



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

Directorate of Higher Education Reviews Institutional Follow-up Report

**University of Technology Bahrain
Kingdom of Bahrain**

Date Reviewed: 3-7 March 2019

Review Report Publication Date: 15 April 2020

Follow-up Visit Date: 2-3 February 2022

HI009-C2-F002

Table of Contents

Acronyms.....	3
I. Introduction.....	5
II. Standards and Indicators	7
III. Conclusion	34
Appendix I: Judgements per Standard	35
Appendix II: Overall Judgement	36

Acronyms

ABET	Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology
ACDC	Alumni and Career Development Centre
AMAIUB	AMA International University- Bahrain
ASU	Applied Science University
AUB	American University of Bahrain
AY	Academic Year
BoD	Board of Directors
BoT	Board of Trustees
BQA	Education & Training Quality Authority
CAFS	College of Administrative and Financial Sciences
CCQI	College Continuous Quality Improvement
CE	Community Engagement
CGPA	Cumulative Grade Point Average
CILO	Course Intended Learning Outcome
CoE	College of Engineering
DHR	Directorate of Higher Education Reviews
DSA	Deanship of Student Affairs
ECBE	European Council for Business Education
GFH	GFH Financial Group
HEC	Higher Education Council

ICT	Information Communication Technology
ILO	Intended Learning Outcome
IQA	Internal Quality Assurance
IR	Institutional Review
IRO	Institutional Research Office
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
NQF	National Qualifications Framework
PDD	Planning and Development Department
PIAP	Programme Industry Advisory Panel
PILO	Programme Intended Learning Outcome
PR	Progress Report
QAAD	Quality Assurance and Accreditation Department
QM	Quality Manual
QMS	Quality Management System
SIS	Student Information System
UC	University Council
UCQI	University Continuous Quality Improvement
UTB	University of Technology Bahrain
VPAA	Vice President for Academic Affairs
VPAF	Vice President for Administrative and Finance
WBL	Work-Based Learning

I. Introduction

The follow-up visits of the Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) conducted by the Directorate of Higher Education Reviews (DHR) of the Education & Training Quality Authority (BQA) in the Kingdom of Bahrain is part of a cycle of continuous quality assurance review and reporting on improvement. The follow-up visit applies to all HEIs that have been reviewed using the Institutional Reviews Framework (Cycle 2) and received a judgement of '**Does Not Meet Quality Assurance Requirements**'.

The output of each follow-up visit is a published report which indicates the level of progress achieved by the institution. There are two types of judgements with regard to the follow-up visit. The first evaluates the progress made within each Standard. The second is an overall judgement on the progress made by the Institution.

The institutional review of the University of Technology Bahrain was conducted by the DHR of the BQA on **3-7 March 2019** and the Review Report was published on **15 April 2020**. The judgement on University of Technology Bahrain for each Standard was as follows:

Standard 1: Mission, Governance and Management; **Partially Addressed**

Standard 2: Quality Assurance and Enhancement; **Partially Addressed**

Standard 3: Learning Resources, ICT and Infrastructure; **Partially Addressed**

Standard 4: The Quality of Teaching and Learning; **Partially Addressed**

Standard 5: Student Support Services; **Addressed**

Standard 6: Human Resources Management; **Addressed**

Standard 7: Research; **Partially Addressed**

Standard 8: Community Engagement; **Not Addressed**

This Report provides an account of the follow-up process and findings of the follow-up panel's visit, whereby the University of Technology Bahrain was revisited on 2-3 February 2022 to assess its progress in line with the published Institutional Reviews Framework (Cycle 2) and the BQA regulations. The follow-up process incorporated the review of the evidence presented by the Institution to the DHR, the Improvement Plan submitted to BQA on 22 July 2020, the progress report and its supporting materials, which were submitted in **October 2022**, and the documents submitted during the follow-up site visit and those extracted from the interview sessions.

The follow-up visit was conducted by a panel (the Panel) consisting of two members. The visit focused on assessing how the Institution addressed the recommendations within the Standards that have not been addressed. For each recommendation given under these standards, the Panel judged whether the recommendation is '**Successfully Addressed**',

'Adequately Addressed' or **'Not Adequately Addressed'** using the Rubric in Appendix I. Based on this, a judgment of **'Sufficient Progress'**, **'In Progress'**, or **'Insufficient Progress'** is given to each standard using the rubric in Appendix II.

II. Standards and Indicators

Standard 1

Mission, Governance and Management

Sufficient Progress

Recommendation 1.1:

Consider amending the Mission statement in its next revision to explain clearly the quality of teaching and learning to be offered, the level of research to be carried out and the extent of community service intended so that the University management could be able to make appropriate strategic decisions accordingly.

Judgement: Adequately Addressed

In addressing this recommendation, the University of Technology Bahrain (UTB), previously AMA International University – Bahrain (AMAIUB), revised its mission statement while developing the new Strategic Plan (2021-2026) in consultation with the stakeholders. As per the Institutional Review (IR) Progress Report (PR), the revised mission statement aims 'to contribute to the growth and sustainability of the economy and the expansion of human knowledge in business, science and technology fostering continuous innovation and excellence in education and research, strategic partnerships, international recognition, and entrepreneurial development'.

The revised Mission Statement addresses the two core functions of the University which are teaching and research appropriately as it clearly states 'excellence in education and research' and provides the required guidance for making strategic decisions and choices. UTB claims that the phrase 'strategic partnerships, international recognition, and entrepreneurial development spells out the type of research and community engagement (CE) that the University will carry out' and that 'the university's CE will be delivered through strategic partnerships with the community members'. The Panel notes that UTB's intentions with regards to CE dimension are well reflected in Goal 6 of the Strategic Plan 2021-2022 along with its appropriate strategic initiatives (objectives), but not in the mission statement. For example, it is neither clear with whom the strategic partnership would be developed nor how international recognition contributes to CE. Also, it is not clear how entrepreneurial development will be achieved through CE. Thus, the Panel is of the view that the mission statement needs to be further revised to clearly define the CE involvement of UTB that underpin Goal 6 of the Strategic Plan.

Overall, the Panel concludes that this recommendation is adequately addressed.

Recommendation 1.2:

Revise the AMAIUB Bylaws of its BoT, ToR of the UC and the job description of the President of the University to provide a formal status for their activities, have a clear separation of duties and responsibilities between the BoT, UC and the President and therefore an effective governance and management at the University.

Judgement: Successfully Addressed

UTB has enhanced its organization charts, revised the Bylaws, the Terms of Reference (ToR) of its Board of Trustees (BoT) and the University Council (UC), the job description of the President and the ToR of the Academic and Administrative Council. The newly revised Bylaws and ToRs of each entity is explained clearly in a manner that ensures the separation of duties and responsibilities between the BoT, UC and the President. For example, the Board of Directors (BoD) approves the budget and ensures the adequacy of the funds, and the appointment of the President and Vice Presidents, while the BoT sets the strategic directions and long-term vision of UTB, approves the policies and procedures contained in the Operations Manual (OM). As indicated in its ToR, the UC ensures the attainment of the vision and mission through overseeing the administrative, academic, educational and research functions and activities at UTB.

The Panel concludes that this recommendation is successfully addressed.

