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 Arts in Communication and Multimedia Department of Communication and Multimedia

University College of Bahrain

Kingdom of Bahrain

First Follow-up Visit Date: 16-18 June 2019
Review Date: 12–15 December 2016
HC093-C2-F012

Table of Contents

Acronyms

BACM	Bachelor of Arts in Communication and Multimedia
BQA	Education & Training Quality Authority
CGPA	Cumulative Grade Point Average
CILO	Course Intended Learning Outcome
ESC	Examination and Scheduling Committee
GD	Graphic Design
HEC	Higher Education Council
HoD	Head of Department
HR	Human Resources
ILO	Intended Learning Outcome
IT	Information Technology
LITC	Library and IT Committee
LLC	Life-Long Learning Committee
LTCD	Learning, Teaching and Curriculum Committee
MIS	Management Information System
NQF	National Qualifications Framework
PDP	Professional Development Plan
PILO	Programme Intended Learning Outcome
PR	Public Relations
QA	Quality Assurance
QAAC	Quality Assurance and Accreditation Committee
SARMC	Student Affairs, Recruitment and Marketing Committee'
SRC	Scientific Research Council
ToRs	Terms of Reference

BQA

Programme Follow-up Report – Programme-within-College Reviews – University College of Bahrain - Department of Communication and Multimedia - Bachelor of Arts in Communication and Multimedia - 16-18 June 2019   2

UCB	University College of Bahrain
UEB	University Examination Board
UFC	University Finance Committee
VP	Vice President

BQA

Programme Follow-up Report – Programme-within-College Reviews – University College of Bahrain - Department of Communication and Multimedia - Bachelor of Arts in Communication and Multimedia - 16-18 June 2019   *3*

The Programme Follow- up Visit Overview

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

The 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'.

This Report provides an account of the follow-up process and findings of the follow-up panel (the Panel), whereby the Bachelor of Arts in Communication and Multimedia (BACM), at the University College of Bahrain (UCB) was revisited on 16-18 June 2019, to assess its progress in line with the published Programmes-within-College Reviews Framework and the BQA regulations.

A.   Aims of the Follow-up Visit

(i)   Assess the progress made against the recommendations highlighted in the review report (in accordance with the four BQA Indicators) of UCB's BACM since the programme was reviewed on 12–15 December 2016.

(ii)   Provide further information and support for the continuous improvement of academic standards and quality enhancement of higher education provision, specifically within the BACM programme at UCB, and for higher education provision within the Kingdom of Bahrain, as a whole.

B.   Background

The review of the BACM programme, at UCB in the Kingdom of Bahrain was conducted by the DHR of the BQA on 12–15 December 2016.

The overall judgement of the review panel for the BACM programme, of UCB was that of **'no confidence'**. Consequently, the follow-up process incorporated the review of the evidence presented by UCB to the DHR, the Improvement Plan submitted to BQA in January 2018, the progress report and its supporting materials, which were submitted in March 2019, and the documents submitted during the follow-up site visit and those extracted from the interview sessions.

The external review panel's judgement on the UCB's BACM programme for each Indicator was as follows:

BQA

Programme Follow-up Report – Programme-within-College Reviews – University College of Bahrain - Department of Communication and Multimedia - Bachelor of Arts in Communication and Multimedia - 16-18 June 2019   *4*

Indicator 1: The learning programme; '**not 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'**

The follow-up visit was conducted by a panel consisting of two members. This follow-up visit focused on assessing how the Institution addressed the recommendations of the report of the review conducted on 12–15 December 2016. For each recommendation given under the four Indicators, the Panel judged whether the recommendation is 'fully addressed', 'partially addressed', or 'not addressed' using the rubric in Appendix 1. An overall judgement of 'good progress', 'adequate progress' or 'inadequate progress' is given based on the rubric provided in Appendix 2.

C. Overview of the - Bachelor of Arts in Communication and Multimedia

The Bachelor of Arts in Communication and Multimedia (BACM) is the only programme offered by the Department of Arts, Communication and Multimedia. The BACM was first offered as a 'Graphic Design Concentration' in the academic year 2003-2004 under the Information Technology programme. In the academic year 2007-2008, two additional concentrations, namely: Multimedia, and Public Relations were added, and the programme was renamed as the Bachelor of Arts in Communication and Multimedia. At the time of the follow-up site visit, the total number of enrolled students for the academic year 2018-2019 was 189 students: 42 in Graphic Design concentration, 20 in Multimedia concentration and 127 in Public Relations concentration. The total number of faculty members delivering the programme, at the time of the site visit, was five: one full-time assistant professor, one full time associate professor, and three lecturers, of whom two are part-timers.

1.   Indicator 1: The Learning Programme

This section evaluates the extent to which the BACM programme of UCB, has addressed the recommendations outlined in the programme review report of December 2016, 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 1.1: *revise the programme aims and the qualification's title to be more inclusive of the three current concentrations*

Judgement: *Not Addressed*

As per the progress report and evidence provided, the Department of Communication and Multimedia has prepared a proposal of a new structure of the programme, which suggests a new qualification title 'Graphics and Motion Design' accompanied with a new study plan. These were discussed by the Advisory Board in February 2019. During interviews, the senior management clarified that the proposal has been approved on both the department and quality assurance levels, but is still under discussion internally by the senior management and will eventually be submitted for HEC approval.

Upon examining the proposed study plan and as was clarified during interviews, the Panel found that the suggested qualification titled 'Graphics and Motion Design' includes two main concentrations, namely: Graphics and Motion Design. The Panel learned, based on the Advisory Board recommendation, that Public Relations (PR) concentration will be moved to the Business Department. Nonetheless, PR courses will remain available for the 'Graphics and Motion Design' students as electives. The Panel reviewed the new study plan and noted that the total number of credit hours of the suggested award is 131 credits. However, during interviews, the senior management confirmed that the total credit hours of the award will not exceed 125 credits and that the credit hours as shown in the provided evidence may change, since the proposal has not yet been finalized internally.

As for the programme aims, the Panel examined the programme specification document, which was last updated in December 2018, and noted that it includes the same four generic aims, as was in the last review visit. The progress report states that these will be revised once the new qualification's title and new concentrations' structure are approved.

Accordingly, the Panel considers this recommendation as not addressed.

