



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

Directorate of Higher Education Reviews Institutional Review Report

University College of Bahrain
Kingdom of Bahrain

Date Reviewed: 22-26 September 2019

HI010-C2-R009

Table of Contents

Acronyms.....	3
I. Introduction.....	5
II. The Institution Profile	6
III. Judgment Summary	7
IV. Standards and Indicators	9
Standard 1	9
Standard 2.....	17
Standard 3.....	22
Standard 4.....	28
Standard 5.....	38
Standard 6.....	41
Standard 7.....	45
Standard 8.....	49

Acronyms

ADC	Academic Department Committees
BoT	Board of Trustees
BQA	Education & Training Quality Authority
CGPA	Cumulative Grade Point Average
CILO	Course Intended Learning Outcome
DHR	Directorate of Higher Education Reviews
ESC	Examination and Scheduling Committee
HEC	Higher Education Council
HEI	Higher Education Institution
HoD	Head of Department
HR	Human Resources
ICT	Information Communication Technology
ILO	Intended Learning Outcome
LITC	Library and IT Committee
LLC	Life-Long Learning Committee
LTEPP	Learning, Teaching and Enhancement Policy and Procedures
MBA	Master of Business Administration
NQF	National Qualifications Framework
PDP	Professional Development Plan
PD	Programme Director
PILO	Programme Intended Learning Outcome
QAAC	Quality Assurance and Accreditation Committee
QAO	Quality Assurance Office
QMS	Quality Management System

RPL	Recognition of Prior Learning
SAMRC	Student Affairs, Marketing and Recruitment Committee
SRC	Scientific Research Council
ToR	Terms of Reference
UCB	University College of Bahrain
UCC	University College Council
UEB	University Examination Board
UFC	University Finance Committee
UILO	University Intended Learning Outcome
VP	Vice President

I. Introduction

In keeping with its mandate, the Education & Training Quality Authority (BQA), through the Directorate of Higher Education Reviews (DHR), carries out two types of reviews that are complementary. These are: Institutional Reviews where the whole institution is assessed; and Programme Reviews where the quality of learning and academic standards is judged in specific programmes. The DHR completed the first cycle of institutional reviews in 2013, and the second cycle has been scheduled for 2018-2019, in accordance with the Institutional Quality Reviews Framework (Cycle 2) approved by the Cabinet (Resolution No. 38 of 2015). The main objectives of the institutional reviews are:

1. To enhance the quality of higher education in the Kingdom of Bahrain by conducting reviews to assess the performance of the Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) operating in the Kingdom, against a predefined set of Standards and provide a summative judgment while identifying areas of strength and areas in need of improvement.
2. To ensure that there is public accountability of higher education providers through the provision of an objective assessment of the quality of each provider, which produces published reports and summative judgements for the use of parents, students, and the Higher Education Council (HEC), and other relevant bodies.
3. To identify good practice where it exists and disseminate it throughout the Bahraini higher education sector.

The institutional review process will assess the effectiveness of an institution's quality assurance arrangements against a pre-defined set of standards and indicators, and identify areas of strength and areas of improvement. Each Indicator will have a judgement; i.e. 'addressed' or 'not addressed', which collectively will lead to a Standard's judgement. A Standard will be given a judgement of 'addressed', 'partially addressed' or 'not addressed' depending on the number of indicators 'addressed' within a Standard, as detailed in the Institutional Quality Reviews Framework (Cycle 2). The aggregate of Standards' judgements will lead to an overarching judgement – 'meets quality assurance requirements', 'emerging quality assurance requirements', 'does not meet quality assurance requirements', as shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Overall Judgements

Judgement	Description
Meets quality assurance requirements	The institution must address all eight Standards
Emerging quality assurance requirements	The institution must address a minimum of five Standards including Standards 1, 4 and 6 with the remaining Standards being at least partially satisfied
Does not meet quality assurance requirements	The institution does not address any of the above two overall judgements

II. The Institution Profile

Institution Name	University College of Bahrain
Year of Establishment	2002
Location	Saar, Manama
Number of Colleges	University College of Bahrain comprising 3 Academic Departments and 1 General Studies Unit
Names of Colleges	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Department of Business Administration (BA) 2. Department of Information Technology (IT) 3. Department of Communication and Multimedia (CMM) 4. General Studies Unit (GS)
Number of Qualifications	<p>4 Qualifications:</p> <p>BSc in Business Administration</p> <p>BA in Communication and Multimedia</p> <p>BSc in Information Technology</p> <p>MBA - Master of Business Administration</p>
Number of Programmes	4
Number of Enrolled Current Students	<p>2018-2019:</p> <p>Full-Time: 241/Part-Time: 36/Total: 277</p>
Number of Graduates	<p>BSc Business Administration (since 2002): 953</p> <p>BA Communication and Multimedia (since 2005): 232</p> <p>BSc Information Technology (since 2002): 172</p> <p>MBA Master of Business Administration (since 2004): 269</p> <p>Total Graduates: 1626</p>
Number of Academic Staff Members	<p>Full-Time: 14</p> <p>Part-Time: 4</p>
Number of Administrative Staff Members	<p>Full-Time: 20 (including senior management)</p> <p>Part-Time: 3</p>

III. Judgment Summary

The Institution's Judgement: Does Not Meet QA Requirements

Standard/ Indicator	Title	Judgment
Standard 1	Mission, Governance and Management	Partially Addressed
Indicator 1	Mission	Addressed
Indicator 2	Governance and Management	Not Addressed
Indicator 3	Strategic Plan	Not Addressed
Indicator 4	Organizational Structure	Addressed
Indicator 5	Management of Academic Standards:	Addressed
Indicator 6	Partnerships, Memoranda and Cross Border Education	Not Applicable
Standard 2	Quality Assurance and Enhancement	Not Addressed
Indicator 7	Quality Assurance	Addressed
Indicator 8	Benchmarking and Surveys	Not Addressed
Indicator 9	Security of Learner Records and Certification	Not Addressed
Standard 3	Learning Resources, ICT and Infrastructure	Not Addressed
Indicator 10	Learning Resources	Not Addressed
Indicator 11	ICT	Not Addressed
Indicator 12	Infrastructure	Addressed
Standard 4	The Quality of Teaching and Learning	Partially Addressed
Indicator 13	Management of Teaching and Learning Programmes	Not Addressed
Indicator 14	Admissions	Addressed
Indicator 15	Introduction and Review of Programmes	Not Addressed

Indicator 16	Student Assessment and Moderation	Addressed
Indicator 17	The Learning Outcomes	Addressed
Indicator 18	Recognition of Prior Learning	Addressed
Indicator 19	Short courses	Not Applicable
Standard 5	Student Support Services	Addressed
Indicator 20	Student Support	Addressed
Standard 6	Human Resources Management	Partially Addressed
Indicator 21	Human Resources	Not Addressed
Indicator 22	Staff Development	Addressed
Standard 7	Research	Partially Addressed
Indicator 23	Research	Addressed
Indicator 24	Higher degrees with research	Not Addressed
Standard 8	Community Engagement	Not Addressed
Indicator 25	Community Engagement	Not Addressed

IV. Standards and Indicators

Standard 1

Mission, Governance and Management

The institution has an appropriate mission statement that is translated into strategic and operational plans and has a well-established, effective governance and management system that enables structures to carry out their different responsibilities to achieve the mission.

Indicator 1: Mission

The institution has a clearly stated mission that reflects the three core functions of teaching and learning, research and community engagement of a higher education institution that is appropriate for the institutional type and the programmes qualifications offered.

Judgement: Addressed

The Panel notes that the UCB has a vision and mission statement which have been recently revised and approved by the Board of Trustees (BoT). This statement reflects the three core functions of a university, namely teaching and learning, research and community engagement. Furthermore, the vision statement specifies the particular educational fields that UCB focuses on, namely business administration, information technology and the creative industries. During interviews, the Panel learned that UCB aims to become 'the university of choice' and this was also stated in the vision statement. The Panel is of the view that the statement is too generic in character, as it does not differentiate UCB from other universities. The Panel advises UCB to further refine its vision and mission statements to highlight the aspirational and differentiating characteristics of UCB in the market.

During the tour of the facilities, it was noted that the old vision, mission and purpose Statement is still displayed in buildings, rather than the revised one. The Panel recommends that UCB should ensure that the updated vision and mission statements are displayed across all documents and media, and that displays of the old statements in buildings are removed and replaced with the new ones.

According to the SER, the mission statement of the UCB was modified as part of a strategic review of the Institution to formulate its strategic plan for the years 2018 to 2024. This review process took into account the national strategies on higher education and research in 'Bahrain Economic Vision 2030'. Staff and students were provided with the opportunity to comment and provide feedback on the revised mission statement, which was also circulated to external stakeholders for review. Although the Panel learned during interviews that this process of obtaining comments occurred mainly through emails, rather than through dialogues and meetings. Yet, the Panel noted that interviewed academic staff members and student are aware of the revised mission statement.

The Panel concludes that UCB has a clearly stated mission that reflects the three core functions of a HEI. The Panel also concludes that there was evidence of a review of the mission statement, taking the context of higher education into account, and that this review involved its stakeholders. All in all, the Panel considers this Indicator as addressed.

Recommendation

- Ensure that the updated vision and mission statements are displayed across all documents and media, and that displays of the old statements in the campus buildings are removed and replaced with the new ones.

Indicator 2: Governance and Management

The institution exhibits sound governance and management practices and financial management is linked with institutional planning in respect of its operations and the three core functions.

Judgement: Not Addressed

The BoT serves as the governance body of the UCB, while the University College Council (UCC) assumes 'overall responsibility and oversight of academic standards and the direction and regulation of academic and administrative matters'. The Panel notes that the Terms of Reference (ToR) of the UCC are clearly set out, and include making recommendations to the BoT on academic and administrative policies. In turn, the ToR of the Board are set out in a Charter. According to the Charter, the responsibilities of the BoT include ratifying policies that will ensure the proper functioning of the Board and the Institution, and ratifying the appointment of key officers. Furthermore, the BoT has three sub-committees: Academic Affairs, Executive and Planning committees. The role of the Academic Affairs Committee is to oversee the quality and relevance of academic programmes, while the Planning Committee focuses on long-term planning and sustainability of the UCB. The role of the Executive Committee is briefly described in the Charter as 'This committee shall exercise the powers of the board in the management of the business and affairs of the University College between meetings of the board. Therefore, the Panel advises that the role of the Executive Committee to be more detailed in the BoT Charter.

The process to review the relationship between governance and management is described in the SER. The Panel notes that the Charter of the Board versus the ToR of the UCC clearly differentiates between their various roles and responsibilities. However, in the latter document the Chairperson of the University College Council is specified as 'Chairman, Board of Trustees'. Furthermore, according to the minutes of the UCC there is no clear specification of who was the Chair of the meeting. The Chairperson of the BoT is most often listed first under the list of attendees and is given the designation of 'Chairman' in the minutes of 26 September 2016 and 30 October 2018. The minutes of the UCC of 26 September 2018 and 30 October 2018 were signed and approved by the Chairperson of the BoT. This is also the case in the UCC minutes of 11 October 2018, 17 October 2018, and 24 October 2018. Only in the minutes of 13 January is this revised to 'Chairman of the Board of Trustees'. In the minutes of the UCC of 14 February 2019, the President is clearly identified as the Chairperson for the first time, and approved the minutes. Hence, the Panel recommends that UCB should revise the ToR of the UCC and ensure that the governing body and management have a clear separation of duties. Furthermore, it was noticed that through his representation on numerous committees, the Director of Administration and Finance may become drawn into academic matters of the UCB. The Panel recommends that UCB review the

involvement of the Director of Administration and Finance on these committees and consider sending a Departmental representative where appropriate.'

The BoT members were appointed within the last three years. A list of trustees is provided. The process of appointing members of the BoT is not explained in the SER nor in the Charter, other than noting that 'between 7-10 appointed for a period of 3 years at the invitation of the University College founder and Board Chairman'. From interviews, the Panel concluded that the Chair of the BoT had invited people with relevant experience to be members in the Board. After meeting BoT members, the Panel appreciated the selection and expertise of the Board members. The induction of new BoT members is carried out informally by the Chair of the BoT and takes the form of a meeting. There is no induction policy document, but the BoT Charter outlines its membership, frequency and nature of meetings, the committee structure and key duties of the chairman of the BoT, the President, Vice President and trustees. The Panel recommends that the UCB should draft a policy for the appointment and induction of members of the BoT. According to the Charter, meetings are scheduled to take place three times a year. Sample records of attendance and minutes of board meetings indicate that meetings are taking place regularly.