Recommendation 1.3:

Develop a clear and specific strategic goal for community engagement to be incorporated into the Strategic Plan, with appropriate strategic objectives, operational initiatives and key performance indicators.

Judgement: Successfully Addressed

In addressing this recommendation, UTB has first revised and further developed its Strategic Plan (2021-2026) and then addressed CE in Goal 6 by underlining 'Effective and Impactful Community Engagement'. Strategic initiatives and activities/projects are all indicated and appropriately detailed with tasks, responsible person/office, activity Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), target values, timeframe and budget requirement in the Operational Plan for the Academic Year (AY) 2021-2022. The IR PR indicates that achievements are monitored by the Planning and Development Department (PDD) at the end of every semester through the accomplishment and progress reports. The Panel is satisfied that the UTB new Strategic Plan (2021-2026) has a clear and specific strategic goal for CE with appropriate strategic objectives, operational initiatives and KPIs.

The Panel concludes that this recommendation is successfully addressed.

Recommendation 1.4:

Review and update the AMAIUB Organizational Chart to include Colleges, Academic Departments and Academic and Administrative Councils.

Judgement: Successfully Addressed

Following the change in the institutional management that took place in June 2021, UTB revised the organizational structure and fulfilled the requirements of the recommendation. The current organizational chart of UTB is sufficiently detailed and includes all colleges, departments and programmes as well as all the various councils and committees serving UTB. Hierarchies, reporting and communication lines among different entities are clearly indicated.

The Panel concludes that this recommendation is successfully addressed.

Recommendation 1.5:

Restructure AMAIUB councils and committees to enable the participation of students and other relevant entities, as appropriate to ensure efficient and formal communication, coordination and management of the University.

Judgement: Successfully Addressed

UTB revised the ToRs of its councils and committees and enabled membership of academic and administrative staff and students' representatives, in relevant committees appropriately. As evidence of the participation of academic and administrative staff and students in committee meetings, a sample of council and committee minutes of meetings was provided. This was further confirmed during the virtual interview sessions with faculty and students, who indicated that they attend these meetings and have a voting power.

The Panel concludes that this recommendation is successfully addressed.

Recommendation 1.6:

Implement more efficient and appropriate approaches in assessing the effectiveness of AMAIUB councils and committees.

Judgement: Successfully Addressed

To assess the effectiveness of its councils and committees, UTB implemented a Dashboard System and commissioned the PDD to monitor the accomplishments of the committees and councils after having been verified by the appropriate authority. Once the reports are compiled by the PDD, they are entered into the Dashboard and achievements are evaluated and tracked through the KPIs. Following the improvement observed in the achievements of committees and councils at the university level, the administration took the decision to expand the Dashboard coverage to include committees and councils at the college level as well. Interviews with the UTB senior management confirmed the benefits brought about by the use of the Dashboard System in monitoring the effectiveness of various councils and committees and the resultant improvement in their effectiveness/accomplishments.

The Panel concludes that this recommendation is successfully addressed.

Recommendation 1.7:

Strengthen the role of the AMAIUB Board of Trustees in overseeing the achievement and maintenance of academic standards, beginning with getting the Operations Manual approved by the Board of Trustees formally at the earliest convenience.

Judgement: Successfully Addressed

With the change of the university management, UTB appointed new BoT members and revised the Bylaws. According to the Bylaws, BoT has the responsibility to oversee, through periodic reports, matters relating to the achievement of the academic standards, including students' enrolment and graduate attributes and performance. The responsibilities of UC, Vice-President for Academic Affairs (VPAA) and the President, are all clearly specified in relation to attaining and maintaining high academic standards at the University. Upon request, a copy of the Operational Manual, containing all the policies and procedures of the UTB was given to the Panel. During the interview session with the

administration of UTB, the Panel learned that the newly appointed BoT has been approved by the Higher Education Council (HEC) and its first meeting is scheduled to take place on 30 March 2022.

The Panel concludes that this recommendation is successfully addressed.

Recommendation 1.8:

Develop policies, regulations and procedures on handling the academic and behavioural misconduct of AMAIUB students.

Judgement: Successfully Addressed

UTB developed and approved, at its UC meeting, the Policy on Student Grievance and Academic and Behavioural Misconduct in which all matters concerning these issues are attended to briefly. During the interview sessions with UTB academic staff and administrators, the Panel noted that there had not been any incidence recently concerning student grievance, academic or behavioural misconduct.

The Panel concludes that this recommendation is successfully addressed.

Standard 2 Quality Assurance and Enhancement

Sufficient Progress

Recommendation 2.1:

Revisit AMAIUB Quality Assurance and Accreditation Department, Continuous Quality Improvement and Quality Management System to eliminate the overlap in the roles of concerned entities as a matter of urgency and enhance the effectiveness of their roles.

Judgement: Successfully Addressed

UTB reviewed its Quality Management System (QMS) and revised the duties and responsibilities of the three entities responsible for quality assurance at the University. These are, the University Continuous Quality Improvement (UCQI) Committee, the Quality Assurance and Accreditation Department (QAAD), and the College Continuous Quality Improvement (CCQI) Committee. Accordingly, UCQI Committee proposes and develops the university's quality assurance and enhancement framework, and strategies. It reports directly to the UC, and it is chaired by the University President. The QAAD manages the Internal Quality Assurance structure (IQA) and ensures that every college/department satisfies all quality requirements. It is responsible for all contacts with external agencies such as the BQA, HEC and other national and international accrediting bodies. It is headed by the QAAD Director and reports directly to the President.

The CCQI Committees on the other hand execute and monitor quality assurance activities within the colleges and they directly report to the Dean as well as to QAAD. The Panel considers the revised roles and responsibilities of the quality assurance entities at various levels of the University appropriate, relevant and contribute to the effectiveness of the quality assurance system at UTB.

The Panel concludes that this recommendation is successfully addressed

Recommendation 2.2:

Ensure that all key quality Assurance-relevant documents, such as the Quality Manual, are accessible by all relevant stakeholders in order to promote their awareness in this aspect and spread the Quality Assurance culture.

Judgement: Successfully Addressed

The IR PR indicates that UTB has ensured that all stakeholders have access to various quality assurance related documents, including the Quality Manual (QM) and Operations Manual and Committee Guidelines through the university's website. As confirmed in interviews, academic and administrative staff, and students are able to access these documents through the shared Google drive. Furthermore, in spreading the awareness and quality assurance culture, UTB improved the orientation activities provided to newly hired academic staff, as well as the various quality assurance-related workshops/trainings conducted by the colleges' Faculty Development Committees (FDCs). In addition, the Centre for Learning Innovations and Customized Knowledge Solutions (CLICKS) and the

Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) conducted further trainings on quality assurance related matters.

The Panel concludes that this recommendation is successfully addressed.

Recommendation 2.3:

Go beyond identifying the potential opportunities for improvements by focusing on the actions to be done for addressing these opportunities to close the loop of Quality Assurance cycle and ensure the quality and effectiveness of these actions in the core areas of the University's performance.