Recommendation 1.2: *unify the total credit hours required for the three concentrations*

Judgement: *Partially Addressed*

In addition to the new study plan of the new qualification title, UCB has also revised the current study plan of the BACM programme. This plan was named 'the proposed study plan for the academic year 2019-2020'. The Panel examined this plan and noted that the total credits for the three concentrations has been unified to 122 credits. Moreover, the total credits of the compulsory courses were unified to 30 credits for each of the three concentrations. The Panel also noted a balance between credits allocated for elective courses in each of the three concentrations. However, the Panel learned during interviews and from the provided evidence that this unification was approved by the Department in June 2017 and has been included into the programme specifications in December 2018, therefore, it will be implemented starting from the academic year 2019-2020.

The Panel recognises the changes made to address this recommendation; however, since the plan is continuously being revised and has not yet been implemented, the Panel is of the opinion that this recommendation is partially addressed.

Recommendation 1.3: *revise the curriculum of the Public Relations concentration to ensure the balance between theory and practice*

Judgement: *Partially Addressed*

The Panel examined the study plan proposed for the academic year 2019-2020 and notes that in relation to the PR concentration, there is a balance between theory and practice in terms of course titles. However, the Panel notes that the study plan has not yet been implemented, and as mentioned in other parts of this Report, there is a lack of specialized staff and resources, which the Panel is concerned may impede the achievement of this balance. Therefore, the Panel is of the view that this recommendation is partially addressed.

Recommendation 1.4: *revise the specifications of all courses to ensure their consistency and that the syllabus is proper and supported by more up-to-date books, digital resources and current research underpinning the three concentrations*

Judgement: *Not Addressed*

The progress report indicates that course specifications for the three concentrations were reviewed by an external reviewer (see recommendation 4.4); accordingly, 'the course specifications for the Graphic Design (GD) concentration have been

comprehensively updated for Semester 2 2018-2019'. The Panel confirmed this upon examining the provided evidence, as it shows that the GD courses were internally and externally moderated, for example: 'Typography II' (GRD 214), 'Illustration' (GRD 133), and 'Colour Fundamental' (GRD 132). During interviews with senior management, the Panel learned that the same procedures are underway for the Multimedia and PR concentrations.

The Panel examined the course specifications and noted that the textbooks of some courses need to be updated, such as: 'Video Effects Studio' (MMP 308), 'New Media Technologies' (MMP 306) and 'Public Opinion' (COM 309). Other courses have textbooks that are unsuitable for their topics, such as: 'Public Relations Campaigns' (COM 402). In addition, there are no digital resources in most of the courses. Moreover, the Panel did not find evidence to support that current research findings inform the content and delivery of the courses. Thus, the Panel is of the view that these issues need to be addressed; and therefore, concludes that this recommendation is not addressed.

Recommendation 1.5: *review and revise the concentrations' intended learning outcomes as well as the alignment of the programme intended learning outcomes with the revised programme aims*

Judgement: *Not Addressed*

In the BACM review report of 2016, it was noted that the Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) for each concentration were excessive and repetitive; and therefore, revision was recommended. As per the progress report, the revision of the concentrations' ILOs 'is being undertaken and will be considered for approval at the full internal and external programme review in Spring 2018-2019'. However, the Panel was not provided with any evidence to support this claim, and it was stated, during interviews with senior management, that the concentrations no longer have ILOs specific to each of them. However, the Panel finds this not advisable due to the different nature of each concentration.

Furthermore, the Panel noted that neither the Programme Intended Learning Outcomes (PILOs) nor the programme aims has been revised. Moreover, there is no evidence on the alignment of the PILOs with the programme aims. The only evidence provided to the Panel shows the alignment of the Course Intended Learning Outcomes (CILOs) to the PILOs. Thus, the Panel concludes that the recommendation is not addressed.

Recommendation 1.6: *review the course intended learning outcomes to ensure that the learning outcomes expected of students are clearly stated in all courses, realistic, and suitable for the type and level of the course, and then map them appropriately to the programme learning outcomes and the revised concentrations' intended learning outcomes*

Judgement: *Not Addressed*

The progress report states that the CILOs for the GD concentration have been revisited and updated, and a complete review will take place in Spring 2018-2019 for the other two concentrations. By the time of the site visit, the Panel was provided with evidence that shows updated course specifications, which include revised CILOs for courses of the three concentrations. However, the Panel noted, upon examining the evidence that most of the 100-level courses include critical thinking skills, while some practical 400-level courses, such as: 'Interactive Media' (GRD 427) do not. This was justified during interviews with senior management that students should be trained on critical thinking starting from level 1, which the Panel did not find to be a sufficient justification (see recommendation 3.7).

Evidence provided included the mapping of the courses to the PILOs, without including the revisited CILOs in the mapping. Moreover, the external reviewer report has confirmed that the mapping between PILOs and CILOs for the BACM programme has not been included in the programme specification. Also, the Panel is of the view that mapping the revised CILOs to PILOs that have not been reviewed or revised is a flawed practice; and accordingly, the response of the Institution to this recommendation is limited. Hence, the Panel is of the view that this recommendation is not addressed.

Recommendation 1.7: *streamline the Internship course in the programme content, governance, course intended learning outcomes and assessment to ensure common understanding amongst different stakeholders*

Judgement: *Partially Addressed*

In the BACM review report of 2016, it was stated that the internship course had a different title, code and arrangements in each of the three concentrations; and therefore, adjustments were recommended. The progress report indicates that a new 'Internship Course' (CGM 400) is now offered across the three concentrations, based on the department's approval on 7th June 2017. The new course specification shows that the internship course is now a programme requirement. Moreover, the ILOs, the assessment policy and provisions on academic integrity are clearly identified in the course specification.

The internship performance form contains six items for the intern's evaluation, which include: teamwork and cooperation skills, technical skills, leadership skills, motivation, communication skills and professional development. The Panel is of the view that these criteria cover the ILO's of the course and are appropriate for the course type and level. Thus, the Panel acknowledges the efforts to streamline the Internship course in the programme content.

In the BACM review report of 2016, it was noted that while the internship handbook stated that the site supervisor awards 70% of the final mark to the student and the course instructor awards 30%, instructors and site supervisors were not clear about this. As per the 'Practicum Handbook' of 2018-2019, these percentages remain the same; however, all interviewed site supervisors were not clear about the percentage of their evaluation to the full grade. Therefore, the Panel concludes that this recommendation is partially addressed.