From interviews, the Panel notes that the UCB complies with the HEC requirement to allocate the equivalent of 3% of revenue to research expenditure and a further 2% to professional development. While one of the ToR of the University Finance Committee (UFC) was to 'Develop an annual operating budget with the recommendations/requests from all departments', the Panel could find no written information to explain the procedure by which resources are allocated to programme offerings. The Panel recommends that UCB should establish a procedure to document the resources that are allocated to its programme offerings. In interviews, the Panel learned that departments determine their resource requirements and prepare their budgets with the support of the Finance Department. The Finance Department consolidates these budgets, which are then discussed at the UFC. The UFC is a standing committee that reports to the BoT. During interviews, the Panel learned that at one of the two regular BoT meetings each year, the budget is tabled for discussion and Board approval, and that it is the responsibility of the Director of Administration and Finance to ensure that the budget is not in deficit.

According to the ToR of the UFC, which is chaired by the Director of Administration and Finance, its role is to oversee the financial affairs of the UCB, including budgeting, monitoring adherence, reviewing financial reports and projections, and making recommendations to the Board related to financial arrangements. From interviews, however, the Panel was informed that in practice, authorisation of all expenditure is done by the Chairperson of the BoT.

The Panel notes that accounting, auditing and reporting procedures are set out in an 'Accounts & Finance Policies and Procedures' document. An Internal Auditor has been appointed within the Office of Administration and Finance, and is responsible for various internal control procedures to ensure UCB compliance with the prescribed auditing standards. In interviews, the Panel was informed that the UFC checks that all documentation in support of financial transactions is accurate and complete. The ToR for the UFC are clearly set out. However, the Panel notes that the Internal Auditor is a member of the UFC, which reports to the BoT, and it has no auditing activities included in its ToR. Therefore, the Panel recommends that UCB should expand the ToR of the UFC to include internal auditing, in support of the BoT Charter obligation of overseeing an 'external financial audit and transparent reporting';

furthermore, the responsibility and reporting line of the Internal Auditor of the UFC should be revised to enhance the independence of the audits function.

The Panel concludes that this Indicator is not addressed.

Recommendations

- Revise the Terms of Reference of the University College Council and ensure that the governing body and management have a clear separation of duties.
- Review the involvement of the Director of Administration and Finance on the different committees and consider sending a Departmental representative where appropriate.
- Draft a policy for the appointment and induction of members of the BoT.
- Establish a procedure to document the resources that are allocated to programme offerings.
- Expand the terms of reference of the University Finance Committee to include internal auditing, in support of the BoT Charter obligation of overseeing an 'external financial audit and transparent reporting'.
- Revise the responsibility and reporting line of the Internal Auditor.

Indicator 3: Strategic Plan

There is a strategic plan, showing how the mission will be pursued, which is translated into operational plans that include key performance indicators and annual targets with respect to the three core functions with evidence that the plan is implemented and monitored.

Judgement: Not Addressed

New vision, mission and values statements were formulated in 2018. These have been further developed into a University Strategic Plan for the period of 2018-2024, identifying four strategic priorities, six strategic goals and their objectives, and key performance indicators for each of the goals. When revising the institutional strategic plan, it was circulated to internal and external stakeholders for comment. An outdated operational plan was included in the supporting evidence for 2015 to 2017, but there is no current operational plan in the same format. During interviews, the Panel established that there is no comprehensive UCB-wide operational planning document with annual targets, but rather a number of operational documents have been developed to indicate how data will be collected and from whom to monitor KPIs. Consequently, the Panel recommends that UCB should translate its Strategic Plan into an institution-wide operational plan with annual targets and tasks, identifying the parties responsible for carrying these tasks and the due dates.

UCB has three plans/strategies with accompanying key performance indicators, namely the UCB Quality Assurance and Accreditation (QAA) Academic Plan 2016-2021, the Institutional Strategic Plan and the Institutional Research Strategy – approved in 2018-2019. During interviews, the Panel learned that the UCB has decided not to follow the conventional operational plan format, and that the responsibility for operational planning and implementation of the strategic plan has been devolved to relevant functions and/or committees that are responsible for ensuring the achievements of relevant

KPIs. In some interviews, the Panel observed that some committees were aware of the strategic KPIs relevant to their role and function, but in other cases interviewees couldn't make a direct link between what they did in the strategic plan and its KPIs. The Panel concluded that there are inadequate mechanisms in place to systematically measure and track the level, or status of the KPIs.

The Panel was informed during interviews that the previous system of annual monitoring and improvement plans based on an annual operational plan had been abandoned. There is some evidence that the BoT currently monitors and reviews the strategic plan through a list of review deadlines and a list of the University's achievements in relation to the strategic plan. Furthermore, a strategic roadmap document that was drafted eight months after the commencement of the current strategic plan, identified strategic priorities and included a detailed SWOT analysis of the institution. No further documentary evidence was provided to the Panel demonstrating the processes to monitor an operational plan, nor is there evidence of systematic data collection and reporting. Consequently, it is recommended that UCB should coordinate the setting of annual targets for all KPIs, and develop supporting mechanisms to systematically collect data, measure and track the level, or status of the KPIs attainment.

Overall, the Panel concludes that the procedures and responsibilities at UCB are insufficient for the formulation, implementation, monitoring and review of operational plans. Hence, the Panel considers this Indicator as not addressed.

Recommendations

- Translate the Strategic Plan into an institution-wide operational plan with annual targets and tasks, identifying the people responsible for carrying these tasks and the due dates.
- Coordinate the setting of annual targets for all KPIs; and develop mechanisms to systematically collect data and monitor progress towards attaining the annual targets.

Indicator 4: Organizational Structure

The institution has a clear organizational and management structure and there is student participation in decision-making where appropriate.

Judgement: Addressed

The Academic and Administration Policy Infrastructure document sets out a list of policies and structures that have been developed to coordinate leadership across the Institution at the senior management level. The structuring of jobs into units and departments as reflected in the organogram facilitates coordination of activities across the UCB, and is complemented by a committee structure, which has recently been reorganised. The organizational structure includes two independent boards, namely the Advisory Boards and University Examination Board (UEB). It is unclear why these are given the designation of 'Independent Boards' and why the UEB would be regarded as independent, given its composition. The Panel advises that the UCB clarify what it means by an Independent Board and what structures would qualify as being 'independent'.

There is evidence that UCB's committees are meeting regularly and that some of the senior managers are members of these meetings as clarified in the provided documents. All of them report to the UCC apart from UFC which reports to BoT.

The Panel was informed that as the Institute is small; people are close to each other and regularly interact informally to keep each other informed about UCB decisions and information. During interviews, the Panel was informed that all minutes of committees' meetings are saved by QA Office, available online and circulated to the concerned personnel.

The organogram of the University was updated in 2018, and an explanation has been provided of how the structure was amended. The structure reflects the separation of academic functions from administrative and support functions. Staff and students can access the organizational chart from UCB's website or the Cloud server as stated in the SER. A committee structure supports the organizational structure. Each committee has detailed ToR and a listing of the composition of its membership.

The Panel notes that job descriptions of key posts at UCB set out their main duties and responsibilities. During interviews, staff members were able to explain what their main roles, duties and responsibilities entailed. However, there were instances where it was unclear who was responsible for a particular role. For example, the Panel was informed that the Student Affairs Office was responsible for alumni relations. However, the Panel later learned that currently there is limited alumni activities, and alumni have little contact with the Institute, other than being invited to departmental activities (e.g. exhibitions) as mentioned during alumni interviews. In another case, the Panel was informed that responsibility for community engagement resided with the Student Affairs and Marketing Office, but in interviews it was evident that this office only arranged social and philanthropic events for students. Thirdly, the organogram has a box (entity/unit) for Maintenance and Security, but the Panel was advised by email from UCB that this box (entity/unit) was vacant and that maintenance was the overall responsibility of the Chair of the BoT who had ensured that maintenance was carried out by him. The Panel recommends that the UCB should ensure that responsibility for these functions is clearly assigned and delegated, and that the organogram and job descriptions should be revised where necessary.

Students are included in two committees, namely Student Affairs, Marketing and Recruitment Committee (SAMRC) and the UCC. The Standing/Central Committees document lists a representative of the Student Council as a member of the UCC and the minutes of the SAMRC list the President of the Student Council as being in attendance. According to the SER, the Vice President (VP) for Academic Affairs, Quality and Accreditation meets regularly with the President of the Student Council, to discuss matters that affect students. This was confirmed in interviews with both parties. Besides students, other stakeholders inform decision-making. The membership of the University Advisory Board (UAB) includes four representatives from business, industry and government and Department Advisory Boards include representatives from industry, government and the alumni as members. During interviews, the Panel was informed that the advisory boards for each department were combined into a UCC Board. The Panel confirmed during interviews that the advisory boards only operated at a departmental level. The Panel advises that if a University Advisory Board structure is retained, then mechanisms ought to be put in place to differentiate its role from Departmental Advisory Boards, and to ensure that regular meetings take place.

The committee structure was reviewed in 2018. Sample minutes of the meetings of some of these committees indicate that discussions take place in these committees related to the implementation, use, operation and effectiveness of relevant policies, procedures and guidelines. While the Panel learned that there were regular discussions related to the functioning of committees, and that adjustments were made in response to this feedback, there is no indication of any formal and systematic mechanism to regularly review the functioning of these committees, or for the collection of data from various stakeholders that can be used for this purpose. During interviews, the Panel concluded that there were committees that had overlapping responsibilities (e.g. for various aspects of examinations) and that there were too many committees meeting too infrequently (typically only once a semester), and often having similar membership in their composition (e.g. the Heads of Department (HoDs) are members of numerous committees). Therefore, the Panel recommends that UCB should revise the structure of its committees and reconsider the frequency of meetings in their composition; and develop mechanisms to monitor their effectiveness. All in all, the Panel considers this Indicator as addressed.

Recommendations

- Ensure that responsibility for the functions of alumni relations, community engagement and maintenance & security is clearly assigned and delegated, and that the organogram and relevant job descriptions are to be revised where necessary.
- Revise the structure of committees and reconsider the frequency of meetings in their composition; and develop mechanisms to monitor their effectiveness.

Indicator 5: Management of Academic Standards

The institution demonstrates a strong concern for the maintenance of academic standards and emphasizes academic integrity throughout its teaching and research activities.

Judgement: Addressed

Numerous policies and procedures have been drafted related to the management of academic standards and approved for implementation by the UCC; with a four-year policy review cycle to be implemented in the future. The Panel also learned that this academic planning was currently viewed as ongoing, with changes, consolidations and refinements being made as required. From interviews, the Panel learned that the VP and the Head of Quality Assurance and Compliance collected feedback from relevant stakeholders' users of policies on how effective these policies are in practice. Based on this feedback, revised policies had been tabled at relevant committee meetings and were ultimately tabled at the UCC for approval. The evidence provided indicates that staff development and engagement workshops have been held to train staff on the use of these policies. In addition, they have been made available to staff on-line. From interviews, the Panel also learned that UEB plays a central role in ensuring that graduates have met all the requirements and standards to be awarded their degree.

The UCB has an Academic Honesty and Integrity Policy which explains how allegations of misconduct are investigated to ensure that a fair disciplinary procedure is followed, and who is responsible for this. The relevant academic department first considers any cases of misconduct, which are then referred to

the Examination and Scheduling Committee (ESC) for a decision. Minutes of the ESC list the details of the cases of misconduct that have been investigated including the penalty that was applied.

The Student Code of Conduct is available in the Student Handbook and the section covers details related to several aspects such as academic integrity and dishonesty, academic violations, student plagiarism and its consequences, and disciplinary measures or penalties, and explains the process of violation reporting and appeals.

From interviews, the Panel learned that there is a policy and procedure related to plagiarism. The Panel was informed also that UCB had recently introduced a further mechanism to reinforce the rules by getting students to sign a statement acknowledging that they will abide by the rules, prior to taking an examination. Any breaches of the rules are dealt with by the ESC and the student's grade is adjusted accordingly. The Panel learned from interviews that cases of cheating are also tabled for discussion at the UEB.

The Panel concludes that the UCB demonstrates a strong commitment to the maintenance of academic standards and academic integrity in its teaching and research activities. The Panel considers this Indicator as addressed.

Recommendation

- None

Indicator 6: Partnerships, Memoranda and Cross Border Education [where applicable]

The relationship between the institution operating in Bahrain and other higher education institutions is formalized and explained clearly, so that there is no possibility of students or other stakeholders being misled.

Judgement: Not Applicable

No agreements are currently in place. Previous agreements have lapsed and the Institution is still in the process of negotiating new agreements with several UK and European universities.