Judgement: Successfully Addressed

UTB revised its QMS and integrated Plan, Do, Act and Check (PDCA) Model, in all its processes including reviewing and monitoring improvements at institutional, college, department and course levels. At the end of the trimester, all of the accomplishment and committee progress reports submitted by the departments/colleges are reviewed at the institutional level. PDD evaluates these submissions against a set of KPIs and if targets are not met, PDD discusses the issue with the concerned departments and makes adjustments in the implementation to ensure that the intended outcomes are achieved on time. In addition, college CQIs monitor the implementation of recommendations made as a result of course review and programme review. During the interview sessions, the academic staff and administrators confirmed the implementations of the PDCA cycle in all of the quality assurance related activities.

The Panel concludes that this recommendation is successfully addressed.

Recommendation 2.4:

Expand the scope of the Internal Quality Assurance process to include other core aspects of the University's functions beside the academic and support ones.

Judgement: Successfully Addressed

UTB revised the QMS to cover all the University's processes. In addition, an Internal Auditor, who is also a member of the UCQI Committee was assigned by the President to conduct an annual audit of the administrative processes. Towards the end of AY 2020-2021, initial IQA audits were conducted starting with the Human Resource Department, Information Communication Technology (ICT) Centre, Facilities Management Department and Purchasing Department. Interviews with the relevant stakeholders confirmed these implementations.

The Panel concludes that this recommendation is successfully addressed.

Recommendation 2.5:

Review the implementation of the University Benchmarking Policy to ensure a wider scope of this Policy is implemented, more reflective results are achieved and appropriate actions are made.

Judgement: Successfully Addressed

In addressing this recommendation, UTB revised its Policy on Benchmarking, which outlines the benchmarking principles and procedures to be followed, including identifying areas for improvement, gathering appropriate information to enable comparisons and improvement of performance. The

revised policy has been implemented in the recent annual course review where an informal benchmarking was conducted as part of the Annual Course Review. Other benchmarking exercises conducted after the revision of the policy includes that of the College of Administrative and Financial Sciences (CAFS) programmes and the benchmarking of the Library and Learning Centre (LLC). During the interview sessions with the administrators and academic staff, the Panel learned that the benchmarking exercises have been conducted appropriately and that results obtained were discussed and used to develop improvement plans.

The Panel concludes that this recommendation is successfully addressed.

Recommendation 2.6:

Review the implementation of AMAIUB Survey Policy to ensure that its full scope is covered, more reflective results are achieved, and appropriate actions are consequently taken.

Judgement: Successfully Addressed

UTB revised its survey policy and procedures and the institutional survey management framework which included the role of the QAAD in reviewing and approving institutional surveys. According to the revised policy, the Institutional Research Office (IRO) prepares the preliminary draft of the survey report and sends it to the Head of PDD where it is reviewed and then forwarded to the QAAD Director for validation of the results. From QAAD, all administrative relative surveys are sent to the Vice President for Administration and Finance (VPAF) and all academic-related surveys are sent to VPAA for approval. The final approval of all the surveys rests with the President of the UTB.

In order to overcome the inflated survey results, UTB implemented a method to deal with 'extreme response bias'. According to IR PR, this calibration enabled a more reflective analysis and more responsive action plans that would contribute to the improvement of the services provided by the UTB. The Panel examined the student satisfaction survey with the library services which was given as an example for the implementation of the newly developed Survey Policy.

The Panel concludes that this recommendation is successfully addressed.

Recommendation 2.7:

Ensure that all surveys the AMAIUB currently uses are fit for purpose before using them and even prior to their periodic review.

Judgement: Successfully Addressed

According to the IR PR, PDD worked with QAAD and different entities (e.g., Human Recourses Department, Library and ICT Centre) to review the survey instruments in order to ensure that they are appropriate and fit for purpose. Evidence for such work could be followed in the minutes of the meetings where participants discussed how to improve a number of surveys currently in use. In addition, UBT supplied a sample of revised and filled satisfaction surveys designed for various categories of participants including administrative staff, academic staff and students as well as for ICT and library services. During the interview sessions, the Panel learned that UTB implements a total of 19 surveys, of which 15 are major and some are for academic and administrative staff.

The Panel concludes that this recommendation is successfully addressed.

Recommendation 2.8:

Develop and implement a robust mechanism to ensure the safety and integrity of the process of certificate issuance.

Judgement: Successfully Addressed

UTB revised its policy and procedures on Securing Students' Records and included a three-stage checking, and verification process to be implemented, starting AY 2020-2021, by the Registration Staff, Registration Supervisor, and the University Registrar in order to ensure the accuracy and integrity of the documents. This was confirmed by the concerned administrative staff during the interview sessions. The Panel considers the mechanism developed by UTB sufficiently robust to ensure the safety and integrity of certificate issuance.

The Panel concludes that this recommendation is successfully addressed.

Standard 3 Learning Resources, ICT and Infrastructure

Sufficient Progress

Recommendation 3.1:

Review AMAIUB policy and procedures for the expression of needs for the library and learning resources so as to cover the alignment of library and learning resources with the academic programmes.

Judgement: Successfully Addressed

UTB revised its policy and procedures on Acquisition of Library Resources in order to align the instructional materials and learning resources to the requirements of the academic programmes as well as the requirements of faculty members. Sections 6.3, 6.4 and 6.5 of the policy address the alignment of the learning resources through the annual programme and programme periodic reviews (3-5 years), course reviews and the research needs of the faculty, respectively. The Panel reviewed the provided evidence of the action taken by the colleges to ensure the alignment of the library textbooks and instructional materials with the needs of the academic programmes following the annual course reviews and the programme reviews and found them satisfactory. This was further verified during the interview sessions with the academic staff.

Overall, the Panel concludes that this recommendation is successfully addressed.

Recommendation 3.2:

Design and carry out benchmarking that is specifically geared towards library and learning resources.

Judgement: Successfully Addressed

According to the IR Progress Report, a benchmarking activity was carried out with two local universities by the Head of Library and Learning Centre in which the library services and learning resources were compared. As a result of this benchmarking, the Instructional Materials and Library Committee recommended subscription to a significant journal database (IEEE ASPP), installation of a Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) system upon renovation of the library and upgrading the Library Management System. The Panel confirmed the implementation of the benchmarking and its ensued recommendations during the interview sessions with the UTB administrators.

Overall, the Panel concludes that this recommendation is successfully addressed.

Recommendation 3.3:

Design and implement a more informative/detailed surveys about the learning resources (for the different stakeholders) and use their outcomes to improve the contents and services.

Judgement: Successfully Addressed

UTB has redesigned its survey on library services which currently includes 15 items. The recent library survey report showed that the students were satisfied (an average of 3.25 out of 5) with the services, instructional materials and facilities offered to them. Based on one of the survey's recommendations concerning moving from printed to electronic books, journals and references, UTB has taken actions to improve its library and ICT services such as: changing the Student Information System (SIS) from its current system to a new system and providing a wide range of e-textbooks for all programmes. The Panel verified, during interviews, the implementation of the library survey and various improvements made based on its findings.

Overall, the Panel concludes that this recommendation is successfully addressed.

Recommendation 3.4:

Review AMAIUB Information Technology Policy and Procedures periodically and design and conduct a more appropriate information technology induction for its students and faculty/staff.