Recommendation 1.8: *expose the faculty to current research and scholarship in teaching and learning and ensure that their teaching methods are up-to-date and leading in their field of expertise by expanding its continuous Professional Development activities for the faculty*

Judgement: *Partially Addressed*

The progress report indicates that UCB has expanded its continuous professional activities for the faculty; citing for mention establishing a Scientific Research Council (SRC) to replace its Academic Research Committee and developing a new research strategy. UCB has also a Lifelong Learning Committee (LLC) which looks specifically at staff development needs. Moreover, the senior management has clarified during interviews that the Vice President (VP) -himself- has presented a number of workshops including a 'Research Strategy Development' workshop on 21st November 2018, which focused on how research informs teaching. Interviews with the faculty showed that these workshops were compulsory for all faculty members.

The Panel reviewed the minutes of the LLC meeting and noted that members of the Committee planned and implemented a number of workshops to enhance the faculty's teaching methods, such as: formative assessment and team building for UCB's staff. However, the Panel noted that the presenters in these workshops were not selected for their experience in the field, but rather they were faculty members who are interested in the topic of the workshop. Moreover, the Panel was not provided with evidence on how these workshops enhanced the teaching methods of the faculty. Interviews with the senior management and evidence provided show that feedback on these workshops was measured and analysed and that the VP ensures the attendance of all faculty members.

BQA
Programme Follow-up Report – Programme-within-College Reviews – University College of Bahrain - Department of
Communication and Multimedia - Bachelor of Arts in Communication and Multimedia - 16-18 June 2019   *10*

The minutes of the SRC meetings show that the members discussed several topics, such as: the establishment of a database for scientific research at UCB, organizing an internal research seminar, and updating university website for research. However, there is no evidence that any of these activities were implemented.

Based on the above, the Panel finds that efforts done by UCB are partially addressing this recommendation, and is of the view that the College would benefit from including more experienced presenters in its workshops, in addition to documenting the linkage between the planned professional development activities and teaching methods' updates.

Recommendation 1.9: *develop and implement a robust policy and procedures to detect and prevent plagiarism.*

Judgement: *Partially Addressed*

UCB has an 'Academic Honesty and Integrity Policy' which was last reviewed and updated in October 2018. From interviews and as detailed in the policy, the academic misconduct cases are investigated initially within the Department and then submitted to the Examination Scheduling Committee (ESC) for a final decision of any penalty to be imposed. ESC's decisions are reported to the University Examination Board (UEB) with the Chairperson of ESC being also a member of UEB. In addition to this policy, UCB developed a new 'plagiarism guidance and procedures in October 2018, which includes: the definition of plagiarism, the impact of plagiarism on students and instructors, the plagiarism detection tools, and refers to the 'Academic Honesty and Integrity Policy' for detection procedures and penalties. The procedures, as shown in the Policy, clarify that multiple plagiarism cases could lead to failing the course, suspension for a whole semester or dismissal from the College. However, the Panel noted that the policy did not specify the exact penalty for each violation. In addition, by examining samples of detected plagiarised cases and actions taken, the Panel noticed that the process is not strictly and consistently adhered to.

In the BACM review report of 2016, it was stated that there is no provision of plagiarism in the assessment policy. In this follow-up, the Panel noted that there is a provision of academic integrity in the assessment policy of the internship course only, while in other courses the students are referred to the plagiarism provisions stated in the Student Handbook.

'Grammerly' software is used to detect the similarity percentage of texts submitted by students, moreover, it was confirmed to the Panel during interviews with senior management that there are negotiations to purchase 'Turnitin' to be used in the academic year 2019-2020. The progress report also indicates that Google image is used to check plagiarism in images (visual plagiarism). However, there is no mention that

BQA
Programme Follow-up Report – Programme-within-College Reviews – University College of Bahrain - Department of
Communication and Multimedia - Bachelor of Arts in Communication and Multimedia - 16-18 June 2019   11

detecting plagiarism for all coursework is compulsory and there is no evidence that Grammerly software is being used. Moreover, interviews with faculty showed that some of them depend on their previous work/teaching experience in detecting plagiarism, while others admitted that they have no idea that a detecting software is available.

Thus, the Panel acknowledges the revised academic honesty and integrity policy; however, it should be clearly communicated to students in the course specification and strictly adhered to. In addition, the plagiarism-detection software needs to be more advanced. Hence, the Panel concludes that this recommendation is partially addressed.

BQA

Programme Follow-up Report – Programme-within-College Reviews – University College of Bahrain - Department of Communication and Multimedia - Bachelor of Arts in Communication and Multimedia - 16-18 June 2019   *12*

2.   Indicator 2: Efficiency of the Programme

This section evaluates the extent to which the BACM programme of UCB, has addressed the recommendations outlined in the programme review report of December 2016, under Indicator 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: *conduct a study to evaluate students' performance against admission levels and revise the admission requirements accordingly*

Judgement: *Not Addressed*

The progress report indicates that the admission requirements for the BACM programme were reviewed and approved by the Quality Assurance and Accreditation Committee (QAAC) in November 2018. However, no evidence was provided to support that the admission requirements were revised based on a study conducted to evaluate students' performance against admission levels, other than a statistics sheet that shows students' grades in high school and their current Cumulative Grade Point Average (CGPA).

The progress report also states that the updated admission requirements are available in the programme specifications. When examining the provided evidence, the Panel noted that only the admission requirements for the GD concentration have been updated to include a portfolio submission in addition to the general requirements. Moreover, the Panel notes that there is no mention of the weight of the portfolio submission with regard to the admission process as a whole, and how the programme will deal with students who fail to submit a successful portfolio.

The provided evidence shows that the new admission requirements for the GD concentration were based on a proposal presented to the QAAC by two staff members from the GD concentration in February 2018. The proposal includes an assessment rubric, and a comparison table of admission criteria in different programmes locally and internationally. However, the Panel was not provided with any evidence on updating the admission requirements for the other two concentrations. When inquiring about this during interviews with senior management, the Panel learned that the reason behind this is that the qualification title and its concentrations will be changed to include mainly Graphics and Motion Design, and therefore their focus was on the GD concentration.

Based on the abovementioned, the Panel is of the view that the recommendation to conduct a study to evaluate student's performance against admission levels and use

its results along with stakeholders' feedback in revising the admission requirements is not addressed.

Recommendation 2.2: *assign a coordinator for each concentration to be formally responsible for the academic performance in their concentration and assist the head of department in the process of decision-making*

Judgement: *Not Addressed*

The progress report states that the Department intends to revise the number and nature of the three concentrations, to ensure that these are appropriate for the programme title and aims. In doing so, the Department 'will take account of the academic expertise of individual members of academic staff in the department in terms of how responsibility for their management, delivery and further development will be assigned amongst them'. During interviews, the Panel clarified this statement from the senior management, and learned that due to the extreme shortage of academic staff (as indicated in recommendation 2.3) – only one or two staff members in each concentration- all staff members are present in all meetings and participate in the process of decision-making. Hence, they are involved in the decision-making process within their concentration. However, the Panel is of the view that this recommendation is not addressed, due to not having an official appointment of a concentration coordinator yet.