Recommendation

- None

Judgement: The Institution **partially addresses** Standard 1: Mission, Governance and Management

Standard 2

Quality Assurance and Enhancement

There is a robust quality assurance system that ensures the effectiveness of the quality assurance arrangements of the institution as well as the integrity of the institution in all aspects of its academic and administrative operations.

Indicator 7: Quality Assurance

The institution has defined its approach to quality assurance and effectiveness thereof and has quality assurance arrangements in place for managing the quality of all aspects of education provision and administration across the institution.

Judgement: Addressed

UCB has a comprehensive Quality Management System (QMS) which consists of a set of policies, procedures and guidelines covering various aspects of its academic, support and administrative operations. The Panel notes that the UCB has made changes to its organizational structure and the ToR and membership of its key entities to enhance the monitoring of academic standards and the quality of its academic, administrative and support services. A committee structure, at institutional and departmental levels, is in place to support the UCB's administrative structure with the implementation of the QMS in their respective areas. The Quality Assurance and Accreditation Committee (QAAC) has an overall responsibility for developing, enforcing and monitoring quality assurance policies, procedures and standards (i.e., the QMS). The QAAC is chaired by the VP and provides advice regarding quality assurance-related matters to the UCC. From interviews, the Panel found that governance and management entities and committees members were clear about their roles in the implementation of the QMS and their reporting lines.

A newly established Quality Assurance Office (QAO) is staffed with a Quality Assurance Manager and a Quality Officer. The QAO's role includes the review of the quality-related policies. With the amendment of the ToR and/or membership of committees, the UCC ToR have been expanded to include monitoring the effectiveness of the QMS. As per evidence provided, the first review of UCB's standing committee structure is scheduled for the Fall Semester of 2019-2020. The Panel notes that some aspects of the QMS are still work in progress, depending largely on individual initiatives. The Panel recommends that UCB establish formal mechanisms and implement them consistently to monitor and evaluate the QMS for effectiveness, in order to ensure it is fit for purpose and to allow for improvements to be identified and introduced systematically.

According to the evidence provided, the UCB policies and procedures are appropriately communicated, and are incorporated into handbooks. As the vast majority of the policies are recently developed, their review dates are due starting from 2022 onwards. Extra evidence submitted to the Panel confirms that UCB conducted a review of its activities (programme, examination rules, NQF in April and May 2019) following an earlier review of its policy framework, in collaboration with an external consultancy firm against the standards/requirements of external regulatory bodies, notably the HEC and BQA, leading to the development of 13 new academic policies. While the Panel understands

the urgency of attending to the academic matters for programme reviews, it encourages UCB to also review the policies related to all core functions including administrative and support services.

All UCB programmes are licensed *via* HEC. There is also evidence that HoDs meetings discussed UCB progress against BQA and HEC requirements. In interviews, the Panel learned that UCB has an internal system to ensure compliance with these regulatory requirements at the department level. Heads of academic departments are tasked to ensure that the programme standards are set at the right National Qualifications Framework (NQF) levels, and that periodic reviews are conducted by review panels and that workshops are organised. Interviews revealed that external moderators are also asked to assess Programme Intended Learning Outcomes (PILOs) and examination questions against the NQF levels, and the Panel confirmed that their feedback in this regard is taken into consideration by UCB.

The Panel learned through interviews that UCB takes a broad-based approach towards responsibility for the management of the QMS, by cultivating a quality culture. In line with this approach, all staff and management personnel at all levels are responsible for the quality policies and procedures relevant to their work areas, and the QAO provides QA-related training. During interviews, the Panel learned that both academic and non-academic staff attend training workshops on new policies so that they know what their roles are in the management of the University QMS. To support the creation of this culture and the dissemination of information, the UCC includes in its membership the heads of all the academic departments, as well as the heads of key administrative and support entities who are responsible for transmitting this information effectively and timeously to their staff.

From interviews and submitted documents, the Panel learned that the VP also uses the regular meetings which he holds with the heads of academic departments as a communication platform to provide staff with guidance in quality assurance related matters. The QMS documents (policies, procedures, forms, templates, etc.) are also made available online (One Drive) for easy access, and any new processes or amendments to the existing ones are introduced to the relevant staff through workshops and training sessions. Through interviews and site visits, the Panel confirmed that most staff and administrators were aware of the policies and procedures they are expected to use in the discharge of their duties. All in all, the Panel considers this Indicator as addressed.

Recommendation

- Establish formal mechanisms and implement them consistently to monitor and evaluate UCB's Quality Management System for effectiveness, in order to ensure it is fit for purpose and to allow for improvements to be identified and introduced systematically.

Indicator 8: Benchmarking and Surveys

Benchmarking and surveys take place on a regular basis; the results of which inform planning, decision-making and enhancement.

Judgement: Not Addressed

UCB has recently developed a formal Benchmarking Policy outlining explicit procedures and responsibilities, explaining the rationale for any benchmarking proposal and setting out specifications

for the identification of potential benchmarking partners. Aimed primarily at academic programmes, the policy aims at ensuring that all the UCB programmes are at the same level or similar to those delivered by comparable local and international HEIs; and meet the professional and industrial requirements. From interviews, the Panel learned that UCB does not yet have any formal benchmarking agreements in place.

The Panel was provided with evidence of a series of benchmarking exercises conducted in early 2019, which revolved around courses, with some changes having been made as a result of these exercises. The Panel also heard that UCB has recently conducted desktop benchmarking of its student admission criteria against local and regional HEIs, including the University of Bahrain and Zayed University-UAE. The Panel recommends that UCB should expand the scope of its benchmarking activities beyond courses to ensure that benchmarking covers other aspects such as administrative and support services, research and community engagement. The Panel also advises that UCB arrange for benchmarking agreements with appropriate national, regional and international institutions where possible.

UCB deploys some surveys to collect feedback regarding its services and activities. The surveys target its internal stakeholders. Currently, there are three surveys that aim at evaluating the student learning experience at different stages of their study. There is a Student Evaluation Feedback Questionnaire to be filled by students about the taken courses at the end of every semester. Another two surveys are administered in the final year, one is titled Programme Evaluation Survey for Students in the Final Year and is meant to provide an overall programme evaluation, whereas the other is a Final Year Student Survey which evaluates the prospective graduate's whole learning experience at UCB. Moreover, there is a Field Trip Feedback Form which seeks students' views regarding industrial/field trips.

The Panel notes that employer satisfaction survey has not been developed yet. However, during interviews the Panel was informed that a Graduate Destination Survey has been recently developed for UCB's graduates after they join the labour market. The Panel recommends that UCB should develop a survey for employers and expedite the administration of its Graduate Destination Survey, disseminate them regularly and use the collated information to improve its programmes and resources. The Panel notes that the Final Year Student Survey and Graduate Destination Survey seek more detailed feedback on the UCB learning resources than the Student Evaluation Feedback Questionnaire which is run every semester. There is only one very broad and general item in the Student Evaluation Feedback Questionnaire which reads as 'The University's physical facilities were suitable for learning environment (Item 6, Section 2). Therefore, the Panel recommends that UCB should revise its Student Evaluation Feedback Questionnaire and seek students' feedback on its learning resources and support services in a detailed manner in order to ensure that the delivery of courses is appropriately supported. UCB also runs surveys for its staff members, including a Staff Exit Survey for academic and administrative staff members who leave the University, and a multipurpose Event Feedback Form, which seeks their views of the workshops and training programmes.

The UCB provided several documents showing that surveys are administered and feedback collected and analysed. The Panel also heard through interviews that student satisfaction surveys are analysed by the QAO and their suggestions are given due consideration. Minutes of committee meetings discussing student feedback have been provided, and some improvements were initiated in response to student feedback.

Based on the above, the Panel concluded that practices related to benchmarking and surveys are inadequate to inform planning, decision-making and enhancement. Benchmarking is not regularly conducted and does not cover all core activities of UCB. The surveys conducted are recent and do not include all the relevant stakeholders. Therefore, the Panel considers this Indicator as not addressed.

Recommendations

- Expand the scope of benchmarking practices beyond courses to ensure that benchmarking covers other aspects such as administrative and support services, research and community engagement.
- Develop a survey for employers and expedite the administration of its Graduate Destination Survey, disseminate them regularly and use the collated information to improve the delivery of its programmes and resources.
- Revise the Student Evaluation Feedback Questionnaire and seek students' feedback on learning resources and support services in a detailed manner in order to ensure that the delivery of courses is appropriately supported.

Indicator 9: Security of Learner Records and Certification

Formalized arrangements are in place to ensure the integrity of learner records and certification which are monitored and reviewed on a regular basis.

Judgement: Not Addressed

UCB has recently developed two policies to manage its student records and results in order to maintain their integrity. Firstly, the Results and Reporting Policy caters for aspects related to examination scores such as grade entry on the system, grade amendment and the declaration of student results. It also identifies the parties involved in these processes. Secondly, the Security of Learner Records and Certificates Issuance Policy lists the procedures for identifying and verifying the prospective graduates to ensure the accuracy of the awards. The policy does not spell out the levels of access to students' records, but such privileges are documented elsewhere. Through the site visit, the Panel confirmed that the electronic document system is effective and reliable. Although the physical records were kept in fireproof cabinets, there are concerns over their security. While the Panel confirmed through the site visit that the bulk of the students' physical records were appropriately shelved in a safe room, it nevertheless saw some files on a desk in the Registrar's Office, which the Panel noted was unlocked. While the Panel understands that these records may be drawn for day-to-day activities, the practice could compromise their security. The Panel recommends that UCB should ensure the security of its physical student records by developing procedures for strict access to them.

UCB sets in its Interim Strategic Plan (ISP) 2015-2017 an action plan to establish a backup database for its management information system 'LOGSIS', and claims that arrangements are in place for providing external data disaster recovery hosting services. Through interviews, however, the Panel was informed that the back-up copy is saved on an external hard disk which is updated on a weekly basis and kept by one staff member. The Panel, therefore, strongly recommends that UCB should formalise its practice in relation to electronic backup of its records by keeping a secure backup copy outside of its premises;

and develop guidelines to regulate aspects related to its safekeeping, updating frequency and accessibility.

The maintenance of the safety and integrity of the process of certificates issuance is addressed through the 'Results and Reporting Policy'. It has been developed to ensure the security of, and accuracy during the whole certificate issuance process. The policy lists procedures designed to maintain the accuracy of the graduating students' records and the full alignment between the paper and electronic versions of their grades. There are also procedures to uphold the security of electronic records by regulating access to them. Through interviews, the Panel confirmed that instructors are trained on entering their students' grades through LOGSIS and are given personal usernames for this purpose. They are also acquainted with the procedures to follow whenever there is need to change a grade on the system. To minimise human error, LOGSIS has been designed to generate letter grades and Cumulative Grade Point Average (CGPA) automatically. In addition, the lists of prospective graduates are circulated by the Registry in advance for verification and approval by the HoDs to avoid any potential confusion in the issue of awards. During the site visit, the Panel verified that the system was error-proof, as it is programmed to automatically overrule manipulations after the system is closed. The Panel also heard that UCB has recorded no cases of wrongly-issued awards.

As UCB adopts a four-year review cycle for its policies, it is yet to conduct a formal review of the policies it implements to maintain the safety and integrity of the process of certificates issuance due to their recent deployment. The Panel, however, saw evidence of a LOGSIS evaluation and examples of suggested improvements.

Overall, the Panel concludes that security of learner records and certification are inadequate and considers this Indicator as not addressed.

Recommendations

- Ensure the security of UCB's physical student records by developing procedures for strict access to them.
- Formalize practice in relation to electronic backup of records by keeping an additional secure backup copy outside the premises; and develop guidelines to regulate aspects related to its safekeeping, updating frequency and accessibility.

Judgement: The Institution **does not address** Standard 2: Quality Assurance and Enhancement

Standard 3

Learning Resources, ICT and Infrastructure

The institution has appropriate and sufficient learning resources, ICT and physical infrastructure to function effectively as a HEI, and which support the academic and administrative operations of the institution.

Indicator 10: Learning Resources

The institution provides sustained access to sufficient information and learning resources to achieve its mission and fully support all of its academic programmes.

Judgement: Not Addressed

UCB provides a Library and a Learning Resources Centre (LRC) through which staff and students access online materials. It has established a Library and IT Committee (LITC) to manage different aspects of the learning and ICT provision. The Library Guide is also available online and contains detailed regulations for access and use of the provided learning resources. Users are also given the opportunity to recommend books for the Library to acquire. Users are issued University-based email accounts and can access learning resources and facilities on and off campus from the first day they join UCB; and the Panel verified that it is accessible through UCB's website. The Panel was provided with evidence showing a list of the findings of a recent audit of UCB's learning and ICT resources. The Panel also saw evidence which confirms that resource auditing has been conducted twice in 2019 as a regular quality assurance mechanism.