Judgement: Successfully Addressed

The ICT Centre revised its policies and procedures along with the job descriptions as per the new organizational chart of UTB. This was achieved through the Policies on Computer and Laboratory Maintenance and Repair, Computer Laboratory Guidelines, Data Backup and Restoration, and Policy on ICT Disaster Recovery. The revised positions, titles, and job descriptions are reflected in the ICT centre's policies and procedures. In fulfilling the recommendation on induction for students, the Deanship of Student Affairs (DSA) starting from AY 2020-2021, organized orientation programmes for the new students which included seminars on online classes, ICT and library services. In addition, workshops were organized to help students access their Moodle accounts and online classes through Zoom. As for the newly recruited academic staff, besides the orientation provided by the Human Resources Department, they are assigned a mentor, who are together with the ICT Centre, assist the newly recruited faculty in adapting to the university systems. This has been verified during the interview sessions by the Panel.

Overall, the Panel concludes that this recommendation is successfully addressed.

Recommendation 3.5:

Upgrade the Campus Information System so that it includes various services such as the online payment, tools for the support of decision making, etc., and that special measures be taken to secure the system and all the data.

Judgement: Successfully Addressed

The IR Progress Report indicates that UTB has taken prompt action to develop a new online SIS that has the capacity of integrating various application programmes, such as Moodle, office365, Microsoft azure, dynamics, SharePoint, HRMS, and ERP. Although online payment of tuition fees has been implemented since April 2020 through Benefit Pay, the new SIS, which is expected to be fully operational at the end of AY 2021-2022, will include an online payment as well as a notification system that alerts and tracks changes made to students' records by any staff, authorized or unauthorized. This has been verified with the ICT staff as well as with the students during the interview sessions.

Overall, the Panel concludes that this recommendation is successfully addressed.

Recommendation 3.6:

Develop facilities in ways that ensure their appropriate alignment with the needs of the academic programmes they serve (student study areas, faculty offices, sports facilities, cafeteria, etc

Judgement: Successfully Addressed

As part of its new Strategic Plan (2021-2026), UTB developed a Campus Improvement Masterplan in order to provide a modern and adequate facilities, including a spacious library, student study areas, group discussion rooms, canteen and new outdoor sports facilities. The Panel verified plans for developing and improving UTB campus facilities during the interview sessions with the administrators and the students.

Overall, the Panel concludes that this recommendation is successfully addressed.

Standard 4 The Quality of Teaching and Learning

In Progress

Recommendation 4.1:

Review the University Academic Plan to clarify its purpose and reporting channels, and to ensure that it is based on a clearly articulated philosophy of education which informs the strategic and operational objectives of the plan, and that it is owned by all members of the University.

Judgement: Adequately Addressed

The Academic Council revised the Academic Plan for AY 2020-2021 based on the strategic objectives of the UTB Strategic Academic Plan 2016-2021 which includes the teaching and learning philosophy of the University. Furthermore, UTB provided college operation plans for CAFS, College of Computer Studies (CCS) and College of Engineering (CoE) for AY 2020-2021, based on the strategic objectives of the old Strategic Plan 2016-2021. Following the development of the new Strategic Plan (2021-2026) and its strategic objectives, UTB developed its Academic Plan for AY 2021-2026 as well as the Academic Affairs Operational Plan for AY 2021-2022. The Panel noted that the new Academic Plan has a clear philosophy 'to achieve continuous innovation and academic excellence in teaching, learning and research and that every faculty member and student achieve their full academic potential'.

The IR PR states that the roles and responsibilities of the faculty members in the implementation of the Academic Plan was ensured through a series of orientation sessions while the Academic Operational Plan is monitored by the VPAA and PDD through the Dashboard System where targets, person responsible and tasks completed are recorded. During the interview sessions with the academic staff, the Panel noted that the academic administrators and faculty members need to have more understanding of the purpose, the use and the implementation of the new Academic Plan. The Panel advises UTB to address this issue.

Overall, the Panel concludes that this recommendation is adequately addressed.

Recommendation 4.2:

Ensure that feedback is obtained from all participants across all work-based learning placements so that a more comprehensive picture of its effectiveness and any improvements necessary can be obtained.

Judgement: Successfully Addressed

The IRO under the PDD developed and conducted specifically designed surveys for employers (workplace supervisors) and for students involved in the Work-Based Learning (WBL) placements. Results were analysed and sent to the colleges where actions for improvement were identified. One of the areas noted for improvement was 'coordinating closely the schedule of onsite company visits with the student and company supervisor'. The Panel confirmed the implementation of the surveys during the interview sessions with the faculty members.

Overall, the Panel concludes that this recommendation is successfully addressed.

Recommendation 4.3:

Review the compilation of Course Reports and Course Portfolios to ensure that the information contained in Portfolios is fit for purpose and is included consistently in all Portfolios, and is evaluated in a reflective and critical way.

Judgement: Adequately Addressed

The QAAD developed clear guidelines and a standard format for the preparation of the course portfolios to be implemented by all colleges. QAAD in cooperation with the colleges organized a series of capacity building workshops to all faculty members including the part-time faculty as well as workshops and training programmes for the CQI chairs of each college on internal quality audit. The Panel requested the power points of the workshop on preparing course e-portfolio, and found them quite useful in training faculty members on compiling the course portfolios.

The Panel examined the content of some course portfolios and found that they do not contain pre-moderation and post moderation reports as indicated in the Policy on Moderation and as required by the recommendation 4.8. The Panel considers this as an important omission that needs to be corrected (see Recommendation 4.8).

In the IQA Report on Course Portfolio, the Panel observed that each course is evaluated against four criteria, each with assigned weights: (i) Quality of content and presentation (20%), (ii) Quality of assessment methods (40%), (iii) Transparency and appropriateness of marking (20%), and (iv) Correctness and consistency of Course Intended Learning Outcomes (CILOs) assessment (20%). A total of 12 courses were evaluated and each course evaluation was given as an overall mark. For e.g., ENGL 301 IQA rating was given as 3.05, but the breakdown with respect to each criterion was not given. This implementation does not identify the source of weakness and prevents an effective evaluation of each course. Furthermore, IQA Report provides findings on each criterion and makes remedial recommendations. The Panel is of the view that although such overall evaluation summarises the findings, it doesn't reveal sufficient details with regards to which courses are actually fulfilling the required criterion and which ones do not, so as to allow these courses which are not satisfactory to be targeted. The Panel also observed that the IQA Reports have only reviewed a small number of courses for e.g., only 12 courses from the CCS programmes and 14 courses from the CoE Programmes which is about 15-20% of the total number of courses in these programmes. Thus, the Panel is of the view that the IQA Reports do not reflect an accurate overall picture of the courses offered by the programmes.

On the other hand, the Panel reviewed the contents of the course portfolio files, the IQA Reports on Course Portfolios, Follow-up Audit on Course Portfolios, and the Improvement Plans on IQA of Course Portfolios, and concluded that the course portfolios are fit for purpose, consistently prepared and recommendations are planned, and their implementations are followed. These issues were confirmed in interviews with the academic administrators and faculty members.

Overall, the Panel concludes that this recommendation is adequately addressed.

Recommendation 4.4:

Ensure that there is a clear and rigorous process for ensuring that all actions identified from Course Reports and Annual Course Reviews are carried out in a timely manner and evaluated for effectiveness.