Recommendation 2.3: *develop and implement a long-term, comprehensive plan that ensures the recruitment of a sufficient number of qualified academic staff to cover the requirements of the programme's three concentrations, and the reasonable re-allocation of teaching loads to enable academic staff to cover academic administrative duties and further develop research*

Judgement: *Not Addressed*

The progress report states that 'the specific staffing needs and allocation of staff to courses will be taken into account in the planning for the full programme review in Spring 2018-2019'. The Panel was provided with evidence on the current academic staff numbers, ranks and courses taught by each faculty member (one full time assistant professor (the HoD), one full time associate professor, in addition to three lecturers (two of them are part-timers)). However, the Panel is concerned that the number of full-time faculty members has currently decreased, as it was seven in Fall 2016-2017 (one professor, two associate professors, one assistant professor, and three lecturers). Moreover, through examining more evidence, the Panel found that there is a case of PR courses being taught by a non-specialised faculty member. In addition, the Panel heard different answers from staff when asked if there are office spaces

available for the part-timers, while the students mentioned that the part timers neither have offices nor office hours.

The Panel was provided with an undated and unsigned 'Recruitment and Professional Development Plan (PDP) 2018-2019', which describes the process of recruitment and its general requirements. The Panel was also provided with a 'Workforce Plan 2019-2020', prepared by the Department of Human Resources (HR) and approved by the President in February 2019, which shows a need to recruit three assistant/associate professors in the Department by September 2019. Nevertheless, the Panel notes with concern that there is no evidence on a comprehensive long-term recruitment plan, or on following a systemic process to address the department's needs for recruitment. For example: it was not evident to the Panel how the number of the needed staff was decided, and what are the measures taken by the Department to compensate the serious shortage of staff.

The shortage of qualified academic staff to cover the requirements of the programme's three concentrations has led to high teaching loads for the current few available faculty members and has deeply affected their conduct of research. Moreover, evidence provided shows no published research since the last BQA review visit.

Based on the abovementioned, this recommendation is not addressed.

Recommendation 2.4: *ensure the accuracy of data provided through the management information system and utilize its periodic reports in decision-making*

Judgement: *Fully Addressed*

The progress report states that the Management Information System (MIS) is used to analyze students' data. The provided evidence shows a number of surveys conducted through the MIS system, and a brief explanation on the LOGSIS, which is a Student Information System (SIS) utilized to generate a wide range of reports. The evidence also includes a sample of minutes of meetings of the Learning, Teaching and Curriculum Committee (LTCD) and the 'Student Affairs, Recruitment and Marketing Committee' (SARMC), which show the utilization of generated reports in decision-making. During interviews with faculty and senior management, the Panel learned that different types of reports could be generated by various decision-making individuals through the MIS system. The Panel was also informed that the QAAC is responsible for data analysis and action planning, which in turn communicates this information to different decision-making levels upon request. Hence, the Panel is satisfied that this recommendation is fully addressed.

Recommendation 2.5: *review the available physical and material resources and develop a plan to update the Graphic Design and Multimedia hardware and software, add more laboratories for Public Relations students and purchase the necessary equipment for video production*

Judgement: *Not Addressed*

The progress report indicates that in 2017, UCB had upgraded the GD laboratory by purchasing and installing six dedicated iMacs. Evidence provided shows two software purchases made in 2017 and 2019. In addition, a policy for 'ICT learning resources' had been published in December 2018. During the site visit, the Panel had the chance to visit the GD laboratory and confirmed the new purchases. However, for the PR laboratory and the necessary equipment for video production, the resources are still limited and insufficient. For example, the Panel learned during interviews with students that they are all required to purchase a professional camera for some practical courses; in addition, if professional high-resolution printing is needed, they always resort to an external service provider to get the job done.

The progress report indicates that, in the academic year 2018-2019, the former Library committee and IT committee were merged together into one formal committee named Library and IT Committee (LITC). The LITC is responsible for overseeing the ICT infrastructure and resourcing. It also reviews the department's requests for resources and raises them to the University Finance Committee (UFC) for approval. Since establishment, the Committee has held two meetings. In its first meeting, dated February 2018, the Committee had discussed and approved its terms of reference, in addition to certain matters related to updating and upgrading different resources, such as: the purchase of a Turnitin license, upgrading the software and hardware in the classrooms and in some staff offices, replacing the XP PCs, and developing a new learning resources policy. However, no evidence was provided on developing a 'plan' to update physical resources and upgrade IT resources. Furthermore, through interviews and as per provided evidence, the Panel notes that purchases are made upon individual request from the concerned department, which further supports the claim that there is no 'plan'.

Although the Panel acknowledges the development of the 'ICT learning resources policy' and the updating of the 'Library and IT committee' ToRs, the impact of these is still insignificant. Hence, the Panel concludes that this recommendation is not addressed.

Recommendation 2.6: *improve the library provision with relevant up-to-date journals and text books, and renew the online databases subscription to support the learning of students in the programme.*

Judgement: *Not Addressed*

As mentioned earlier, the LITC is responsible for overseeing the ICT infrastructure and resourcing, and it has held two meetings since its establishment. In its second meeting, the Committee approved the department's request to purchase a list of magazines in the GD concentration, and during the site visit interviews the Panel learned that the College is in the process of purchasing this list in addition to other books. However, evidence provided shows that the last book purchases were made in 2016. Also, when touring the library, the Panel noticed that the lack in printed books has not yet been addressed and still persists.

For the electronic resources, the College has a valid subscription (Dec 2018 – Dec 2019) to the Questia Database. Furthermore, the Panel learned during interviews and from evidence that UCB is in communication with the Britannica database and the trail version is being assessed by the faculty members; once approved, it will be added to the library resources. The Panel is of the view that more specialised database subscriptions are paramount for developing the library's electronic resources.

Tracking students and faculty utilization of the library resources is done manually by the librarian on a monthly basis. The Panel examined the librarian monthly report and noted that it consists of six columns showing the following: Category of Users, No. Books Loan, No. Books return, Printing/photocopying, Reading/ Writing, Computer using, and Scanning, and in each column the librarian fills in the spaces with a certain number. The Panel finds that this manual report is an insufficient tool for tracking the library usage and lacks important information, such as for example: the titles frequently searched or downloaded, or the titles of books lent. Therefore, it is not clear how this report could be used to improve the library holdings or to evaluate students' needs.

