Nonetheless, the Panel encourages the College to revise the infinite iteration of the moderation process between internal and external moderators, so it will not lead to more workload on the specialization coordinators and faculty members.

Recommendation 3.6: *Undertake a detailed study and analysis of the retention rate on the programme.*

Judgement: *Partially Addressed*

The progress report states that the College has conducted cohort analysis on retention through the Office of Institutional Research and found that retention rates in 2015 and 2016 is 73.3% and 73.9% respectively while it was 70.4% and 72.4% in 2013 and 2014 respectively. During the site visit, the Panel learned that the College provides a variety of support to ensure progression of students in the BSCS programme. For example, there are tutorial sessions provided by the lecturers to students who need academic support in some courses. These tutorial sessions were appreciated by the interviewed students who found them useful and supportive. In addition, there is an academic advisor for each student to ensure smooth progress of students throughout the study plan. The Panel also noted the action taken by the College to ensure course offerings through an early scoping of course preferences for each upcoming trimester to facilitate students' progression and retain them. This action is appreciated by both the working and non-working students. However, no formal detailed study of the reasons behind the attrition of students was provided to the Panel. The Panel acknowledges the actions taken by the College and recommends that the College formally study in more details the reasons behind the low retention rates and assess the effectiveness of its mitigation process. Hence, the Panel considers the recommendation partially addressed.

4. Indicator 4: Effectiveness of quality management and assurance

This section evaluates the extent to which the BSCS programme of AMAIUB, has addressed the recommendations outlined in the programme review report of January 2013, and not fully addressed during the first follow-up visit of June 2015, under Indicator 4: Effectiveness of quality management and assurance; and as a consequence, provides a judgment regarding the level of implementation of each recommendation for this Indicator as outlined in Appendix 1 of this Report.

Recommendation 4.2: *Develop and implement an inclusive decision-making process.*

Judgement: *Partially Addressed*

The progress report indicates that this recommendation was addressed at an institutional level by empowering faculty members through discussing relevant academic and administrative issues in regular faculty meetings and, as a result, concerns are raised from the faculty members' level to the college and university levels. There are committees at different levels, which serve as the custodians of relevant policies, and the evidence provided shows that faculty members are deployed in these committees. Interviewed programme management stressed that being a small College/Department, informal communication also provides a venue for an inclusive decision-making process. Nonetheless, the site visit interviews illustrated that faculty members are mainly responsible for the execution of decisions taken at a higher management level while planning and decision-making is seen to be at the Dean-level or higher. Ownership is still not seen at an individual level. Therefore, the Panel concludes that this recommendation is partially addressed and recommends that the College should continue working on the culture adopted within the University to ensure the full adoption of an inclusive-culture, in relation to decision-making.

Recommendation 4.4: *Develop and implement a policy and procedures to communicate findings and improvements to the different stakeholders.*

Judgement: *Fully Addressed*

The progress report states that AMAIUB has developed and implemented a policy on university surveys and established a survey manual. The Panel studied the provided policy and noted that it stipulates guidelines on how findings and improvements should be communicated to different stakeholders. During interview sessions, the Panel was informed that the institution conducts two annual meetings; the career fair and the alumni homecoming where actions taken based on their feedback is communicated to each of the concerned party. The Panel also noted during the follow-

up visit that surveys' outcomes and actions taken as a result are published on the college's bulletin board, which was also confirmed by interviewed students. Interviewed PIAP members also indicated that they are provided with feedback on the issues they raise, which was confirmed from the minutes of meetings provided on site. The Panel is satisfied with the progress the College achieved in addressing this recommendation.

Recommendation 4.5: *Increase professional development activities for faculty members in areas of real academic value.*

Judgement: *Partially Addressed*

AMAIUB has developed a 'Faculty Development Plan' for the academic year 2016-2017, which is linked to the university's strategic goals. As a result of this plan, a number of specialised workshops and training activities have been conducted. The Panel notes that these activities are in general of an academic value and enrich faculty's professional skills that are relevant to the programme and its delivery. Interviewed faculty members indicated their satisfaction with the professional development they receive. They explained how the reorientation programme - delivered at the beginning of every academic year by the Faculty Development Committee, and attended by all faculty members - facilitates awareness of good practices relevant to higher education and how these would affect the institution's strategy. Moreover, individual needs are identified through the appraisal system and the revised training needs' questionnaire, which the Panel was informed is administered to individual faculty members from the 3rd Trimester of the academic year 2016-2017. These together with the Faculty Development Plan are utilised to develop individual faculty development plans. This process has been implemented recently and its effectiveness is yet to be assessed. The Panel acknowledges the efforts of the College in addressing this recommendation and recommends that the College should further ensure that key academic training needs, such as design of assessment tools, are identified and effectively addressed (see paragraph under recommendation 3.3). Moreover, the low retention rates amongst faculty members also causes a challenge in this regard. Therefore, the Panel considers this recommendation partially addressed.

Recommendation 4.6: *Widen the area of labour market scoping including private and public sectors to diversify its sources of data.*

Judgement: *Fully Addressed*

As indicated in the progress report, a formal study was conducted to evaluate the labour market needs with regard to computer science in the public and private sector of the Kingdom of Bahrain and the eastern region of Saudi Arabia. During interview sessions, the Panel was provided with a number of examples on how the outcomes of

this study have been used to inform decision-making concerning to the programme direction and the courses needed. The Panel examined the provided study document and was satisfied that the study is detailed and comprehensive; and that the outcomes support the development of the programme and its content in line with the local and regional market needs, as evidenced by the improvements introduced to the programme and its content. Hence, the Panel is satisfied with the progress the College has achieved in addressing this recommendation.

5. Conclusion

Taking into account the institution's own progress report, the evidence gathered from the interviews and documentation made available during the second follow-up visit, the Panel draws the following conclusion in accordance with the DHR/BQA Follow-up Visits of Academic Programme Reviews Procedure:

The Bachelor of Science in Computer Science programme offered by AMA International University – Bahrain has made Adequate Progress.

Appendix 1: Judgement per recommendation.

Judgement	Standard
Fully Addressed	The institution has demonstrated marked progress in addressing the recommendation. The actions taken by the programme team have led to significant improvements in the identified aspect and, as a consequence, in meeting the Indicator's requirements.
Partially Addressed	The institution has taken positive actions to address the recommendation. There is evidence that these actions have produced improvements and that these improvements are sustainable. The actions taken are having a positive, yet limited impact on the ability of the programme to meet the Indicator's requirements.
Not Addressed	The institution has not taken appropriate actions to address the recommendation and/or actions taken have little or no impact on the quality of the programme delivery and the academic standards. Weaknesses persist in relation to this recommendation.

Appendix 2: Overall Judgement.

Overall Judgement	Standard
Good progress	The institution has fully addressed the majority of the recommendations contained in the review report, and/or previous follow-up report, these include recommendations that have most impact on the quality of the programme, its delivery and academic standards. The remaining recommendations are partially addressed. No further follow-up visit is required.
Adequate progress	The institution has at least partially addressed most of the recommendations contained in the review report and/or previous follow-up report, including those that have major impact on the quality of the programme, its delivery and academic standards. There is a number of recommendations that have been fully addressed and there is evidence that the institution can maintain the progress achieved. No further follow-up visit is required.
Inadequate progress	The institution has made little or no progress in addressing a significant number of the recommendations contained in the review report and/or previous follow-up report, especially those that have main impact on the quality of the programme, its delivery and academic standards. For first follow-up visits, a second follow-up visit is required,