Judgement: Successfully Addressed

UTB through its college CQI committees verified the implementation of the recommendations made on course reviews during the IQA audits. As evidence of the implementation of recommendations, several courses' files were submitted to the Panel. In addition, the Academic Council revised the Policy on Course Implementation and Review last AY 2020-2021, where specific sections on recommendations, implementation and monitoring were added. According to the Policy, course coordinators are expected to conduct an interim review on the impact/effectiveness of the recommendations on the courses immediately one trimester after their implementation. Findings are reported to the Programme Head and the Dean. The Programme Head is responsible for following up on the course coordinators' implementation of the recommendations until the next cycle of the review. During the interview sessions with the academic administrators and faculty members, the Panel verified the process and the implementation of recommendations made in the course reports and annual course reviews.

Overall, the Panel concludes that this recommendation is successfully addressed.

Recommendation 4.5:

Set out clear expectations of which University bodies will be responsible for reviewing admissions criteria, and sets out how any changes will be approved, recorded and acted upon.

Judgement: Successfully Addressed

UTB revised the Policy on Admissions and included sections on the 'review process', 'approving offices and councils' and 'monitoring'. The revised policy clearly explains the roles of the Admissions and Registrations Office, colleges and councils as well as the approval process which involves the Academic Council and the UC. One occasion where a review of the admission criteria is conducted is during the programme review in which key stakeholders including the Programme Industry Advisory Panel (PIAP) and external examiners participate. The other occasion is when recommendations on the admissions are given following a quality assurance and accreditation visit. As far as the implementation is concerned, the process was implemented during the programme review of the business programmes where both PIAP and external examiners agreed that the existing admission criteria for the business programmes are appropriate and do not require any revisions. This was confirmed by the Panel during interviews with the administrators of UTB.

Overall, the Panel concludes that this recommendation is successfully addressed.

Recommendation 4.6:

Ensure that the Programme Specifications and Curriculum Plans articulate clear progression routes and that students are not allowed to take advanced courses before their prerequisites.

Judgement: Successfully Addressed

The Academic Council of UTB revised its Policy on Programme Development, Review and Enhancement to ensure that it is consistent with the requirements of the HEC and BQA and professional accreditation bodies. The revisions made are to be implemented on both existing and new programmes and cover the programme design, mapping and conformation, approval, monitoring

implementation and periodic reviews. In attending to the provisions of the new Policy, appropriate committees and panels, such as the Mapping Panel, the Confirmation Panel, and the Curriculum Oversight Committee have been formulated to ensure that all the necessary requirements are integrated in the programme. This was confirmed by the Panel during the interview sessions with the UTB administrators and faculty. Furthermore, the Panel noted that the academic advisers review and approve the list of courses to be taken by the students and ensure that pre-requisite courses are taken before an advanced course. In addition, the SIS lists the courses available for students to register in after filtering the pre-requisite requirements of the discipline and would not permit an advanced course to be registered if its pre-requisites were not successfully taken by the student.

Overall, the Panel concludes that this recommendation is successfully addressed.

Recommendation 4.7:

Consistently carry out the mapping of course outcomes to programme outcomes when a new programme is proposed; and ensure that a thorough discussion of mapping and confirming of qualifications on the National Qualifications Framework is carried out by the Curriculum Oversight Committee.

Judgement: Not Adequately Addressed

UTB developed and implemented, starting AY 2019-2020, a Policy on Mapping of Qualifications to NQF, in order to ensure the appropriateness of CILOs for each course. A Mapping Panel for each programme and a Confirmation Panel headed by the Dean of the College were formulated. Very recently, the Policy was implemented during the periodic reviews of the CAFS programmes. The Panel examined a sample of the course specifications and another sample of mappings of CILOs to Programme Intended Learning Outcome (PILOs) and observed that each course specification systematically contained CILOs, Course Structure (Topic Title, Instructional Material, Teaching and Assessment Methods), mappings of CILOs against the NQF Level descriptors, and mappings of CILOs against PILOs. With regard to the mappings of CILOs against the PILOs, the only samples were given were those of the CAFS programmes.

The Panel reviewed the course specifications and mapping exercises of CAFS and identified some inconsistencies, which include the mappings of CILOs against 12 PILOs while the number of PILOs given in the programme specification is only eight. In addition, the CAFS Master's programme lists five PILOs in its programme specification document while there are eight PILOs in the document assessing their achievements. Furthermore, the CAFS Bachelor programmes have the same set of Educational Objectives and PILOs, with the PILOs being very broad and general and do not indicate any specific area of specialisation of the Bachelor programmes. The Panel also noted that the Policy on Intended Learning Outcome (ILOs) states that 'only one verb' to be used in writing the ILOs. While examining the ILOs of several programmes, the Panel noted that this rule has not been observed. Furthermore, some courses are attending to almost all of the PILOs which makes the use of mapping process inefficient. The Mathematics (MATH401) course, as an example, is not expected to meet seven of the eight PILOs of CAFS Bachelor programmes as the PILOs have specific competencies related with the discipline nor it can meet generic skills such as ethics, communication skills, leadership/teamwork unless it is designed to do so. This applies to most of the courses.

Considering that the purpose of mappings is to ensure the efficiency of the programme, the Panel is of the view that due to the above listed issues, the implementations of the mappings are not fit for the purpose. Hence, the Panel concludes that this recommendation is not adequately addressed.

Recommendation 4.8:

Ensure that all courses are externally examined including capstone courses and Work-Based Learning programmes.

Judgement: Not Adequately Addressed

The IR PR indicates that the Academic Council developed clear criteria with assigned weights for selecting external examiners, to be implemented at the beginning of the AY 2020-2021. The IR PR also states that the Academic Council, according to the Policy on Moderation has mandated that all professional courses including the capstone and practicum/WBL courses are to be externally examined. The Panel examined the Policy on Moderation but could not identify any item that specifically require the capstone or WBL course to be externally examined. In addition, the Panel noted that the duties and responsibilities of the 'course examiner' are not clearly explained, in relation to course reviews, or post moderation. There is also no mention, in the Policy, of the external examiner carrying out a pre-moderation either.

The IR PR refers to the external examiners review reports of the CCS and CoE programmes and these reports were provided to the Panel as evidence despite the fact that these documents are not very relevant to the fulfilment of the recommendation in question. Thus, the Panel during the interview sessions with academic staff and administrators, explained the distinction, with regards to the external examiner's input, between the post moderation of (final) examination papers and the annual (or periodic) programme reviews and specifically asked to be provided with the external examiners' post moderation reports on any course, on capstone course and on WBL course from each of the programmes at UTB. However, UTB rather than providing the external examiners' moderation reports, supplied blank templates which are not included in the appendix section of the Quality Manual. The Panel could not find any evidence of any course being externally moderated/ examined, including the capstone and WBL courses.

The Panel concludes that this recommendation is not adequately addressed.

Recommendation 4.9:

Revise the grade appeal policy and make it more precise.