Based on the abovementioned, this recommendation is not addressed.

Recommendation 2.7: *work, in collaboration with the institution, to make the premises accessible and user-friendly to students and employees with special needs*

Judgement: *Not Addressed*

As indicated in the progress report, UCB had updated its special needs policy in October 2018. In addition, the admission policy includes procedures for the applicants with special needs. UCB further employed a part-time student counsellor to support

students with special needs or difficulties. Currently, there are no formally registered students on the BACM programme with special needs. During the site visit, the Panel toured the campus and noted that it is still the same as was during the last review visit. However, the Panel learned through ad hoc interviews that there are plans to move the library to the ground floor. During interviews, the Panel learned also that if there is a case of a student with mobility needs, the whole class is moved to the ground floor.

Although the Panel noted that no changes have been made on the premises to make it accessible to staff and students with mobility needs or special needs, as recommended, the Panel learned during interviews and as indicated in the progress report and from provided evidence that UCB is in the process of developing a resource plan from the start of 2019-2020 to make the premises accessible and user-friendly for any staff or students with mobility needs. Hence, the Panel encourages UCB to expedite its development and implementation.

Based on the above, this recommendation is not addressed.

Recommendation 2.8: *explore alternative options to induct those students who do not attend the orientation sessions*

Judgement: *Partially Addressed*

The evidence provided explains that UCB conducts one orientation session every new academic year, although it accepts students on a semester basis: once in the Fall and once in the Spring. The Panel examined the list of students' attendance on the orientation day for Fall 2018-19 and noted that the number of BACM students who attended the orientation session was 13 (from the PR and GD concentrations).

As stated in the progress report, and confirmed during different interviews, students who miss orientation are referred to the Student Handbook, and the LTCD committee ensures that students receive the Handbook and the orientation presentation. During interviews with students, it was evident to the Panel that students who had missed the orientation session were not aware of some facilities and procedures.

The Panel confirmed during interviews with senior management and from the evidence provided that the effectiveness of the orientation session is evaluated through discussion at the SARMC, where the Student Council representative is present. The Panel also learned during interviews with senior management that the College is studying the formation of an 'Orientation Committee' and is planning to improve the whole process of induction, which the Panel highly encourages.

BQA
Programme Follow-up Report – Programme-within-College Reviews – University College of Bahrain - Department of
Communication and Multimedia - Bachelor of Arts in Communication and Multimedia - 16-18 June 2019   *18*

Acknowledging the future intends to improve the induction of new students and based on the abovementioned, the Panel considers this recommendation as partially addressed.

Recommendation 2.9: *revise the at-risk students' policy and evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention mechanisms to ensure that effective academic support is provided to this group of students.*

Judgement: *Partially Addressed*

The academic advising policy was revised and updated in October 2018. The policy did not provide a specific definition of 'at-risk students', as it includes identification criteria that the Panel finds too broad and vague. As per the Student Handbook, any student whose CGPA falls between 1.7-1.99 is issued an academic warning. If the CGPA falls below this range, the student is placed under academic probation. The provided evidence shows that the number of students issued academic warnings in Fall 2018-2019 was 18, and the number of students under academic probation was six. The Panel recognizes that these numbers are decreased in comparison with the numbers noted in the last review report of 2016.

The policy includes intervention mechanisms to support students at risk, such as reducing course registration to 12 Credit Hours per semester, repeating courses with 'F' and 'D' grades, providing assistance with academic or learning skills, mentoring students' progress by academic staff, or change in course. However, no evidence was provided on evaluating the effectiveness of the intervention mechanisms.

Based on the abovementioned, this recommendation is partially addressed.

3. Indicator 3: Academic standards of the graduates

This section evaluates the extent to which the BACM programme of UCB, has addressed the recommendations outlined in the programme review report of December 2016, 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: *revise the mapping of the reviewed programme aims and programme intended learning outcomes to the graduate attributes*

Judgement: *Not Addressed*

As per the BACM review report of 2016, graduate attributes were not stated in the Student Handbook or in the programme specification document. In addition, there was no proper alignment between the graduate attributes and the programme aims.

It was stated in the progress report that the programmes are mapped to the institution's graduate attributes, which are embedded in the PILOs; however as mentioned in this Report (recommendation 1.1), neither the programme aims nor PILOs were revised or mapped. Therefore, this recommendation is not addressed.

Recommendation 3.2: *amend the formal policy on benchmarking to state precisely and clearly the criteria used in selecting the institutions to be benchmarked with, and what is to be benchmarked, so that it includes all aspects of the programme and its outcomes, and develop a mechanism to incorporate the results of the benchmarking in the programme review*

Judgement: *Partially Addressed*

The progress report indicates that the UCB Benchmarking Policy was revised and updated in November 2018. The Panel notes that it includes clear criteria for the selection of universities for benchmarking purposes. It also states that the main purpose of benchmarking is to ensure that UCB programmes meet national and international standards including professional bodies and industry standards. Furthermore, the Panel found as evidence a 'benchmarking proposal form', which includes detailed procedures on the benchmarking process and the areas that should be covered.

Provided evidence clarifies that the benchmarking has been conducted to 'learn about current admission requirements or supportive material for design courses'. The Department Council at its meeting of January 2019 took a decision to form a benchmarking committee to benchmark the admission requirements of the GD and

Multimedia concentrations. In its meeting of March 2019, the outcome of benchmarking with three regional and one international universities and a professional body were discussed and changes to the admission requirements of GD were approved. However, no evidence on a benchmarking study was provided, and no evidence was provided on conducting benchmarking on the programme level. The Panel confirmed, during interviews with the senior management, that the benchmarking process has been conducted only once to benchmark the admission requirements of the GD concentration, and that the practice in UCB is to choose certain aspects for benchmarking when needs arise, other than conducting a full holistic benchmarking study covering all aspects of the programme.

Thus, the Panel appreciates the clear and formal Benchmarking policy; however, the programme will benefit from a more holistic study that includes all aspects of the programme and its outcomes, such as: internships, teaching and learning practices, student advising and counselling and co-curricular and extra-curricular activities, etc. Therefore, the Panel concludes that this recommendation is partially addressed.