The Panel noted that UCB offers a postgraduate programme (MBA) in the evening and the Library operating hours are not suitable for its students as the library opens from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m. during working days and upon request during weekends or examination periods. Consequently, the Panel recommends that UCB should reconsider the opening timing of its library to allow its postgraduate students to easily access its services. According to the provided Audit Reports, it was confirmed that the study spaces provided by UCB are sufficient for its current student population. The Panel confirmed, during the site visit tour, the existence of rooms for private and group study in all UCB's buildings apart from the library as there is limited space for group projects.

From interviews, the Panel learned that the LITC is tasked, among other things, to review requests made by the academic departments to acquire learning resources relevant to their programmes and liaising with the UFC to secure financial resources for these requests once they are approved by LITC. The evidence provided to the Panel confirms that LITC holds regular meetings and that the review of learning resources is a regular agenda item. While noting the improvement efforts made by the LITC, the Panel observed that the UCB's learning resources have not been properly mapped to the academic programmes it offers, as some programmes are better resourced than others. The Panel heard through interviews with students, for example, that computer laboratories are equipped with specialised software programmes and current books are available for the Graphic Design programme, while students in other programmes such as Business Administration still find it difficult to get recent publications relevant to their fields of specialisation. During the site visit tour, the Panel searched for a

variety of topics related to the programmes offered by UCB, which resulted in only short lists of available printed/hard copy references, most of which were relatively old books. While the Panel was in the library, they searched the available electronic database and noted that it offered very limited sources. The Panel found that UCB had subscribed to only one electronic journal, and that many of the open access journals available were irrelevant to the disciplines. Besides, some results of the searching are fee-paying, and it was unclear who would bear these costs should these references be acquired. From interviews, although the Panel learned that UCB has recently established an agreement with one of the local universities to share their online resources; yet it was not activated during the site visit. The Panel notes that the Annual Monitoring and Review Reports show the urgent need to map and update UCB's printed and electronic resources to the requirements of its academic programmes. Therefore, the Panel recommends that UCB should identify the learning resource requirements of the offered programmes, and then update and expand its learning resources, whether printed or online/electronic databases to ensure that the library resources meet programme and research needs.

UCB lists learning resources among the benchmarking criteria in its Benchmarking Policy. The Panel notes, however, that while some resource requirements were discussed in other platforms such as Programme Advisory Board meetings, these discussions are not informed by formal benchmarking of its learning resources and services against other local or regional HEIs. Consequently, it is recommended that UCB should benchmark its physical and electronic learning resources to those offered by similar institutions.

UCB has a Student Support Policy listing the support services which are provided to them. Upon registration, new students are offered an induction programme through which they are introduced to the various learning support services and trained on using learning facilities, including the library, laboratories, IT services, and e-learning. Evidence provided to the Panel shows that training workshops are also conducted for new academic staff upon their arrival to familiarise them with UCB's learning environment.

From interviews and evidence provided, the Panel learned that UCB evaluates its learning resources through student surveys to ensure their effectiveness. Evidence also confirms that improvements to learning resources have been made in response to the findings of these surveys. The Panel notes, however, that only the Final Year Student Survey seeks specific feedback about ICT and the Library. As this survey is administered to prospective graduates at the end of each programme, the Panel recommends that UCB should conduct more regular satisfaction surveys to its enrolled students to be able to identify any potential shortages in its learning resources and address them in a timely manner.

The Panel concludes that the information and learning resources provide inadequate support to the academic programmes. Therefore, this Indicator is considered as not addressed.

Recommendations

- Reconsider the opening hours of the library to allow postgraduate students to easily access UCB's services.

- Identify the learning resource requirements of the offered programmes, and then update and expand learning resources, whether printed or online/electronic databases to ensure that the library resources meet programme and research needs.
- Benchmark physical and electronic learning resources with those provided by similar institutions.
- Conduct more regular satisfaction surveys to its enrolled students to be able to identify any potential shortages in its learning resources and address them in a timely manner.

Indicator 11: ICT

The institution provides coordinated ICT resources for the effective support of student learning.

Judgement: Not Addressed

As per the SER, the management of the ICT services and facilities has been entrusted to the LITC chaired by the VP. UCB has recently developed an ICT Learning Resources Policy which regulates staff and student access to ICT support learning resources. The Panel was provided with evidence that the new arrangements in relation to the management of the ICT resources are discussed with, and disseminated to, the academic departments and other stakeholders represented in the LITC. To eliminate the risk of depending on a single administrator/super user and to simultaneously enhance and expedite the provision of support services, an in-house ICT specialist has recently been appointed by UCB. However, with only one person providing all the ICT-related support services, the Panel has concerns about the reliability and sustainability of this arrangement, particularly as many ICT maintenance processes such as system upgrading and/or data back-up are time-consuming. In addition, it is unclear to the Panel how UCB will deal with ICT problems when this sole officer is unavailable, such as when he is on annual or sick leave. The Panel recommends that UCB should ensure a reliable back up for all UCB's ICT activities including sufficient support personnel.

According to its Mission statement, the UCB's education provisions include ICT-intensive concentrations such as Information Technology and the Creative Industries. In line with this orientation, it has included in its Institutional Strategic Plan 2018-2024 an objective to 'Support staff with updated IT systems to improve learning, teaching, research and student support' (Objective 4.3). The Panel saw no evidence of planned maintenance and replacement of ICT resources, and UCB is yet to develop and implement a formal operational plan for the management of its ICT resources, which includes active disaster recovery plans. The Panel recommends that UCB should develop and implement an ICT operational plan, including active disaster recovery plan, and monitor the implementation of this plan to ensure the effectiveness and safety of its ICT resources and services.

UCB's ICT Learning Resources Policy sets the guidelines for ICT provision. It lists the services which students and staff members are entitled to have and provides information about the support services they get and identifies the parties responsible for them. The Policy has an appended list of IT facilities with specifications which UCB regards as the minimum requirements for the ICT services it provides. During interviews, the Panel heard positive user feedback regarding the adequacy, reliability and accessibility of ICT resources. The facilities tour during the site visit corroborated this view, as the Panel

found the laboratories to be adequately equipped with new computers with large screens and appropriate software for the offered programmes at UCB.

ICT provision is monitored through feedback from students and staff and formal audits. User satisfaction is gauged through surveys administered to staff and students at different stages. The Panel found, however, that the UCB did not respond systematically to the findings of these surveys as UCB takes a piecemeal approach to addressing feedback received on its ICT resources usage. Consequently, the Panel recommends that UCB should establish a systematic approach for addressing students and staff feedback on its ICT resources and utilise the collated data to inform improvements in order to maintain user satisfaction.

There is evidence that UCB's LOGSIS produces reports that inform decision-making at departmental and institutional levels. From the evidence provided and interviews, the Panel gathered that the system monitors students' attendance and generates warning letters at pre-set levels. It also monitors students' performance and identifies those underperforming students when their CGPAs fall below 2.0, which then triggers the academic support process designed for students at risk, or on probation. Academic advisors are given access to key documents for this process, including the concerned students' schedules and their transcripts. LOGSIS also generates lists of prospective graduates, which are then forwarded by the Registrar to the UEB and then their respective departments for verification and approval.

Overall, the Panel concludes that the institution does not provide reliable ICT resources in support of student learning, and hence considers this Indicator as not addressed.

Recommendations

- Ensure a reliable back up is available for all UCB's ICT activities including sufficient support Personnel.
- Develop and implement an ICT operational plan, including active disaster recovery plan, and monitor the implementation of this plan to ensure the effectiveness and safety of UCB's ICT resources and services.
- Establish a systematic approach for addressing students and staff feedback on its ICT resources; and utilise the collated data to inform improvements in order to maintain user satisfaction.

Indicator 12: Infrastructure

The institution provides physical infrastructure that is safe and demonstrably adequate for the conduct of its academic programmes.

Judgement: Addressed

According to Objective 6.3, UCB assigns strategic importance to the development and expansion of its physical infrastructure. It adopts a two-pronged approach to manage this aspect in the short-term and long-term. In the short-term, the Panel noted that a register of the equipment was last drawn in a 2018

audit of learning resources. The Panel also saw evidence of scheduled maintenance of the physical facilities and infrastructure that had been conducted in the past and planned for the future.

UCB campus consists of three buildings with a capacity to serve 1200 students and only a fourth of this number is currently studying there. It maintains a register of its physical facilities, along with a maintenance plan. The Panel conducted a campus tour during which classes, studio laboratories, computer laboratories, staff offices, student council, cafeteria, halls, informal study spaces with games were visited and noted that they were sufficient to deliver UCB's current programmes. Although as mentioned in Indicator 10 that the library has very limited space for group projects and both printed and online resources are very limited. The Panel also heard that extra classrooms are available, and may be used to relocate lectures if any unforeseen circumstances prevent lecturers or students from holding them in their assigned venues. Two amphitheatres are also used for larger classes, as well as for examinations whenever the need arises. The Panel confirmed that computer and design laboratories have PCs and drawing desks (15 units) that are commensurate with the numbers of students per class and small discussion rooms are provided for small group projects. However, when UCB staff were asked about provisions for students with special physical needs, they stated that classes had once been shifted to the ground floor on a temporary basis to accommodate the needs of a student with an injury that made climbing the stairs difficult. The Panel observed that accessibility to UCB's facilities needs to be reconsidered by its management despite the existence of ramps. Some of the classes and laboratories are located in the second or third floor which makes it hard for both students and staff in case of injuries or medical conditions. Consequently, the Panel is of the view that the provision of elevators in the academic buildings is required to support students and staff with injuries or physical disabilities, so that they can more easily attend classes and access the studios/laboratories and the library. Hence, the Panel recommends that UCB should ensure that its facilities are accessible for students and staff with injuries or physical special needs.

UCB has a Health and Safety Committee that meets twice a year and is responsible for overseeing and ensuring the implementation of occupational health and safety regulations, thereby ensuring that the relevant laws and regulations of the Kingdom of Bahrain are complied with. During the site visit, the Panel also saw that there is a dedicated first aid room, equipped with a bed and a first aid kit.

UCB uses student satisfaction surveys to elicit their views regarding various aspects of their study/work experience at UCB. Findings of student surveys are analysed by the respective departments and QAAC, however, it was noted that no improvements were made in response to these surveys. The Panel concluded that the student surveys used by UCB have room for improvement, particularly in relation to their ability to evaluate the University's infrastructure. The Panel also notes that while staff feedback is sought through meetings with the senior management, there is no evidence of staff satisfaction surveys being conducted to evaluate their response to the various services and facilities of the University. The Panel recommends that UCB should seek specific and detailed feedback from staff and students about each aspect of its infrastructure and respond systematically to its surveys' findings to ensure that its services and facilities are fit for purpose.

Overall, the Panel concludes that UCB provides physical infrastructure that is safe and demonstrably adequate for the conduct of its academic programmes. Consequently, this Indicator is considered as addressed.

Recommendations

- Ensure that the facilities are accessible for students and staff with injuries or physical special needs.
- Seek specific and detailed feedback from staff and students about each aspect of the infrastructure and respond systematically to survey findings to ensure that services and facilities are fit for purpose.

Judgement: The Institution **does not address** Standard 3: Learning Resources, ICT and Infrastructure

Standard 4

The Quality of Teaching and Learning

The institution has a comprehensive academic planning system with a clear management structure and processes in place to ensure the quality of the teaching and learning programmes and their delivery.

Indicator 13: Management of Teaching and Learning Programmes

There are effective mechanisms to ensure the quality of teaching and learning provision across the institution.

Judgement: Not Addressed

UCB considers itself a student-centred HEI as specified in its Institutional Strategic Plan 2018-2024. The second of UCB's six strategic goals refers to teaching, learning and enhancement. The ambitious goal is to 'deliver a world-class teaching, learning and student engagement experience 'and to provide 'a quality assurance driven, and market-focused, education in the fields of the arts and sciences, particularly business administration, information technology and creative industries'. The Panel notes that there is a Quality Assurance and Accreditation (QAA) Academic Plan 2016-2021 which was revised and updated in November 2018. It includes a statement of the philosophy of teaching and learning and describes UCB's understanding of teaching and learning. The plan is implemented by all its entities and is accessible *via* the staff intranet. As the Panel learned in interviews with senior management, the Academic Plan is monitored and reviewed internally only. In examining course files and talking with students, alumni and employers during the site visit, the Panel noted that more attention needed to be given to scientific and technological standards, including greater response to recent market needs, and that this should be included in the current programme structures and course content. These requirements were previously stated in the UCB Market Needs Analysis Report 2017. The Panel is of the view that the effectiveness of the existing mechanisms of teaching and learning provisions is insufficient to achieve its ambitious goal. Thus, the Panel recommends that UCB should revise and update its current programme structures and course content to be in line with scientific and technological standards, and its Market Needs Analysis Report. In interviews the Panel learned that occasional input was given from the Programme Advisory Boards to enhance the contents of programmes, but this input needs a long-term holistic perspective.