Judgement: Not Adequately Addressed

UTB revised its Policy on Grade Appeal after a series of consultation involving the DSA and the College Deans. The IR PR indicates that the old Policy on Grade Appeal has been clarified through rephrasing the statements and also the roles and the basis of the approval processes. The Panel examined the Policy on Grade Appeal and found that the appeal for the final grade is to be made to the DSA who will decide 'if the appeal has a reasonable ground or not' by 'checking the grades of the student in the course he/she appeals' and 'the record of the student' including his/her Cumulative Grade Point Average (CGPA). Then if the appeal is found acceptable by the DSA it will be sent to the Dean of the College who will also verify if the appeal is valid by 'reviewing the grades of the course

through the full period of the trimester', including 'all available records in the student information system'. This was confirmed by the Panel during the interview sessions with the administrators.

The Panel finds the criteria used to evaluate the appeal case, by both by the DSA and the Dean of the College, inconsistent with the academic standards, international norms and good practice, as it invites subjectivity and personal judgement. The Panel is of the view that the appeal for grade cannot be judged based on the student's academic performance and CGPA. The appeal process should start from the bottom, i.e., with the student meeting his/her course instructor and then moving upwards till, if the appeal is not accepted, considered at University level Committee. During interviews with students, the Panel heard that some of the students' complaints made to the DSA were not taken seriously and not followed. The Panel advises UTB to look into this issue carefully.

The Panel notes that the contents, wording and grammar of the Policy on Grade Appeal needs to be revised. In the 'Responsibilities' section, a definition is given for the terms 'Faculty Representative', 'Program Head' but they do not appear in the rest of the Policy while, 'teacher' and 'concerned faculty' are not defined. In the definition of 'Grade', it says that the appeal can be made for test 1, test 2, laboratory reports etc. but does not mention the 'final examination'. The definition of the 'Dean' needs to be written separately for DSA and the Dean of the College.

The Panel concludes that this recommendation is not adequately addressed.

Recommendation 4.10:

Revise the thresholds used for plagiarism detection and apply the plagiarism detection to all students' assignments and not just to capstone and practicum reports.

Judgement: Successfully Addressed

The Academic Council of UTB, revised the policy on Teaching, Learning, and Assessment and reduced the threshold of plagiarism detection for practicum from 30% to 20%. Plagiarism detection is required to be applied on all students' works including homework, assignments, and case studies. In addition, faculty members are required to examine and verify all submitted works by students even if the similarity index from the plagiarism report is lower than the threshold indicated in the policy. The IR PR states that implementation was verified through the internal quality audit of course portfolio for AY 2020-2021. This was also confirmed during the interview sessions with the academic staff and students.

Overall, the Panel concludes that this recommendation is successfully addressed.

Recommendation 4.11:

Revise programme specifications and AMAIUB approach to measuring the achievement of CILOs and PILOs as this is a fundamental aspect of the Mission of the University.

Judgement: Not Adequately Addressed

In addressing this recommendation, the Academic Council of UTB revised its Policy on ILOs and clarified their attainment level. According to IR PR, in order to train the faculty members in assessing the CILOs and PILOs, a number of workshops, conducted by experts from ABET, were held. The Panel examined the power points of these workshops and noted that such workshops do not provide a

practical training on assessment of CILOs and PILOs, nor do they cover the five methods of assessing PILOs. The Panel requested further evidence on the involvement of the College Curriculum Committees and also further evidence on the five methods of assessing the PILOs for each programme. Examining these documents, the Panel observed the following important inconsistencies:

(i) By definition, achievement of PILOs needs to be assessed at the time of the graduation. However, the assessment of the PILOs was carried out in the 1st Trimester through direct and indirect methods and showed that students have achieved all of the PILOs at this very early stage of their studies.

(ii) From the provided spreadsheet of the CILOs assessment, it is not clear which questions (or parts of the project) in tests 1 and 2 and specifically in the final examination, are assessing which CILOs and also what weights have been used in taking the weighted average of the assessment of CILOs in different tests/projects and final examination.

(iii) Courses with eight CILOs and with multiple verbs in them and also tests/projects/final examinations assessing a high number of CILOs makes the assessment of CILOs very difficult and time consuming. The Panel is of the view that the assessment of CILOs (and the PILOs) needs to be reviewed and simplified to first ensure that they are written appropriately, more specific to the discipline and mapped properly. Courses do not necessarily need to have eight CILOs covering all the domains (knowledge, skills and competences) as courses in the early years of the programme are expected to have more knowledge-based CILOs, while those of later years more skills-based contents. All of these issues have important consequences on the assessment of the CILOs and PILOs.

(iv) The Panel noted that the capstone and internship courses' ILOs do not assess specific PILOs as they should be when they are offered in the final year of the curriculum.

The Panel concludes that this recommendation is not adequately addressed.

Recommendation 4.12:

Ensure that more sustained efforts are spent on building links with the alumni and employers and tracking the academic standards of the graduates.

Judgement: Successfully Addressed

In their efforts to maintain links with the alumni and employers, the Alumni and Career Development Centre (ACDC) conducted tracer studies in order to determine the destinations of the graduates in relation to their works and organized career fairs for both new graduates and alumni. Furthermore, ACDC conducted satisfaction surveys for the alumni and employers to have their views on how to improve the academic programmes at UTB. Moreover, during the bi-annual programme meetings of the colleges, the opportunity was given to the PIAP, which have members from both the alumni and employers to voice their opinion on the UTB programmes. This was confirmed with the administrators during the interview sessions.

Overall, the Panel concludes that this recommendation is successfully addressed.

Recommendation 4.13:

Ensure that more attention is paid to developing benchmarks that include linking of the learning outcomes with the occupational standards, and to conducting benchmarks with programmes of local universities (in addition to those already conducted with regional ones).

Judgement: Successfully Addressed

The Academic Council of UTB has revised its Policy on Programme Development, Enhancement and Review so as to require that all programme owners consider the standards of occupational / professional societies in their programme development/revisions and also to ensure the appropriateness of PILOs. According to the IR PR, the CoE and CCS used the ABET's student outcomes in formulating their PILOs which are mapped to the professional practices and occupational standards of engineering and computing, whereas the ILOs of the CAFS programmes, are aligned to the European Council for Business Education (ECBE) core professional competence requirements, and QAA-UK benchmarking standards. With regards to implementations, UTB provided two benchmarking exercises for the CAFS' s Bachelor programmes that were carried out in AY 2021-2022. Both of the benchmarking exercises compared a number of criteria such as curriculum similarity, credit requirement, length of study period, graduation requirements both with local and international universities.

Overall, the Panel concludes that this recommendation is successfully addressed.

Standard 6 Human Resources Management

Sufficient Progress

Recommendation 6.1:

Ensure that AMAIUB Policy on Faculty Recruitment is consistently implemented.

Judgement: Successfully Addressed

UTB revised its policy on Academic Staff Recruitment and announced available vacancies including higher academic and administrative positions through its website as well as in some well-known recruitment websites. Recruitment of new academic staff involves a presentation and an interview conducted by the UTB senior management, while recruitment for higher management positions is carried out through selecting suitable candidates from both within and outside the University. The IR PR indicates that UTB has recruited five full-time and 15 part-time faculty members by following the requirements of the Policy on Academic Staff Recruitment. According to this policy, the President and Vice Presidents of the University are appointed by the BoD upon the recommendation of the BoT. The Panel verified that the recent recruitments have been carried out in line with the policy requirements.