Recommendation 3.3: *ensure the consistent implementation of the assessment policies across all courses and the regular revision of these policies*

Judgement: *Not Addressed*

As per the progress report, and supporting evidence, UCB updated its 'Assessment and Moderation Policy' in October 2018, to support teaching, learning and assessment. According to 'UCB Guidance - Assessment, Examination and Moderation', which was updated 2018, 'all courses/modules should ensure that there is clear formative and summative assessment in the course/module specification'.

Furthermore, the Panel confirmed during interviews with the senior management that all course syllabi must be reviewed by a peer reviewer, then verified and approved by the HoD. However, evidence provided shows that this practice was fully implemented only in GD courses, while some scattered implementation was recognized in courses from other concentrations (see recommendations 3.5, and 3.6). For example, there is no evidence that Multimedia and PR course syllabi have been verified, nor that internal moderation of formative assessment across all courses is being conducted. In addition, the external moderation of summative assessment is limited to GD courses.

Thus, the Panel acknowledges the clarity and comprehensiveness of the revised assessment and moderation policy; however, evidence shows inconsistency of its implementation. Therefore, this recommendation is not addressed.

BQA
Programme Follow-up Report – Programme-within-College Reviews – University College of Bahrain - Department of
Communication and Multimedia - Bachelor of Arts in Communication and Multimedia - 16-18 June 2019   *21*

Recommendation 3.4: *develop and implement a mechanism to ensure the proper alignment of assessment tools to course intended learning outcomes, and utilize the outcome to ensure the achievement of the programme intended learning outcomes*

Judgement: *Not Addressed*

UCB's 'Assessment and Moderation Policy' explains the mechanism followed to ensure the proper alignment of assessment tools to CILOs, which is done through internal and external moderation in addition to other moderation activities which include 'discussion with, and observations by, assessors, meetings of assessors, and analysis of assessment documents and materials'. To validate this, the Panel examined the effectiveness of both internal and external moderation processes and noted inconsistency in implementation (see recommendations 3.5 and 3.6). During interviews, the Panel learned that a series of workshops and meetings was held by the VP for capacity building on assessment mapping and practices. For example: a workshop was held in November 2018 on how to link between assessment and ILOs, which led to the development of new forms for pre-assessment moderation of assignment briefs. Another workshop was held in January 2019 on 'Academic Course Preparation'.

The Panel examined the course specifications of all courses and noted that assessment tools are properly aligned to CILOs, as stated in the progress report and submitted evidence. However, it was noted in the BACM review report of 2016 that there was no assessment plan to show how the PILOs are being assessed and how the closed cycle of assessment is informing new changes to course content or assessment tools. Therefore, the Panel requested evidence on the existence of the assessment plan, and it was cleared that it has not been developed yet. Furthermore, the progress report states that 'A follow up report has been developed and is in use to ensure that the moderators' comments are addressed, and the assessments are aligned to CILOs and the assessment is appropriate at the relevant NQF level for the course/module assessment'. However, the Panel was not provided with such report. Therefore, this recommendation is not addressed.

Recommendation 3.5: *adhere to the procedure related to internal moderation and ensure the consistency in the implementation of post-assessment moderation.*

Judgement: *Not Addressed*

As mentioned earlier, UCB has developed the 'Assessment and Moderation Policy', which details both internal and external moderation processes. In addition, the QAAC has also developed new moderation forms for the pre- and post-assessment to include additional areas for comments by moderators, as was recommended in the BACM review report of 2016. Furthermore, the progress report indicates that the VP has

undertaken a series of workshops with academic staff, including a workshop specifically covering the use of formative as well as summative assessment for all courses.

As per the progress report, internal moderation has been conducted for all courses of the second semester of the academic year 2018-2019. The Panel verified this through examining samples of pre-moderation filled forms of different courses from the three concentrations. The Panel also noted that the moderation forms were signed by the moderator and verified by the HoD and moderators commented on changes to be made to the assessment. However, the Panel noted that due to shortage of staff, courses are internally moderated by faculty members of other concentrations. For example, a course in 'Public Relations Technique' was internally moderated by a staff member from the GD concentration, which is not advisable.

Although the Panel acknowledges the revision of policies and the updating of forms and templates, this recommendation is not addressed due to inconsistent implementation.

Recommendation 3.6: *develop and implement a clear mechanism for external moderation of the assessment tools and monitor its implementation to ensure consistency*

Judgement: *Partially Addressed*

In the BACM review report of 2016, it was noted that external moderation is done for final projects only, and the Department is intending to expand its application on different assessment tools in the near future. The progress report states that the VP has introduced 'external moderation for coursework as well as the final examination in 2018-2019'. This was also stated in the revised 'Assessment and Moderation Policy'. However, the progress report states that external moderation was not conducted for Multimedia and PR courses. During interviews, the senior management explained that it was not easy to find an external moderator for Multimedia and PR.

The Panel acknowledges that a clear mechanism for external moderation is in place, however, it is not consistently implemented across all courses. Thus, this recommendation is partially addressed.

Recommendation 3.7: *revise the approach used for the assessments' setting to ensure that the assessment of 'critical thinking skills' is at the appropriate level*

Judgement: *Not Addressed*

The progress report states that the revised pre-moderation forms and post-moderation forms for both coursework and examinations request the moderator to confirm whether the assessment is at an appropriate level in terms of NQF requirements. However, the Panel noted from the mapping of GD concentration courses ILO's to the PILO's that most of the 100-level courses address critical thinking skills and some 400 level courses lack critical thinking skills, which is considered inappropriate (see recommendation 1.6).

Moreover, the Panel examined samples of PR and Multimedia projects of students and notes that the students' level of performance is below the expected level compared to similar regional and international programmes. However, the Panel notes also that the GD projects of students are up to the expected level. Interviews with students showed that the lack of resources is one of the main reasons for the low performance of students in PR and Multimedia concentrations. Moreover, some students mentioned also that the unavailability of part-time faculty during office hours is negatively impacting the quality of production of their practical projects. Thus, the Panel concluded that the recommendation is not addressed.

Recommendation 3.8: *assign specialized faculty members to monitor the students in the workplace in all concentrations, and ensure consistency in the management and assessment of the internship programme*

Judgement: *Partially Addressed*

UCB has revised the 'Practicum Handbook' for the academic year 2018-2019. The Panel examined the Handbook and noted a clear description of the role of the student, the course instructor and the site supervisor. Each student is assigned an instructor and students are encouraged to seek out their instructor and communicate with him/her particularly during office hours and by appointment, when necessary. According to the Handbook, the course instructor should visit the internship students at the workplace and the visits may take up to an hour, although it is not clear who arranges these visits. Some students and site supervisors, during the interviews, indicated that the course instructor does not contact them before the visit; however, they all agreed that the course instructor visits students at least once in a semester.