The main entities responsible for the maintenance of academic standards and the assurance of quality are the President, the VP, the HoDs and the Programme Directors (PDs). Each HoD accounts for the academic programmes, curricula, academic personnel, student body and physical facilities; the PD manages the programme and assists the HoD—although, as the Panel learned during the site visit, the PDs had not yet been appointed. The Academic Plan is monitored by the QAAC, the related Academic Department Committees (ADCs) and the MBA Committee. The Panel acknowledges that in interviews with senior management and faculty members UCB demonstrates an outspoken concern for the maintenance of academic standards and for its teaching and research activities. Yet, roles and responsibilities are overlapping at times. This is most notably attributed to the large number of units and committees that have arisen due to the recent and necessary redesign of the organization structure

of the UCB and related processes. The Panel recommends that UCB should review and clarify the management responsibilities for its academic programmes and in particular the interplay of the HoDs' roles/functions in committees. Moreover, the Panel urges UCB to reduce the number of committees in a meaningful way in order to enhance their efficiency as indicated in Standard 1 (Indicator 4).

The Learning, Teaching and Enhancement Policy and Procedures (LTEPP), published in October 2018, is comprehensive and clearly structured. This policy is supported and amended by numerous other policies and good practice guidance covering almost every related aspect of teaching and learning. All policies are assigned to Standing Committees in order to guarantee their implementation and monitoring. The periodic review dates in four-year intervals are indicated in all policies. The current LTEPP and all related policies have been discussed in workshops and with academic personnel – which was, as it was revealed to the Panel in interviews with senior management and faculty members – a pre-condition for the effective management of UCBs' academic programmes. Additionally, the Faculty Guidebook specifies tasks and duties of academic personnel in a more general way.

Internships/Practicums are seen at UCB as a 'significant aspect of a student's development within their programme of study as stated in the SER. There are policies and procedures in place. Students are supported by an Internship Unit Coordinator and receive academic supervision during their internship. There are Internship Module specifications and templates to support students. Notably the Internship/Practicum Student Handbook describes clearly roles and responsibilities of the student, the supervisor and the site supervisor along with assessment criteria and an employer evaluation. In interviews the Panel was informed that internships are not part of the MBA programme since UCB assumes that applicants possess work experience. Most MBA students are in employment contracts during their study, as the Panel learned in interviews with alumni and students. The Panel acknowledges the widespread support and organization of the Internship arrangements and suggests inviting its industry partners to UCB to elaborate on their offerings, requirements and expectations.

UCB has implemented a consistent system to evaluate the quality of teaching and learning to enable continuous improvement: at programme, course and at classroom level. The Programme Specifications are part of the Annual Review Report and must be approved by the QAAC whereas Course Specifications are reviewed every semester and assessments of course are monitored and reviewed by both internal and external staff. The evaluation process of the above-mentioned tasks is supported by templates and forms and discussed in workshops. Part of the process also is a system of peer-based classroom observation. QAAC analyses the Annual Monitoring and Review Report and makes sure that actions for improvement are taken. The Annual and Periodic Programme Reviews Procedure specifies related tasks, action plans and their implementation. From interviews with different stakeholders, the Panel noticed a general lack of satisfaction with the quality of the offered programmes in terms of depth and breadth. In addition, the examination of course files revealed that many of the implemented practices (e.g. moderation) are recent and therefore their impact is not yet evident. Accordingly, the Panel notes that although a lot of internal effort and dedication have already been put into enhancing UCB's quality of teaching and learning; yet the implemented practices are still insufficient to maintain adequate academic standards especially in the absence of the needed benchmarks. The Panel recommends that UCB should enhance the quality of its teaching and learning and ensure adequate depth and breadth of its programme offerings. The Panel also advises that in order to keep up with rapidly evolving professional environments and considering the increasing

competition amongst HEIs locally, more unique features could be incorporated into its programme offerings. All in all, the Panel considers this Indicator as not addressed.

Recommendations

- Revise and update its current programme structures and course content to be in line with scientific and technological standards, and its Market Needs Analysis Report.
- Review and clarify the management responsibilities for its academic programmes and in particular the interplay of the HoDs' roles/functions in committees.
- Enhance the quality of its teaching and learning and ensure adequate depth and breadth of its programme offerings.

Indicator 14: Admissions

The institution has appropriate and rigorously enforced admission criteria for all its programmes.

Judgement: Addressed

UCB has a Student Admissions Policy and Procedures for Special Needs Applicants. Information about academic offerings is published on UCB's website, in Programme Brochures and in the Student Handbook. The Panel acknowledges that the information is clear, comprehensive and generally up-to-date.

UCB regulations mention two types of recognition of credits: (1) from Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) in another HEI and (2) from transferring from one department to another within the UCB programme offerings. The transfer of credits from one programme to another is regulated in the Student Admissions Policy. The HEC has to finally approve the transfer as clarified from interviews. The processes of UCB's internal transfer of credits from one department or programme concentration to another are documented in the Policy and Procedures for Inner Transfer and are deemed to be effective, as the Panel learned in interviews with HoDs, faculty members and students.

UCB's admission criteria are of generic character and they include a successful IELTS test or alternatively a TOEFL test. Admission criteria and the measurement of knowledge competencies for applicants of the Bachelor programmes are aligned with the international and local norms—except that there are no programme-specific requirements. There is one exception: effective from this academic year, all students of the Graphic Design Concentration in the BA in Communication and Multimedia programme are required to submit a portfolio, which was confirmed in interviews during the site visit.

To be admitted to the MBA programme the applicant has to hold a Bachelor degree -from any discipline - with a minimum CGPA of 2.5 (out of 4.0) along with an acceptable score in the IELTS test, which the Panel learned in the interviews with administrative and academic staff. Moreover, admission to the MBA programme requires a relevant and formal business or management background and should be completed by evidence of a minimum of 3 years' work experience. The absence of programme specific admission criteria might be one reason for some of the undergraduate students to be at-risk of academic failure as per the statistics for 2018-2019 in the submitted evidence. It is worth noting that although the

admission requirements are included in UCB's Benchmarking Policy and Procedures; yet interviews with administrative and academic staff revealed that formal and international benchmarking for UCB's admission criteria has not been conducted yet. The Panel, therefore, recommends that UCB should implement programme specific admission requirements and benchmark all of UCB's entry requirements to international standards to ensure the appropriateness and accuracy of its entry requirements.

UCB's medium of instruction is the English language as clarified in the SER. For this reason, students must provide a proof of proficiency in English with a certain IELTS or TOEFL score. The IELTS score must be 5.0 or more for the undergraduate programmes, 5.5 or more for the MBA programme, whereas the TOEFL score for the undergraduate is 500 for paper-based examination as clarified from interviews, the provided evidence and on UCB's website. In-house English courses are available, if a student's English knowledge does not meet the admission requirements. The Panel learned in the interviews that two foundation English language courses are currently offered at UCB.

As indicated in the SER, the Student Admissions Policy and Procedures determine and regulate UCB's admission processes. A review of the Student Admissions Policy and Procedures was conducted in 2018 and the next review is scheduled in 2022. A desktop analysis of local HEIs admission requirements was conducted in January 2018; a follow-up meeting was held in January 2019. The criteria for admission were eventually approved by the HEC. The Panel concluded that UCB generally has appropriate admission criteria for all its programmes in line with HEC minimum requirements, and that these are applied. Hence, the Panel considers this Indicator as addressed.

Recommendation

- Implement programme specific admission requirements and benchmark all of UCB's entry requirements to international standards to ensure the appropriateness and accuracy of its entry requirements.

Indicator 15: Introduction and Review of Programmes

The institution has rigorous systems and processes for the development and approval of new programmes - that includes appropriate infrastructure - and for the review of existing programmes to ensure sound academic standards are met. These requirements are applied consistently, regularly monitored and reviewed.

Judgement: Not Addressed

The introduction and review of programmes follows the approach of Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) in UK as stated in the SER and as explained in the submitted evidence. The Panel learned in interviews with senior management and academic staff that international External Validators have been involved, and a template was provided to the Panel in drafting programme reviews, policies and procedures. It was noted that areas for improvement were clearly documented in the Annual Programme Monitoring and Review Reports. However, improvements were not firmly implemented in a consistent manner. The 2017-2018 Monitoring and Review Report of the BSc programme in Business Administration asserts that 'job readiness could be improved'. Another Report shows an employment rate of only 33% of UCB graduates from the BSc Information Technology programme. One External Reviewer commented that

'external scrutiny is there but not regular' and that 'improvement of results of graduate students is needed to achieve the aims and ILOs of the programme'. During interviews with students and alumni, the Panel learned of diverging experiences. Several statements referred to outdated course contents. Furthermore, although efforts are expressed to formally engage external input from HEIs in Bahrain, from universities abroad, from employers and professional bodies, the provided evidence is insufficient to show how external input finds its way effectively into the curricula of all programmes, as discussed later in this Indicator. Consequently, the Panel recommends that UCB curricula should reflect relevant scientific knowledge and research trends and are closely adapted to labour market and societal needs.

One of many QAAC tasks is to make sure that UCB's qualifications are based on recognised higher education fields of study. The Benchmarking Policy includes the requirement to map CILOs and PILOs to the appropriate level in the NQF. The Validation Panel Meeting has been created to improve the effectiveness of study programmes and to ensure that all programmes are prepared to be aligned with BQA/NQF and HEC requirements. The objectives of these meetings are to discuss curriculum and syllabus design and course/module specifications, to make recommendations and to report on good practice. The Validation Panel Meeting is chaired by the VP. From interviews, the Panel was informed that UCB's qualifications have not been placed on NQF yet, as UCB should be listed first as an institution before submitting a request to place its qualifications.

The tailoring of new programmes has to follow the Qualification Design, Approval and Review Policy along with the Review, Evaluation and Improvement Policy which were updated in 2018. All programmes of UCB have been in place since its foundation, and no new programmes have been developed yet. As the Panel learned in interviews with senior management, there is a variety of ideas for creating new graduate programmes: Islamic Finance, Entrepreneurship, Health Sciences, Diplomacy and Strategy. However, none of them is in a concrete planning phase yet. The Panel advises UCB to strengthen the Bachelor programmes before engaging in introducing new Graduate programmes. One of QAAC tasks, along with Learning, Teaching and Curriculum Development Committee (LTCDC), is to review and validate existing study programmes and to consider proposals for the development of new programmes, which is also documented in the existing Programme Specifications. PILOs are mapped to CILOs and eventually to the University Intended Learning Outcomes (UILOs) as per the guidelines in the provided evidence and are subject to annual and periodic review.

Both the Annual and Periodic Programme Reviews Policy and Procedures and the Review, Evaluation and Improvement Policy and Procedures provide the framework for monitoring and reviewing UCB's study programmes. All programmes undergo both annual and periodic reviews. Eventually, an Outcome Action Plan is implemented by the respective HoDs. According to the ToR, QAAC is in charge of conducting programme reviews and reporting to the UCC. Programme reviews are generally discussed and finalised by internal Periodic Review Panels. External input is given by UCB's Department Advisory Boards. As the Panel came to know during the interviews conducted on-site, some External Consultants contribute actively with proposals for UCB's academic programmes, software use, and professional skills requirements. The Panel noted the existence of eight External Reviewers. Protocols and minutes of these proposals find their way into Action Plans, but are not yet embedded rigorously enough into course curricula. The Panel is of the view that effectiveness of the programme reviews is critical to the success of UCB's learning and teaching efforts. Consequently, the

Panel recommends that UCB should prioritise the input of the External Reviewers and show more flexibility and agility in updating programme structures and content.

QAAC and the LTCDC are, among other responsibilities, in charge of curricular improvement and that PILOs and CILOs comply with NQF requirements and expectations. The Benchmarking Policy and Procedures describe the mapping tasks of the University departments to the NQF standards. It is appreciated by the Panel that a series of workshops—chaired by the VP—were organised to familiarise academic personnel with NQF exigencies. Following these workshops, NQF level descriptor mapping has been completed for all courses by the departments. However, as mentioned earlier UCB has not been listed on the NQF yet.

Overall, the Panel concludes that the systems and processes for the introduction and review of programmes are inadequate to ensure sound academic standards are met. Therefore, this Indicator is not addressed.