Overall, the Panel concludes that this recommendation is successfully addressed.

Recommendation 6.2:

Expand the scope of AMAIUB benchmarking activities with local universities to include HR areas beyond practices for benefits and compensation.

Judgement: Adequately Addressed

The Human Resources Department carried out an informal benchmarking with three local universities concerning salary, housing allowance, transportation allowance, annual and sick leaves, medical care and health insurance in private hospitals for the part-time and full-time faculty members of all ranks and the administrative staff as well. The IR PR stated that the new administration of UTB is in the process of revising and improving the salary package and benefits of the newly recruited faculty members. In addition, the new management is also considering improving the salaries and allowances of the existing employees and providing them with private health care benefits.

During the interview sessions the Panel learned that the new salary scale and other benefits have been implemented for the newly recruited staff while there was no change in the salaries and benefit of the existing staff. The senior management informed the Panel that this is mainly due to the falling number of student admissions and in due course the salaries of the existing staff will be adjusted as per the new salary scale. The Panel considers this situation of paying two different salary packages and benefits to employees who are carrying out the same responsibilities as unfair and urges the UTB to correct this situation at the earliest convenience.

Overall, the Panel concludes that this recommendation is adequately addressed.

Recommendation 6.3:

Ensure that there are sufficient number of appropriately qualified academic staff as per the requirements of the Higher Education Council.

Judgement: Successfully Addressed

With respect to the MBA programme, the subject of this recommendation, UTB and CAFS have taken the necessary steps to ensure that all faculty members assigned to this programme are full-time PhD holders. Currently there are six full-time PhD qualified academic staff in the MBA programme and all of the courses are delivered by PhD-holding academic staff. This was further confirmed during the interview sessions with the administrators and the academic staff.

Overall, the Panel concludes that this recommendation is successfully addressed.

Standard 7 Research

In Progress

Recommendation 7.1:

Ensure that the college-specific Research Operational Plans are aligned to the University's Strategic Plan.

Judgement: Not Adequately Addressed

In addressing this recommendation, the Research Centre held a meeting with the college research committees' chairs in order to identify the core research topics that are within the specializations of each college. The IR PR indicates that 'this is reflected in the new research operational plan in support of the UTB Strategic Plan and that the 5-year research operation plan is the basis for developing the college specific research plan'.

Upon examining the university research operational plan, the Panel noted that it listed research goal (no. 4) with its strategic initiatives and activities along with tasks to be carried out for each activity, person responsible, KPIs, targets, timeframe and the budget needed. However, there was no indication that the university level research operational plan is coordinated with the college research operational plans as the tasks listed are general. Furthermore, the operational plan does not specify the common areas of research for all colleges, nor does it distinguish the specific research areas of each college.

Analysing the operational research plans at college level, the Panel noted that CAFS research operational plan is identical to the university level research operational plan as it has the same research tasks as well as the same targets and the same budget for all of the strategic initiatives and activities listed in the university level research operational plan. Likewise, the CoE has the same activities, tasks, KPIs, and targets as that of the university level research operational plan and the only difference was the amount of budget allocated for each task. The CCS identified its own activities and tasks based on the strategic initiatives of the university research operational plan and developed consistent KPIs with target values and budget requirements. The Panel is of the view that the required alignment and consistency of the operational plans at the university level and college level have not been achieved.

The Panel is of the view that this recommendation is not adequately addressed.

Recommendation 7.2:

Link faculty research performance with their academic promotion

Judgement: Not Adequately Addressed

In addressing this recommendation, UTB developed policy and procedures for faculty promotions where research performance is an important factor in faculty members' promotion. During the interview sessions, the Panel was informed that UTB would start accepting applications for promotion in September 2022. The IR PR states that the Policy on Academic Promotion is consistent with the regulatory requirements of the HEC and also benchmarked with other universities, locally and internationally. The Panel notes that in promoting faculty members to assistant, associate and full

professorship ranks, the policy considers research, teaching performance, and contribution to department/college/university and community services, however the policy is not sufficiently detailed and has a number of areas that could be further improved. Evaluation of the applicant is not based on a thorough and objective assessment of his/her contributions to research, teaching and community services but rather depends on the general judgement of the College Promotion Committee and the University Level Promotion Committee. The weights given to each of these core areas in determining the overall mark for decision making is not specified. Points to be earned for a single author publication and a co-authored publication are not indicated. Furthermore, the Policy does not indicate that the area of the publications needs to be within the discipline of the faculty member (applicant for promotion). Publications, editing or contributing with a chapter in a book published by a credible publisher have not been considered. With regard to community services there is no clear minimum requirement and its overall effect (weight) in decision making is not indicated.

Apart from the above criteria / related issues, there is no independent jury for the evaluation of the promotion applications (faculty files) with members from outside the UTB, to ensure no conflicts of interest. Also, the Panel notes that faculty apply through their College Promotion Committee rather than directly to the University Promotion Committee which is inconsistent with international norms and good practice. Appeals are made through the University Promotion Committee, but the Panel is of the view that it could be more appropriate to establish an independent appeals committee.

The Panel is of the view that this recommendation is not adequately addressed.

Recommendation 7.3:

Develop and implement a mechanism to ensure clarity and transparency of allocation and spending of the University's budget for scientific research.

Judgement: Adequately Addressed

The IR PR indicates that the new Scientific Research Policy specifies the guidelines and procedures for the application, evaluation and approval of research funding clearly as well as the roles and responsibilities of the researcher. The Policy has a section on the HEC Scientific Research Regulations which incorporates expending mechanisms for scientific research that requires 'a percentage not less than 3% of the total annual revenues to be allocated for scientific research'.

In meeting the HEC requirement of spending 3% of annual revenue of the university budget on scientific research, UTB listed the expenditures it allocated on three main projects, namely: (i) UTB Kibo Cube Satellite Project, (ii) Solar Panel Photovoltaic (PV) Energy System Project and (iii) Artificial Intelligence Research Laboratory. In addition, the IR PR states that part of the university budget is spent on Journal subscriptions. After the Scientific Research Policy became effective in March 2021, UTB funded five conferences, four equipment expenditures of its faculty members and also paid research database subscriptions. During the interview sessions the Panel asked the university administrators if the allocated expenditures on scientific research mentioned above would add up to 3% of the annual revenue of UTB and would actually be implemented. The Panel was informed that some of the intended expenditures are still on paper.

The Panel concludes that this recommendation is adequately addressed.

Recommendation 7.4:

Review AMAIUB policy on the selection of external examiners for its postgraduate programme and diversify the membership of the thesis defence panels.

Judgement: Successfully Addressed

The IR PR states that UTB has increased the number of external examiners from four to 15, selected from various specializations, including Human Resources (6), Finance and Economics (3), Information Technology (3) and Marketing and Entrepreneurship (3). The IR PR also provided the names of the external examiners all of which are PhD qualified and approved by the HEC. This was confirmed during the interview sessions with the faculty and administrators.

Overall, the Panel concludes that this recommendation is successfully addressed.

Recommendation 7.5:

Ensure that the AMAIUB staff professional development plans and programmes include activities specifically designed to enhance academic staff capacity as research and postgraduate students' supervisors.