The Handbook includes a template of the 'evaluation form', which contains a section to evaluate student's teamwork and cooperation skills, technical skills, leadership skills, motivation, communication skills and professional development, in addition to

other slots for supervisor's comments and student's responses. The form also includes a question of whether the site supervisor would consider hiring the student in the future, which the site supervisors see as insignificant and the answer of this question does not necessary reflect a real evaluation of the student's performance. The Panel learned also that the site supervisors did not get the chance to raise this issue to the College.

Thus, the Panel acknowledges assigning specialized faculty members to monitor the students in the workplace in all concentrations; however, more efforts are encouraged to ensure consistency in the management and assessment of the internship programme. Therefore, this recommendation is partially addressed.

Recommendation 3.9: *revise the approach used for setting and implementing graduation projects, especially in Public Relations and Multimedia, to ensure that students are able to meet international standards appropriate for a qualification at the bachelor's level*

Judgement: *Not Addressed*

In the BACM review report of 2016, it was noted that the final projects of students in the PR concentration did not assess the skills they were supposed to acquire according to the PILOs, and were in the form of theoretical pieces of research that did not achieve the standard of work expected at this level of study. In addition, the projects in Multimedia were more of a collection of unengaging scenes that lacked creativity and rhythm.

The Panel noted from the interviews with faculty and students that there are external juries for the graduation projects. However, there is no evidence of revising the programme's approach used for setting and implementing graduation projects. The Panel examined samples of graduation projects from the three concentrations and noted that PR projects do not assess the skills students are supposed to acquire, as they only produce simple forms of PR material as press releases. Furthermore, Multimedia graduation projects reflect low levels of achievement and lack of creativity and rhythm. During interviews with students, they referred to the lack of assistance and support provided to them due to the poor resources and unavailability of part-timers outside class hours. Thus, the Panel concludes that this recommendation is not addressed.

Recommendation 3.10: *strengthen the role of programme advisory board, and ensure that regular meetings are held with clear agenda and documented minutes and that programme advisory board feedback is used systematically to inform the programme decision-making*

Judgement: *Not Addressed*

In the BACM review report of 2016, the Panel raised the following concerns: the chair of the advisory board was a UCB staff member, the advisory board was not meeting regularly, and it was not clear how the feedback of the advisory board is used to further improve the programme.

The Panel was provided with evidence on the current formation of the advisory board, which shows 12 members, six are externals and six are from UCB staff, with the HoD as the chairperson of the advisory board. The Panel is of the view that the chairperson should be from the external members to ensure that independent advice is provided.

Interviews with the advisory board members revealed that meetings are not regular; instead, they are scheduled on days and at times when the external members are able to attend. From the provided evidence, the Panel notes that the advisory board met twice, on 7th of Feb. 2019 and on 23rd of November 2016. The Panel learned from the interviews with the advisory board members that topics discussed in the meetings related only to the new study plan and qualification's title. The Panel also notes from the evidence provided that their suggestions and recommendations regarding the new title of the programme and the study plan were taken into consideration, when preparing the proposal for the new qualification. However, although it is stated in the progress report that the programme structure and updated programme aims and PILOs were reviewed following scrutiny and discussion by the advisory board, the minutes of the meetings do not include any discussion related to the updated programme aims and PILO's.

Overall, the Panel acknowledges that the advisory board meets with a clear agenda and documented minutes and that the programme advisory board feedback is used to inform the programme decision-making with regard to introducing the revised programme. However, the advisory board meetings need to be regular, its formation needs to be reconsidered, and its feedback should systematically inform varied issues of programme decision-making. Thus, this recommendation is not addressed.

4. Indicator 4: Effectiveness of quality management and assurance

This section evaluates the extent to which the BACM programme of UCB, has addressed the recommendations outlined in the programme review report of December 2016, 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 4.1: *develop and implement a mechanism to monitor the implementation of policies and procedures related to the programme and evaluate their effectiveness*

Judgement: *Fully Addressed*

The evidence provided shows that the organization structure of UCB has been reviewed and updated, including the standing committees at college and departmental levels, and their ToRs to eliminate duplication and overlap. This update was approved in October 2018. The Panel notes also that the role of the QAAC was significantly enhanced by appointing qualified administrative and academic staff to carry out the assigned tasks. Policies and procedures have also been reviewed and updated, such as the Assessment Policy (October 2018), Programme Review Policy (October 2018), Internship Handbook (2018-2019), Faculty Guide Book (September 2018), Student Handbook (2018-2019), Academic Advising Policy (October 2018), Research Policy (February 2019) and Research Strategy (2018-2024), and Benchmarking Policy (March 2019). The Panel examined the standing committees' organization chart, and their ToRs and found that it has clear defined roles and responsibilities.

The Panel acknowledges the new updates on different policies and the structure of the Institution, and is of the view that this recommendation is fully addressed. However, as all these updates were only recently approved (between 2018 and 2019), the Panel encourages UCB to sustain the achieved progress in these regards.

Recommendation 4.2: *revise the reporting lines within the Department of Arts Communication and Multimedia and between the Department and the institution's administration offices to ensure effective leadership within the programme.*

Judgement: *Partially Addressed*

The progress report indicates that, on the institutional level, UCB has reviewed and revised the roles and responsibilities of the management positions, namely: President,

Vice-President, and Head of Department. The Panel confirmed during interviews that the senior management was clear about their roles and responsibilities, and that there is a hierarchy in the decision-making process and clear reporting lines between the Department and the college management. Furthermore, the new restructuring of the standing committees on the college level and their updated ToRs shows that the membership of all committees must include either the HoD or a representative from the Department.

Within the Department, the Panel examined the department's meeting minutes and noted that various tasks of managing different issues are discussed within the department and assigned by the HoD to the staff members. However, effective leadership is still unclear, especially with the shortage of staff which affects the proper implementation of various tasks, such as internal moderation and different quality assurance activities. Therefore, the Panel is of the view that this recommendation is partially addressed.

Recommendation 4.3: *undertake, in collaboration with the institution and quality assurance unit, a holistic and systematic review of quality assurance at the programme level to ensure that systems and structures are supporting faculty members and students to achieve high quality educational outcomes*

Judgement: *Partially Addressed*

The progress report indicates that a Quality Assurance Office at the institutional level, called the 'Quality Assurance and Compliance Department', has been newly established (November 2018), in response to the recommendations of the HEC and the BQA. This office is headed by an executive director, who is assisted by a Quality Assurance Manager, a Quality Assurance Officer and a Standing Committees' Clerk, to manage the academic and quality assurance infrastructure of the College. In addition, the ToRs of the QAAC were reviewed and updated in October 2018. The QAAC is chaired by the VP and composed of HoDs, the registrar, head of student affairs, director of administration and finance, executive director of QA and compliance, and the QA manager. QAAC is responsible for overseeing academic quality and standards.