Recommendations

- Ensure that the curricula of all UCB programmes reflect relevant scientific knowledge and research trends and are closely adapted to labour market and societal needs.
- Prioritise External Reviewers input and show more flexibility and agility in up-dating programme structures and content.

Indicator 16: Student Assessment and Moderation

There are implemented transparent assessment policies and procedures including moderation. Assessment of student learning is appropriate and accurately reflects the learning outcomes and academic standards achieved by students.

Judgement: Addressed

UCB expresses its commitment to effective, consistent internal and external moderation and assessment, encompassing study programmes as well as courses/modules. The University relies on various policies, procedures and guidance documents, which are accompanied by various workshops on academic practice. The central policies are: the Assessment and Moderation Policy and Procedures, the Academic Honesty and Integrity Policy and Procedures, the External Moderators Policy and Procedures, the Learning, Teaching and Enhancement Policy and Procedures, the Annual and Periodic Programme Review Policy and Procedures, the Guidance on Assessment, Examination and Moderation and the Enabling Learners with Special Needs Policy and Procedures. The documents on the website, the Student Handbook, the Faculty Handbook and the University Catalogue provide only limited information on the policies. During the site visit, the Panel was able to confirm that all policies and procedures are available to staff through Microsoft OneDrive. The Panel learned in interviews with faculty members that related workshops ensured widespread knowledge and understanding of these policies and procedures and that they are implemented across the UCB.

The VP initiated and implemented a series of academic workshops on various topics, including moderation and assessment. The Panel learned in interviews that the workshops promoted

understanding of the quality concept in the assessment processes of UCB. The VP asked for feedback on these workshops and acted upon the results with further workshop offerings. In addition, the UEB was introduced and the Panel was assured during the interviews that its value is widely understood and appreciated amongst faculty members.

UCB's Examination and Scheduling Committee is a body for approving examination schedules and confirming examination guidelines and procedures and schedules pre- and post-assessment meetings. The Assessment and Moderation Policy and Procedures document serves as a basis for appropriate and fit-for-purpose assessment moderations. The Panel verified during the interviews that external moderators comment also on the conducted mapping to NQF level descriptors—as provisionally assigned by the UCB. The Assessment and Moderation Policy and Procedures document is complemented by the External Moderators Policy and Procedures document which explicitly outlines the identification, invitation and appointment of external moderators. The role of a UCB's external moderator is characterised in the Guidance Assessment, Examination and Moderation document. The Panel also learned in the interviews that external moderators are provided with all related programme and course guides, policies and regulations, forms for pre-, post- assessment moderations; and are in contact with a key person from the respective department. The serious comprehension of the assessment and moderation mechanisms by the external moderators is appreciated by the Panel.

The possibility of grade appeal for the final examinations occurs in the University Catalogue and in the Student Handbook. The Assessment and Moderation Policy, which is valid across all UCB's entities, provides information on how students' appeals are processed. Students with grading issues may appeal—after paying a petition request fee—within one month after the examination. As the Panel learned from interviews, most appeals are processed in a timely manner.

Academic misconduct and plagiarism are dealt with mainly in the Academic Honesty and Integrity Policy and Procedures and in the Plagiarism Policy and Procedures. Both policies are clear and unequivocal. These policies are consistently applied and cover plagiarism as well as collusion, misrepresentation and buying or commissioning written or coded assignments. Prevention from fraud is achieved by making students aware of academic misconduct, by using 'grammarly.com' as a detection tool, and by clearly describing the consequences, all the way to dismissal. Turnitin has also been in discussion lately. The Student Code of Conduct, as well as relevant Course Specifications allude to the issue of plagiarism. Even each examination paper given out by UCB includes a reminder to students of the consequences of cheating. Furthermore, the Panel noted in interviews that the rules and regulations on plagiarism are well understood amongst all students and teaching staff.

The Panel is of the view that transparent assessment and moderation policies and procedures are in place and are appropriate. Therefore, this Indicator is addressed.

Recommendation

- None

Indicator 17: The Learning Outcomes

The institution ensures that all programmes and courses have clearly formulated learning outcomes and there are effective mechanisms to ensure that graduates achieve the learning outcomes of the programmes.

Judgement: Addressed

The SER describes a hierarchical structure of ILOs, in line with BQA/NQF Qualifications Framework. The ILOs cover the areas of (1) knowledge and understanding, (2) subject specific skills, (3) critical thinking, and (4) general and transferrable skills. ILOs along with Graduate Attributes are stated in the UCB Guidance: Intended Learning Outcomes document. Furthermore, the University Catalogue and all of UCB's Programme Specifications provide explicit descriptions of programme aims and related PILOs. CILOs are indicated as part of the course structure in all Course Specifications—except for a few courses in the Communication and Multimedia Programme, like COM301 or COM306.

The Learning and Teaching Enhancement Policy and Procedures provides the basis for the achievement of Graduate Attributes and ILOs. The Benchmarking Policy and Procedures was developed with the aim of ensuring the suitability and appropriateness of Graduate Attributes, Programme Goals, PILOs and CILOs. The additional Guidance on ILOs and the Coursework Specification Templates facilitate achievement of Graduate Attributes and ILOs across all programmes as outlined in the SER. Yet, the mechanisms to ensure the achievement of Graduate Attributes and ILOs according to the aforementioned policies and procedures are not yet fully in effect. According to the LTEPP Policy 'learning involves more than memorization; it involves recall but, more importantly, understanding, application, analysis, evaluation and creativity.' In many cases this goal has not been achieved. As observed by the Panel in random samples of course work during the site visit (e.g. course files for CIT 231, FIB 301, MGT 310, COM 306), priority was rather given to the reproduction of knowledge instead of applying it to a specific context or problem. Equally, software teaching should be relevant and sustainable: GRD 326 uses Adobe Flash to create animations, a software which will no longer receive technical support with effect from 2020. More appropriate would be the use of HTML 5 and Java Script. Furthermore, UCB's Benchmarking Policy asks explicitly for two benchmarking universities, one of them international, and the involvement of professional bodies. As the Panel learned in interviews these requirements have not been met in all programmes. The Panel recommends that UCB should ensure that the mechanisms for achieving intended learning outcomes—outlined in the Policies for LTEPP and for Benchmarking—are strictly implemented and verify the equivalence of learning outcomes and their linkage to professional requirements. The Panel further recommends that CILOs and PILOs of UCB's programmes should put more emphasis on methodology, critical thinking skills and on the transferability of knowledge.

UCB has approved processes and protocols for submitting learners' data and results for certification as clarified in the SER. Leading documents are the Security of Learner Records and Certificates Issuance Policy and Procedures and the Results and Reporting Policy and Procedures. Moreover, a university grading portal—Student Information System (SIS)—is in use. The Panel is of the view that the system is adequate to ensure the integrity of students' records.

UCB tracks students' progression toward their goals with a convincing Academic Advising Policy and Procedures. Academic Advisors provide personal tutoring and academic support and try to assist students' progress as clarified during interviews. It is acknowledged that the University provides

facilitating templates, such as the Student Advising Plan, or the Academic Advising Document. Likewise, the instructors and academic departments keep track of the students' individual progress. Central bodies are the Examination and Scheduling Committee (ESC) and the UEB. Basic support is given to students with special needs. The Panel learned during interviews with students, academic and administrative staff, that contacts with UCB alumni are not maintained on a regular basis. The follow up of alumni's progress ends with the Graduate Exit Survey. Thus, the Panel recommends that UCB should follow students' destinations beyond their duration of study on a regular and formal basis, in order to gain insights in the relevance of its course offerings. In addition, the Panel advises UCB to involve alumni actively both in curricular and extra-curricular events. Presentations or practical experiences in the professional world could be shared, and closer ties with alumni could lead to mutually beneficial connections of UCB with the professional world.

The SER specifies that UCB uses external review mechanisms to determine the suitability of its learning outcomes, basically with the help of the external pre- and post-assessment moderation forms. CILOs and PILOs are regularly being reviewed and screened by the HoDs. They are also controlled by the VP and External Reviewers. The Benchmarking Policy defines principles and practice, and the Benchmarking Procedures describe criteria, processes—like the aforementioned nomination of two universities, one from Bahrain, one from abroad, reporting requirements and implementation. The Panel is of the view that the design of appropriate policies and procedures are a necessary pre-condition, but they need to be fully implemented as well, as discussed earlier in this Indicator.

Overall, the Panel is of the view that the Institution ensures that all programmes and courses have clearly formulated learning outcomes and mechanisms to ensure that graduates achieve programme learning outcomes. Hence, this Indicator is addressed.

Recommendations

- Strictly implement the mechanisms for achieving learning outcomes—outlined in the Policies for Learning, Teaching and Enhancement and for Benchmarking—and verify the equivalence of learning outcomes and their linkage to professional requirements.
- Ensure that Course Intended Learning Outcomes and Programmed Intended Learning Outcomes of UCB's programmes put more emphasis on methodology, critical thinking skills and on the transferability of knowledge.
- Follow students' destinations beyond their duration of study on a regular and formal basis.

Indicator 18: Recognition of Prior Learning [where applicable and legislation permits]

The institution has a recognition of prior learning policy, and effective procedures for recognizing prior learning and assessing current competencies.

Judgement: Addressed

The University has formal arrangements to recognise students' learning achievements and current competencies. The Student Admission Policy provides regulations for transferring students; notably which and how many courses are subject to be credited by the UCB. The Panel learned from interviews

that up to 66% of courses with a minimum Grade of 'C' can be transferred in the undergraduate programmes, and up to 40% in the MBA programme. The Panel appreciates UCB's credit transfer regulations. All transferred courses are sent to the HEC for final approval.

Assessment procedures for the acceptance of prior learning are limited to the admission process, as stated earlier. The Panel learned in interviews that this includes the judgement of the adequacy of formal learning in prior higher education credits, and the portfolio which is a compulsory requirement for the Graphic Design Concentration within the BA in Communication and Multimedia programme. During the site visit the Panel learned that prior learning assessments and recognition are kept in the files of the Registration Unit.

The Panel concludes that UCB has a clear recognition of prior learning policy, and effective procedures for recognising prior learning that are in line with the current national regulations. Consequently, this Indicator is addressed.

Recommendation

- None

Indicator 19: Short courses

The institution has effective systems in place for the management of its short courses [where applicable].

- Not Applicable

Recommendation

- None

Judgement: The Institution **partially addresses** Standard 4: The Quality of Teaching and Learning

Standard 5

Student Support Services

The institution has an efficient and effective student administration and academic support services.

Indicator 20: Student Support

The institution provides efficient and effective student administration and academic support services, and encourages the personal development of students.

Judgement: Addressed

From the SER, the Panel noted that there is a dedicated Student Affairs and Marketing Office to support students in their admission, academic and career advising and personal development. The Student Support Policy documents the support and guidance provided to students. There is a Student Affairs Coordinator ensuring the engagement of students in extra-curricular activities. From interviews, the Panel was informed that the Student Affairs Coordinator had resigned from the full-time position and is currently working on a part-time basis attending to her duties for only half a day, on a daily basis. Furthermore, it was found that an external Student Counsellor with specialised qualifications in psychotherapy was available who provides support to students who need counselling, though on a part-time weekly basis only. From interviews, the Panel found that to encourage students to be fit, UCB students are provided with membership to an external Health Club. When touring the facilities, the Panel observed that there is a First Aid Room available in the Student Affairs Office. However, there was no full-time nurse available for assistance, but one certified trained First Aid staff was available in the QAU office, who can be requested for assistance, if required. The Panel recommends that UCB should ensure that the Student Affairs and Marketing Office is manned with sufficient support staff and appoint a full-time staff member as Student Affairs Coordinator as soon as possible to ensure that students are well-supported in all aspects. Moreover, a certified full-time nurse should be appointed in order to have effective health and welfare services available to students.

UCB has an Admission Policy for Special Needs. A professionally qualified external Student Counsellor is also available on a part time basis to support students with special needs and make referrals when necessary as per the submitted evidence. During the site visit, the Panel investigated the implementation of this Policy and the provision of support for students with special needs. It was found that, to date, there was only one case of a student with special needs at UCB. Reasonable adjustments in terms of providing a separate examination room with the provision of reading the questions aloud were made by the concerned department.

UCB students are supported on academic and other matters by the Central Administration and academic departments and the Student Affairs Office. The Student Orientation Programme is held at the beginning of each year and is arranged by the University and academic departments, where students are formally welcomed to the University. In addition, UCB's website, Student Handbook and Open Day also support students by reminding them of basic procedures and important dates. The Student Advising Policy details the academic support students regarding enrolments and grades. During interviews with students

and alumni, the Panel found that students were aware of the Academic Advising Policy and were verbally advised in a timely fashion about relevant administrative information including registration of courses.