Judgement: Successfully Addressed

UBT has organized a series of professional development training workshops to enhance the research and supervision capacity of its faculty members, during AY 2019-2020 and also during AY 2020-2021. The Panel was provided with sufficient and appropriate evidence for the organization of these workshops, some of which were on Journal Selection and Thesis Ethical Practices, MBA Thesis Advising Induction, Thesis and Capstone Guidelines and Supervision, International Training in Thesis Writing, Review and Procedures, Panelling and Ethics. The organization of these workshops has been confirmed during the interview sessions with the academic staff.

Overall, the Panel concludes that this recommendation is successfully addressed.

Standard 8 Community Engagement

Insufficient Progress

Recommendation 8.1:

Revise the Community Engagement Manual to include clear goals and objectives for Community Engagement which, relate to the University's own situation, are based on its current Mission, and on its new Strategic Plan goal for Community Engagement.

Judgement: Not Adequately Addressed

The IR PR claims that UTB has revised its CE Manual for the AY 2019-2020, where it has addressed the issues mentioned in the recommendation above. The revised manual, as expected, contains the mission, vision, values, CE goals and objectives of the old Strategic Plan (2016-2021). Following the development of the new Strategic Plan 2021-2026, the CE Manual was revised again and given to the Panel upon request. Upon examining the new CE Manual, the Panel observed that the mission, vision, values, CE goals and objectives contained in the new CE Manual are taken from the old Strategic Plan (2016-2021). The Panel noted that the revised CE Manual is basically a formatted, paraphrased (some headings) and cosmetically improved version of the old CE Manual. The only tangible revision was in relation to the CE Framework in which its four key areas have been increased to six. Given that the CE activities are based on the old goals and objectives and do not emanate from the new Strategic Plan (2021-2026), the Panel concludes that such CE activities are not based on the strategic framework of UTB.

The Panel notes that vital documents of the University like Operations Manual, Quality Manual and CE Manual all refer to the old mission and vision statements and the values recorded in the old Strategic Plan (2016-2021) of UTB. The Panel advises UTB to scrutinize all of its documents ensuring that correct (recent) mission, vision statements and values are referred and an awareness initiative to be initiated at the earliest convenience.

The Panel concludes that this recommendation is not adequately addressed.

Recommendation 8.2:

Review AMAIUB operational planning mechanism to ensure that changes made during the planning cycle are documented and justified, and that action planning accurately monitors the activities planned.

Judgement: Not Adequately Addressed

In addressing this recommendation, the UTB UC approved a proposal by the PDD to 'tag the colleges to the operational initiative of Goal 5', thereby allowing actions to be identified within the College Operational Plan to address the objectives under the CE. The operational plans of the colleges (CAFS, CCS and CoE) were for the AY 2020 -2021 and hence based on the old Strategic Plan (2016-2021). The Panel examined the activities of each college and observed a very limited number of activities for each college. In addition, the activities were very general with no details to enable their monitoring.

Furthermore, the activities in the CE Operational Plans of the CCS and CoE were the same and there was no project/activity specific to their disciplines.

The Panel noted that UTB has revised its planning framework and introduced a Dashboard System whereby the PDD, after collecting and uploading the accomplishment reports of colleges/departments/committees into the dashboard, could assess the progress of the planned activities and make adjustments in the implementation of the plans, in conjunction with the departments concerned.

With regards to the CE Operational Plans, UTB provided the Panel with a CE Office Operational Plan for AY 2021-2022 but not for the Colleges. When the Panel requested the CE Operational Plans for the Colleges, it was informed that 'all university level CE activities are open to all employees from both academic and administrative units'. The Panel expected to see CE Operational Plans for each college for AY 2021-2022 (just like for research) that is based on the initiatives and the major activities of the new Strategic Plan (2021-2026). In this way, PDD would be able to monitor the accomplishments and changes made during the planning cycle of the colleges with regard to their CE activities.

The Panel concludes that this recommendation is not adequately addressed.

Recommendation 8.3:

Review the effectiveness of the survey instruments that it currently uses for Community Engagement so that feedback from all stakeholders is consistently obtained; and that the feedback is used to determine not only whether University participants benefit from Community Engagement activities, but whether any impact on the community is being made

Judgement: Not Adequately Addressed

In addressing this recommendation, UTB developed two surveys, one for the students/faculty members/alumni (stakeholders/participants) and the other for the university's partner (community/organization). These surveys are included as appendices at the end of the two revised CE Manuals. Both sets of surveys are very similar and no significant difference between the two was noted. As indicated in the IR PR both surveys were conducted, and their results were included in the CE Evaluation Reports for AY 2019-2020 and for AY 2020-2021. The Panel evaluated the two sets of surveys in the light of the newly revised CE Framework and its six main activity areas. The Panel noted that the surveys on which the CE Evaluation Reports were based, include questions to assess the organization of activities, such as seminar, conference or a workshop as it specifically asks for the opinion of the students/faculty members/alumni and the partners on the activity given. The other questions (9-12 questions) are very general in nature asking the participants/partners if the event has met their expectations, if it is vital and beneficial to the community. Given that the main activity areas of the CE Framework, each having its specific characteristics, the Panel considers these surveys not relevant to the activities outlined in the CE Framework. When this issue was brought up during the interview sessions, the Panel was told that most of the activities were 'educational, cultural and social'.

The CE Evaluation Report for AY 2019-2020 is based on 12 surveys, with 12 activities and 340 stakeholders' responses, while the survey intended for partners include 29 participants' responses. The Panel noted that the surveys' analysis cannot be relied upon to provide meaningful results as it collates

the responses without taking into account the varying nature of activities. Thus, if the responses among the activities are not normally distributed (i.e., as in cases where the responses obtained are extreme or the total number of participants in one activity is far more than that that in other activities), this will yield a biased result and hence inaccurate conclusion. The same observation applies to CE Evaluation Report for AY 2020-2021 as well.

The Panel concludes that this recommendation is not adequately addressed.

III. Conclusion

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

The overall judgement is 'In Progress'.

Appendix I: Judgements per Standard

Criteria for Judgements by Standard	Judgement
Most of the recommendations are successfully * addressed within each Standard	Sufficient Progress
Most of the recommendations are adequately ** addressed within each Standard	In Progress
Most of the recommendations are not adequately *** addressed within each Standard	Insufficient Progress

* The recommendation is successfully addressed when the institution demonstrates a marked progress in addressing the recommendation and the actions taken have led to significant improvements in the identified aspect(s) and, as a consequence, in meeting the indicator's requirements.

** The recommendation is adequately addressed when the institution demonstrates a marked progress in addressing the recommendation but some of the actions taken have not yet led to significant improvements in the identified aspect(s) and, as a consequence, in meeting all of the indicator's requirements.

***The recommendation is not adequately addressed when the institution has not taken appropriate actions to address the recommendation and the actions taken have little or no impact on the identified aspect(s) and, as a consequence, not meeting the indicator's requirements.

Appendix II: Overall Judgement

Criteria for Overall Judgement for Follow-up Visit Report	Overall Judgement
All Standards reviewed receive 'Sufficient Progress' judgement	Sufficient Progress
Majority Standards reviewed receive 'In progress' judgement	In Progress
Most Standards reviewed receive 'Insufficient Progress' judgement	Insufficient Progress