The meeting minutes of the Committee demonstrate an extensive review and monitoring of different quality assurance matters, such as: discussing the action plan set by the Department in response to the external moderation, and discussing the end-of-semester questionnaire, action plans from academic departments (meeting minutes of 16 May 2019), reviewing and approving the programme brochures for publication in 2019-2020 (meeting minutes of 31 January 2019), and approval of programme specifications for 2018-2019 (meeting minutes of 12 November 2018). The Panel also examined other meeting minutes from the last three years and noted the involvement

of the QAAC in different QA matters, which supports the quality of the programmes. Therefore, since most of the changes are recent, it is too early to validate that 'systems and structures are supporting faculty members and students to achieve high quality educational outcomes'. There is also a need to appoint more academic staff to carry out the required tasks. Hence, this recommendation is partially addressed.

Recommendation 4.4: *develop a clear structure for decision-making processes related to periodic reviews of the programme based on a clear analysis of the inputs of all stakeholders.*

Judgement: *Partially Addressed*

In the BACM review report of 2016, the Panel was concerned that the reports and inputs collected from the Curriculum Development Committee, QAAC, advisory board, external examiners and the University Council are not utilized in the periodic review of the programme.

In response, UCB developed an 'Annual and Periodic Programme Review' policy in October 2018. According to this policy and as per the progress report, the programme is subject to two types of reviews: Internal Annual Review and Periodic Review. The Policy details the process of the programme periodic review, and states that it is carried out every four years.

The Panel examined the external reviewer's report and noted that the report is in the form of questions and answers, which is very brief and general (three-pages long), and includes the reviewer's findings and comments regarding all programmes offered by UCB, namely: Master of Business Administration, Bachelor of Science in Business Administration, Bachelor of Science in Information Technology (IT), and Bachelor of Arts in Communication and Multimedia. The Panel also noted that most of the external reviewer's comments were related to the IT programme, which is his area of expertise, as shown from his CV.

Accordingly, the Panel is of the view that the Department would benefit more from an external reviewer who is specialized in the field and from a more detailed external reviewer's report that focuses on examining specifically the BACM programme. Therefore, this recommendation is partially addressed.

Recommendation 4.5: *ensure that the formal mechanism used to solicit feedback from external stakeholders is systematically and regularly implemented, and the results are used to strengthen the programme*

Judgement: *Partially Addressed*

As explained in the provided evidence, UCB solicits feedback from stakeholders using various tools. Surveys are used to collect information about student and staff views on the quality of teaching, learning and other associated activities. These surveys include: student satisfaction with the academic course delivery survey, which is conducted every semester and overseen by SARMC; graduate destination survey, which will be applied from 2019-2020 and overseen by SARMC; in addition to workshops surveys and staff exist surveys, which are overseen by relevant departments. UCB collects feedback also through benchmarking forms and from external moderators, through external moderator reports and moderation forms each semester. The progress report refers to 'student evaluation questionnaires' as a tool for collecting feedback from students. This questionnaire has been updated for 2018-2019 after consultation with the Student Council and was first used in the first semester of 2018-2019. During interviews, the Panel learned that this questionnaire is distributed and collected by the Registry and is then analysed by the newly-established Quality Assurance Office, and then sent up to the QAAC. During interviews with senior management, the Panel learned that meetings are held between the Student Council president and the VP to discuss issues related to students' satisfaction, suggestions for improvements, and other student concerns, and that the senior management is keen to listen to students' voice. Furthermore, the progress report indicates that UCB is investigating the use of online surveys.

Evidence provided includes advisory board meeting minutes of February 2019, which show that the suggested revision of the programme title and study plan was presented to the board. The meeting minutes document also include a set of recommendations on the existing course structure and the current programme specifications. This practice demonstrates some feedback utilization in decision-making.

Evidence provided includes also old survey reports dated back to 2016. These old reports include: alumni survey reports and exit survey reports for each concentration; however, no evidence was provided on recent survey reports. Supporting evidence includes updated forms, some of which were in use in the academic year 2018-2019, as mentioned in the progress report. These forms include empty templates of the Student Questionnaire 2018-2019, UCB Graduate Exit Survey, Benchmarking Proposal Form 2018-2019, External Reviewer Report Form 2018-2019 and the Course Specification Review Form 2018-2019.

Overall, the Panel acknowledges that formal feedback is collected *via* the external review report and the feedback of the advisory board. Moreover, the Panel notes that UCB is in the process of collecting feedback from students and alumni; as, the evidence shows new forms that have been recently developed but with little evidence on their implementation. However, no evidence was provided on collecting feedback from other stakeholders, such as employers, and people from the industry and labour market. In addition, a cohesive report on the results of different surveys' analysis is also needed. Therefore, the Panel sees that this recommendation is partially addressed.

Recommendation 4.6: *establish further formal mechanisms to continuously and holistically scope the labour market to ensure that the programme is up-to-date and caters for the market needs*

Judgement: *Not Addressed*

In the BACM review report of 2016, the Panel noted that the presented 'market needs analysis report' document was not dated and did not contain any input from direct UCB stakeholders; in addition, no evidence on a formal process for scoping the labour market was provided.

The Panel examined the submitted evidence and found that it contains the old market needs analysis report of 2016, and a 'Market Gap Study' conducted by TAMKEEN in 2010. During interviews with senior management, the Panel learned that feedback collected from external stakeholders is considered to be a substitution for scoping the labour market, which the Panel does not see as such. Therefore, the Panel considers this recommendation as not addressed.

BQA

Programme Follow-up Report – Programme-within-College Reviews – University College of Bahrain - Department of Communication and Multimedia - Bachelor of Arts in Communication and Multimedia - 16-18 June 2019   *31*

5. Conclusion

Taking into account the institution's own progress report, the evidence gathered from the interviews and documentation made available during the 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 Arts in Communication and Multimedia programme offered by the University College of Bahrain has made 'Inadequate Progress'.

BQA

Programme Follow-up Report – Programme-within-College Reviews – University College of Bahrain - Department of Communication and Multimedia - Bachelor of Arts in Communication and Multimedia - 16-18 June 2019   *32*

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,