From interviews, the Panel noted that UCB provides opportunities for students to engage in wider social, recreational, community and cultural events. The Student Affairs Coordinator together with Student Council members, support and organise different kinds of activities that help promote social character in students, supports them in their career preparation and facilitates their personal development. In the last academic year, activities related to Breast Cancer Awareness, National Charter Day, Bahraini Women's Day, Career Fair and CV Writing with Injaz were organised. From interviews with students and Student Council members, the Panel found that the Student Council was active in suggesting and organising activities. The Student Council holds regular formal and informal meetings to discuss the organization of activities and its members are represented in the Student Affairs Marketing and Recruitment Committee (SAMRC) for planning. Through interviews with students, the Panel also found that the activities were organised by the Student Affairs Coordinator with the assistance of the Student Council, but had limited engagement from the larger Student Body of the University. Furthermore, UCB alumni were keen on engaging with the University and could be approached to help in various activities like lectures, workshops and projects. Hence, the Panel advises UCB to further enhance the sense of belonging of its students by initiating more student driven activities and student and alumni clubs.

From interviews, the Panel was informed that the Institution gathers students' feedback on course module delivery and services. Actions taken after conducting Graduate Exit Surveys in the last three years were discussed in QAAC meetings, but the focus was on the academic quality of courses and their delivery. There is, therefore, no evidence of detailed data collected to gauge the satisfaction of students, specifically for the student support services. As recommended in Standard 2 (Indicator 8), the content and frequency of the student surveys should be reviewed to ensure feedback of the students, specifically for adequacy and effectiveness of learning resources and student support services.

The Institution has well-defined policies and procedures related to academic advising and supporting students at risk of academic failure. The University By-Laws for Bachelor and MBA programme further support academic advising, enabling early identification and follow up of at-risk students. Academic advisors play an important role in advising students who are under academic probation to enhance their academic performance. In addition, from the site visit, the Panel found that the academic departments, ESC and UEB monitor the students on probation or academic risk. The policies and templates are available and implemented effectively. Furthermore, the Registrar prepares the list of students at risk of academic failure on a regular basis and shares with HoDs and advisors for action. The students on probation are advised to take 12 credits, repeat courses with F and D grades and/or change their major. Thus, the Panel found that the University has a clear mechanism in place to identify and support students at risk of academic failure.

The SER clarifies that the Institution has an operative learning environment and learning resources that support the students academically. As mentioned earlier, the Panel notes that there are clear policies that guide the process and practice of academic advising at UCB. The implementation of these policies was evidenced during interview sessions with staff and students. This is due to the low number of students in each class and academic advisors provide basic personal tutoring support for students as and when required.

The Panel concludes that UCB provides satisfactory student administration and academic support services, and encourages the personal development of students. Hence, the Panel considers this Indicator as addressed.

Recommendations

- Ensure that the Student Affairs and Marketing Office is manned with sufficient support staff and appoint a full-time staff member as Student Affairs Coordinator as soon as possible to ensure that students are well-supported in all aspects.
- Appoint a full-time certified nurse at UCB in order to have effective health and welfare services available to students.

Judgement: The Institution **addresses** Standard 5: Student Support Services

Standard 6

Human Resources Management

The institution has appropriate human resource policies and procedures including staff development in place that demonstrably support and enhance the various operational activities of the institution.

Indicator 21: Human Resources

The institution employs human resources that are sufficient in number and appropriately qualified to achieve the mission and to provide good quality higher education.

Judgement: Not Addressed

Several policy and procedure documents guide Human Resources (HR) management. There is a policy dealing with occupational health and safety and the 'Recruitment and Professional Development Plan (PDP) 2018-2019'. With its supporting documents and templates, PDP is actually a description of the recruitment and professional development procedures of the UCB. There is also a Human Resources Policy and Procedures Handbook, as well as a faculty guidebook consisting of chapters covering the governance of the Institution, academic positions and titles, faculty benefits, and IT & educational resources. For recruitment purposes, a standardised set of assessment tools is available for use in the selection of applicants, including interviews and reference checks. One of the six strategic goals of the UCB is related to attraction, retention and development of its staff. However, there is no evidence of an operational plan in the HR Department for 2019 to give effect to this strategy. The absence of such an operational plan was confirmed in interviews. The Panel recommends that UCB should develop an operational plan for the HR Department to ensure that the HR relevant goal of the strategic plan and its associated KPIs are actioned upon, and that progress made towards meeting these KPIs is effectively monitored.

The CVs of academic staff demonstrate that they have suitable qualifications and/or experience to undertake the responsibilities associated with their current teaching and administrative roles. In addition, an academic staff list for Fall 2018-2019 was included as supporting evidence, along with copies of their CVs suggesting that the Institution does keep up-to-date records of staff and their qualifications.

Over the five years, data provided indicates that the total number of academic staff had ranged from 20 to 25 with a decline in numbers over the past three years. Given that the General Studies Unit was staffed for the first time in 2017-2018, this means that there was an even sharper decline in faculty numbers across the three academic departments. The Academic Staff List for academic year 2018-2019 includes the names of 20 academic staff in the three departments and General Studies Unit combined, 14 of whom were full time and six part time. During interviews, the Panel learned that three new academic appointments were recently made, with all three academic staff members commencing work in early September 2019. The current staff to student ratio is 1:15. The staff retention rate since 2016 has been reported at 85% or more. However, in interviews the Panel established that this rate has been calculated by comparing the number of posts filled at the start of the year to those filled at the end of

the year, rather than taking into account the total number of vacancies that arose during the course of the year. The Panel recommends that UCB should revise the staff turnover by considering the total number of staff terminations, resignations and retirements that occur in a year; and take the necessary actions to improve the staff retention rates.

With respect to UCB's promotion, the Panel was informed that five academic and two administrative staff promotions were recorded since February 2016. The current faculty members are employed at a range of ranks, with at least one Associate Professor in each of the three academic departments. The Panel learned in interviews that staff induction occurred within the same week that a new employee commenced employment. The HR Department provides them with a briefing, a tour of the facilities, their employment contract and job description, and a 'welcome pack' consisting of policies and forms. The concerned HoD also inducts them into the department. In addition to this individual induction, there is a university-wide induction day that is attended by full and part time faculty and consists of a welcome address by the President of the UCB, presentations on the strategy and structure of the UCB, and an introduction to UCB systems. Various documents are also made available such as Faculty Guidebook and the Human Resource Policy and Procedures Handbook. Interviewed staff expressed their satisfaction with respect to UCB's induction. The Panel appreciates that all newly appointed staff are properly inducted.

During interviews, the Panel was informed that in accordance with their contract, faculty are expected to work 45 hours per week. There is a workload allocation system for academic staff, which only takes into account their teaching load at various ranks. Expectations for research, service and student advising are also set out in the provided evidence, but they are not built into a formula to calculate the total workload of each faculty member. The expectations for research and service are stated as follows: 'Although UCB is primarily a teaching institution, faculty members are encouraged to do research in both applied and basic, their primary duty is effective quality teaching', and 'it is generally expected that professorial faculty ranks spend 15% of their time on service activities.' In interviews, the Panel was also informed that the allocation of students for academic advising was dealt with at departmental level, and the Panel notes that there were large differences across departments, due to their differing student numbers. The Panel is of the view that the current workload model is too restrictive, as it does not take into account the full spectrum of academic activity. Furthermore, it prioritised teaching and learning above the other core activities of the University. The Panel recommends that UCB should revise its workload to encompass all the duties and responsibilities of faculty members in order to promote all the three core functions of the University.

The Human Resources Policy and Procedures Handbook includes a section on the employee grievance policy and procedure, which includes grievances related to notices of suspension or discharge, objections to decisions related to salary opposition, or in response to disciplinary action. A clear process is set out on how the employee should initiate a grievance, how this is investigated, the process of a grievance hearing, guidelines for deliberation, and how a decision is reached. The policy notes that the President has the final rule on the matter. However, the Panel found no evidence of cases of grievances being reported.

As indicated earlier in Standard 2 (Indicator 8), UCB runs surveys for its staff members, including a Staff Exit Survey for academic and administrative staff members who leave the University, and a multipurpose Event Feedback Form, which seeks their views of the workshops and training

programmes. The Human Resources Policy and Procedures Handbook also notes that in the event of the voluntary resignation of a staff member, the HoD is to hold an exit interview to determine the reason for the resignation. There is evidence that these interviews are taking place, but this data is not systematically analysed to improve future staff retention practises as confirmed from interviews. Therefore, as indicated early in this Indicator, UCB should take the necessary actions to improve the retention of its academic staff.

In general, the Panel concludes that this Indicator is not addressed.

Recommendations

- Develop an operational plan for Human Resources Department to ensure that the HR relevant goals of the strategic plan and their associated KPIs are actioned upon, and that progress made towards meeting these KPIs is effectively monitored.
- Revise the staff turnover by considering the total number of staff terminations, resignations and retirements that occur in the course of a year; and take the necessary actions to improve the staff retention rates.
- Revise its workload model to encompass all the duties and responsibilities of faculty members in order to promote all the three core functions of the University.

Indicator 22: Staff Development

The institution has a systematic approach to staff development and provides opportunities for all staff to remain up-to-date in their areas of teaching, research and administration.

Judgement: Addressed

The Human Resources Policy and Procedures Handbook contains information on performance appraisals, promotions, as well as the professional development policy for faculty and staff. Using the 'Annual Faculty Self Performance Report', faculty are expected to conduct a self-assessment of their performance. Furthermore, for those members of staff who request Continuing Professional Development (CPD), the PDP sets out the steps that the manager of the applicant is to follow in his/her personal professional development. The Lifelong Learning Committee (LLC) deals with all non-research related professional development. In addition, the job description of the Executive Director for QA and Accreditation includes oversight of CPD. Research-related staff development is handled by the Scientific Research Council (SRC). The minutes provided suggest that the SRC and LLC both meet on a regular basis and consider development requests.

In support of the development of a strategic research plan, a workshop was held in November 2018 with the aim of embedding research, scholarship, professional practice and consultancy into all UCB activities. At a department level, research plans are formulated, noting the research title, investigators, starting and expected completion dates, and the budget (if any). Progress with the implementation of these plans are reported at the department and institutional levels, noting the publishing and indexing details.

Policies such as the Classroom Observation Policy and Review, Evaluation and Improvement Policy provide mechanisms for faculty to receive performance feedback related to their teaching practices. The minutes of the SRC and LLC suggest that staff development activities are planned, but there is no evidence of a consolidated UCB annual plan, only the department level research plans.

According to the SER the VP monitors the use of the performance appraisal system, which provides a mechanism for staff to express their development needs. In interviews, the Panel learned that the VP organises a workshop schedule for the year, based on the policies being developed, written feedback from staff on the workshops including their suggestions for further workshops, and from his reflection on committee engagements and the institution's performance. They do so by completing the Annual Faculty Self Performance Report. In turn, HoDs complete a Performance Appraisal Form, rating the faculty member on aspects of their conducted work, strengths and areas of improvement. From interviews the Panel learned that there was no formal discussion of these completed forms in a performance appraisal interview. The Panel advises that UCB develop a mechanism to ensure that formal appraisal interviews are conducted with staff.

There is evidence of staff development activities being planned for at meetings, and there is evidence provided to show that these activities took place. During interviews, the Panel was informed that two types of staff development plans have been developed. Firstly, through a bottom-up process, individual development needs (in the form of workshops/conferences, short-term courses and other needs) are identified and consolidated into departmental level development plans. Secondly, a group level or university wide staff development programme was formulated to address common developmental requirements. Six workshops have been scheduled for the period September 2019 through to March 2020. Similarly, a series of workshops have been held in 2018/2019.

The Assessment and Moderation Policy provides guidance to faculty to assist them in setting assessments at the appropriate levels. Training has also been conducted on linking assessment to the NQF Framework. The provision of staff development opportunities is also monitored and evaluated. Evidence was provided of feedback for evaluation of staff development workshops. During interviews the Panel learned that this evaluation has informed the Staff Development Plan for 2019/20.

The Panel concludes that the UCB has an approach to staff development that provides opportunities for all staff to develop in the area of teaching particularly. Therefore, the Panel considers this Indicator as addressed.

Recommendation

- None

Judgement: The Institution **partially addresses** Standard 6: Human Resource Management

Standard 7

Research

The institution has a strategic research plan appropriate for its mission that is translated into a well-resourced operational plan, which is implemented and monitored.

Indicator 23: Research

The institution has implemented a plan for the development of research [e.g. disciplinary specific, scholarship of teaching and learning] appropriate for its institutional type that includes monitoring its research output, together with policies and processes to ensure the ethical and effective conduct of research.

Judgement: Addressed

The encouragement of theoretical and applied research is embedded in the 'relevance' focus theme of UCB's mission statement. UCB has an Institutional Research Strategy 2018-2024, which is adequate to a HEI in the Kingdom of Bahrain. The Research Strategy encompasses its own specific mission and vision, strategic goals and specific research focuses on all three of UCB's fields of study, which is appreciated by the Panel. In order to monitor and appraise the research outcomes, a number of KPIs are cited. The Scientific Research Council (SRC) monitors research and scholarship of the Institution and reports to the UCC indirectly, *via* the QAAC. The Panel advises that UCB could engage in formal co-operative research projects with regional and international HEIs and industry partners to both increase faculty members' extrinsic motivation to conduct research and to enhance the quality of research outputs.

UCB's Research Strategy is aligned with the HEC National Research Strategy 2014-2024, notably by creating a research-friendly and financially stable research environment and—in the long run—a knowledge-based society. According to HEC regulations, UCB has attributed a minimum of 3% of its total revenue to Research and Development. Additionally, UCB strives toward a sustainable amount of BD 7500 of external research funding. As clarified during interviews, the University as a whole, is willing to broaden its research activities by allocating sufficient funds, and by initialising research collaborations with public and private universities and institutions within and beyond the region. According to the Research Policy of 2017-2018, research is also supported by funding software and laboratory equipment. The Panel acknowledges the efforts of UCB in enhancing faculty involvement in research activities through allowing individual research time, conducting workshops and encouraging conference participation. The Panel advises UCB to encourage more research activities in all departments, and specifically in the Department of Communication and Multimedia.

There is a Research Policy which briefly touches on issues related to the ethical and safe conduct of research under the paragraphs of 'plagiarism' and 'publication and intellectual property'. There is also mention that academic staff members 'are required to carry out their research in compliance with all statutory ethical and contractual obligations'. The SRC has—among other duties—the task of establishing a 'professional and ethical infrastructure for... research'. Information on academic integrity is also given in the Faculty Handbook. The policy connected to the SRC also comprises requirements

related to academic integrity. Since there is no comprehensive policy guiding the ethical and safe conduct of research, the Panel recommends that UCB should formulate suitable policy guidelines for the ethical and safe conduct of research, or integrate comprehensive information on ethical research into the Faculty Handbook.

As the Panel learned in interviews, the SRC, which was established in 2018, meets every month to monitor research output and handle applications for conferences and sponsored doctorates. The Secretary General of the SRC has the specific duty to support the academic staff in their research activities. Rewards and incentives for active research faculty are described in the Research Policy. Suitable forms are available in order to facilitate applications for conferences, projects and publication support. As indicated in the Faculty Handbook good research practice is also a determining factor for staff promotion. All research activities/topics are annually audited by the HEC for compliance as clarified during interviews.

Capacity building and thus expanding, improving and retaining research knowledge and resources is one of UCB's strategic goals. One aim is to increase research output by activating 80% of all faculty members to engage in research, although their primary duty is quality teaching. The Professional Development Report for 2017-2018 documents a number of capacity building workshops for academic staff. Currently, only 20% of faculty members are research active. The Panel advises that all faculty members attend scientific conferences in their respective academic field at least once a year, or engage in regional or international research collaborations. Additionally, UCB should subscribe to relevant scientific literature or databases as stated in the recommendations given in Standard 3 (indicators 10).

On the whole, the Panel is of the view that UCB has implemented an appropriate plan for the development of research that includes monitoring research activities and output. Therefore, this Indicator is addressed.

Recommendation

- Formulate suitable policy guidelines for the ethical and safe conduct of research, or integrate comprehensive information on ethical research into the Faculty Handbook.

Indicator 24: Higher degrees with research [where applicable]

Where the institution offers higher degrees that include a research component, it provides effective supervision and resources for research students and ensures that its research degrees are of an appropriate level for the programme.

Judgement: Not Addressed

UCB has no license to award doctoral degrees (NQF level 10) but awards a Master's degree (NQF level 9) in Business Administration. As mentioned earlier, the Benchmarking Policy and Procedures was developed to ensure the suitability and appropriateness of Graduate Attributes, Programme Goals, PILOs and CILOs. The additional Guidance on ILOs and the Coursework Specification Templates facilitate that Graduate Attributes and ILOs could be achieved across all programmes as outlined in the SER. In the MBA programme, students are required to do a business project of four to six months

duration which requires research skills. Research methodology is taught specifically only in semesters 2 and 3. The Panel learned in interviews that instructors engage in Research Informed Teaching usually on the basis of their own research activities. The Panel recommends that UCB should emphasise Research Informed Teaching which means to make students acquainted with research fields and methods, and learn more about knowledge production—no matter if they are on an undergraduate or graduate level.

Research knowledge and skills are an integral part of most courses and modules in the MBA programme and in order to support and supervise students in their research capacities, each MBA student is assigned to a full-time PhD – qualified academic staff member as his/her supervisor. The Panel learned in interviews with students and faculty members that supervision of students for their thesis work, is done on a monthly basis. The Panel was informed during the interviews that graduate students are exposed to some relevant research related topics through the activities of their research-active lecturers and supervisors. Interviews also revealed the introduction of a Research Forum at UCB, where MBA students present their thesis projects. The Panel acknowledges the introduction of this Research Forum, which serves as a space for open discussion and debate on scientific issues. To complement this format, the Panel suggests engaging students in more research capacity building through specialised workshops, encouraging them to participate in scientific conferences and doing exercises in drafting conference papers (knowledge production).

Information on monitoring MBA students during their thesis or business project is given in a general manner in the Academic Regulations MBA 2017-2018. In addition, for details and duties of supervision, the SER refers to the MBA Proposal Guidance document (MBA Thesis/Project Preparation Guide) and the MBA Project Proposal (Programme Business Project Handbook). As the Panel learned in interviews, students' meet their supervisors on a monthly bases and supervision is done in a dedicated and supportive way. However, as the Panel noted during the site visit, research-related resources being hard copies or electronic are very limited and library opening timing needs to be reconsidered [See Standard 3 indicator 10]. The Panel, hence, recommends that UCB should ensure that sufficient resources are available for students to carry out their research programmes. As recommended in Standard 3, UCB should subscribe to current and research-relevant journals and data-bases, acquire up-to-date literature either in digital format or physical books, provide adequate working space in the library, participate in and organise scientific symposia at UCB, and provide a reliable IT and software infrastructure.

The Assessment and Moderation Policy and Procedures is complemented by the External Moderators Policy and Procedures, which explicitly outlines the identification, invitation and appointment of External Examiners. The Panel learned of three External Examiners for the MBA programme—of which one was asked to participate in a Validation Meeting at UCB. The Panel found out during the site visit that according to Article 39 of the UCC by-laws for Masters Degrees the MBA thesis is examined by three assessors, namely the student's advisor, an additional internal examiner and an External Examiner, who only completes the relevant sections of the External Moderator/Examiner Report, rather than producing a detailed examiner report of the thesis. In order to ensure that research theses are at an appropriate scientific level, the Panel recommends that UCB should formally co-operate with HEIs either in Bahrain or abroad, who have renowned research expertise. This will guarantee the commitment of highly qualified external examiners, and, furthermore, the Panel recommends that UCB

should develop unique areas of research expertise. The Panel advises UCB to strive to find third-party funds for their research and offer strong incentives for research-active faculty members and to attract more highly-rated research faculty members.

Although there is an impressive list of at least 14 workshops offered internally for faculty members at UCB, none is dealing with measures to enhance their competencies as supervisors. The Panel recommends that UCB should strengthen staff development activities with either internal or external workshops focusing on capacities as supervisors for graduate thesis projects.

The Panel concluded that the Institution does not provide appropriate support for higher degrees with a research component. Therefore, the Panel considers this Indicator as not addressed.

Recommendations

- Put more emphasis on Research Informed Teaching.
- Ensure that sufficient resources are available for students to carry out their research programmes.
- Formally co-operate with HEIs either in Bahrain or abroad, who have renowned research expertise in order to guarantee the commitment of highly qualified external examiners, and, furthermore, to develop unique areas of research expertise.
- Strengthen UCB's staff development activities with either internal or external workshops focusing on capacities as supervisors for graduate thesis projects.

Judgement: The Institution **partially addresses** Standard 7: Research

Standard 8

Community Engagement

The institution has a clear community engagement plan that is aligned with its mission and which is operational.

Indicator 25: Community Engagement

The institution has conceptualized and defined the ways in which it will serve and engage with local communities in order to discharge its social responsibilities.

Judgment: Not Addressed

Community engagement is stated to be one of the six strategic goals and priorities of UCB's Strategic Plan and is said to be an important pillar of its Vision and Mission statements as evident in the SER. Community engagement is reflected in the Strategic Plans the fifth goal to 'Enhance the University's relationship with government, industry and the community' with clearly articulated objectives and measures of success. The Panel found that the SER and conducted interviews do not corroborate the same understanding of community engagement amongst various stakeholders. Though there are a series of activities organised by the Student Affairs Office and academic departments, there is no clear understanding of them being as community engagement activities. The extracurricular activities, course work related activities, student activities, national events are all considered as community engagement. The relationship with government and industry are not being explored as community engagement. The Panel was informed during interviews with senior management that in the past community engagement was considered as social events, but now it is being revisited as activities based on student needs and a clear strategy needs to be developed for community engagement. Thus, the Panel recommends that UCB should establish a common understanding of the concept of community engagement, and then review the strategy and structure for planning and implementing community engagement activities.

Community engagement is being organised by various entities in the University including the Student Affairs Office, Student Council, and academic departments. Further, as evident from the Follow-up Plan and Progress Report on community engagement activities, is being discussed at the SAMRC, Life Long Learning Committee (LLLC) and the VP. Furthermore, during the site visit, it emerged that the Student Affairs Coordinator is responsible for social activities, but not community engagement. Also, SAMRC sometimes discusses community engagement initiatives, but is not responsible for its planning and implementation. Community engagement is listed in the ToR of LLLC but currently the committee is not working in this area, but will look into it in future. During the site visit, the Panel found that the academic departments are not responsible for community engagement activities and expect the Student Affairs Coordinator to manage them, as community engagement activities typically involves all students. The Panel, therefore, concludes that there is no specific person or committee that has community engagement as a distinct function. Furthermore, as per the plan for 2018-2019, many community engagement events were planned but only half were actually carried out highlighting the

need to have an effective follow up with implementation. Consequently, the Panel recommends that the UCB should clearly identify an entity responsible for community engagement.

While the SER states that the University analyses the reports on external engagement activities and events, it was found by the Panel that many events are not external. The feedback collected from stakeholders involved in community engagement was being discussed in different committees to evaluate the effectiveness of community engagement activities. No formal evidence of receiving feedback from stakeholders on community engagement was evident, other than the Graduate Exit Survey having a section seeking student's feedback on student activities. Furthermore, even though Graduate Exit Survey data is analysed and a report is generated, there is no evidence of it being used in improvement and planning of upcoming events. Therefore, the Panel recommends that UCB should develop a mechanism to get formal feedback from different stakeholders after conducting community engagement activities.

From interviews, the Panel heard that events are organised every year with the involvement of staff, students, and other stakeholders. There is a database to record all the community engagement activities and a report is generated annually. From SER and interviews, it was evident that different kinds of community engagement activities were organised during the last two years, such as community awareness on Cancer, Autism, and Poverty, and Celebrating Women in Bahrain. Furthermore, although UCB is conducting several community engagement activities, there is no evidence of a plan to incorporate themes, and which can be sustained over a period of time. There is also no clear demarcation between student activities and community engagement activities. Furthermore, there is no effective mechanism to monitor the effectiveness of community engagement activities. Therefore, the Panel advises UCB to clearly describe these categories and set up a Web-accessible database to allow its internal and external stakeholders to follow-up on its community engagement events/activities. The Panel also recommends that UCB should develop a mechanism to monitor the effectiveness of community engagement activities.

Overall, the Panel concludes that UCB has not clearly conceptualised and defined community engagement so that it can discharge its social responsibilities. Therefore, this standard is not addressed.

Recommendations

- Establish a common understanding of the concept of community engagement, and then review the strategy and structure for planning and implementing community engagement activities.
- Clearly identify an entity responsible for community engagement.
- Develop a mechanism to get formal feedback from different stakeholders after conducting any community engagement activity.
- Develop a mechanism to monitor the effectiveness of community engagement activities.

Judgement: The Institution **does not address** Standard 8: Community Engagement