



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

Directorate of Higher Education Reviews

Programmes-within-College Reviews Report

Bachelor of Communication
(Bachelor of Communication and Public Relations)
College of Administrative and Financial Sciences
Gulf University
Kingdom of Bahrain

First Follow-up Visit Date: 10-12 December 2017

Review Date: 8-10 December 2014

HC060-C2-Fb012

Table of Contents

The Programme Follow- up Visit Overview.....	2
1. Indicator 1: The Learning Programme.....	5
2. Indicator 2: Efficiency of the Programme.....	11
3. Indicator 3: Academic Standards of the Graduates.....	17
4. Indicator 4: Effectiveness of Quality Management and Assurance.....	23
5. Conclusion.....	28
Appendix 1: Judgement per recommendation.....	29
Appendix 2: Overall Judgement.....	30

The Programme Follow- up Visit Overview

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

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

This follow-up visit Report is a key component of this programme review follow-up process, whereby the Bachelor of Communication, at Gulf University (GU) in the Kingdom of Bahrain was revisited on 10-12 December 2017 to assess its progress, in line with the published review Framework and the BQA regulations.

The subsequent sections of this Report have been compiled as part of Phase 2 of the DHR/BQA's programme follow-up cycle highlighted in the DHR Programme Review Handbook, and associated with the on-going process of institutional and academic quality and enhancement reviews of Higher Education Institutions located in the Kingdom of Bahrain.

A. Aims of the Follow-up Visit

- (i) Assess the progress made against the recommendations highlighted in the review report (in accordance with the four BQA Indicators) of GU's Bachelor of Communication since the programme was reviewed on 8-10 December 2014.
- (ii) Provide further information and support for the continuous improvement of academic standards and quality enhancement of higher education provision, specifically within the Bachelor of Communication programme at GU, and for higher education provision within the Kingdom of Bahrain, as a whole.

B. Background

The review of the Bachelor of Communication programme at GU in the Kingdom of Bahrain was conducted by the DHR of the BQA on 8-10 December 2014.

The overall judgement of the review panel for the Bachelor of Communication programme of GU was that of '**no confidence**'. Consequently, the follow-up process incorporated the review of the evidence presented by GU to the DHR, the improvement plan, the progress report and its supporting materials, and the documents submitted during the follow-up site visit and those extracted from the interview sessions.

The external review panel's judgement on the GU's Bachelor of Communication programme for each Indicator was as follows:

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

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

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

Indicator 4: Effectiveness of quality management and assurance '**satisfied**'

The follow-up visit was conducted by a panel consisting of two members. This follow-up visit focused on assessing how the institution addressed the recommendations of the report of the review conducted on 8-10 December 2014. For each recommendation given under the four Indicators, the Panel judged whether the recommendation is 'fully addressed', 'partially addressed', or 'not addressed' using the rubric in Appendix 1. An overall judgement of 'good progress', 'adequate progress' or 'inadequate progress' is given based on the rubric provided in Appendix 2.

C. Overview of the Bachelor of Communication

The Bachelor of Communication programme is managed by the Mass Communication and Public Relations Department of the College of Administrative and Financial Sciences at GU. The admission to the programme was opened in 2007, and in the academic year 2009-2010, the Higher Education Council (HEC) suspended the admission into the programme and then re-opened it again in the second semester of the academic year 2010-2011. Whereas, in the academic year 2011-2012 the programme was suspended, and then in the academic year 2012-2013 admission to it was re-opened and the programme was running up till the time of this follow-up visit.

The programme and its curriculum have been reviewed and developed by the University several times; the most recent review was in March 2016, which resulted in the change of the programme title from 'Bachelor of Communication and Public

Relations' to 'Bachelor of Communication'. This is in addition to a change in the structure of its curriculum, which has been adopted since September 2016. The total number of students enrolled in the programme at the time of this follow-up visit was (179) students of whom (129) were admitted in the academic years 2016- 2017 and 2017-2018, and are currently enrolled in the newly revised Bachelor of Communication programme. While the remaining (50) students are still enrolled in the previous programme, which was reviewed by the BQA. All students enrolled in the programme are citizens of the Kingdom of Bahrain, except for five students coming from other Arab countries. Concerning the teaching staff of the programme, their total number is (10) members, including two associate professors, and three assistant professors who are working full-time, and five lecturers working part-time. The programme is taught in Arabic.

1. Indicator 1: The Learning Programme

This section evaluates the extent to which the Bachelor of Communication programme of GU, has addressed the recommendations outlined in the programme review report of December 2014, under Indicator 1: The learning programme; and as a consequence provides a judgment regarding the level of implementation of each recommendation for this Indicator as outlined in Appendix 1 of this Report.

Recommendation 1.1: *Revise the programme curriculum to include adequate practical applications that satisfy the programme requirements and provide sufficient balance between the theoretical and practical components of the programme; in addition to adding fundamental and core courses in all fields of the programme.*

Judgement: *Partially Addressed*

As mentioned in the Progress Report, which was prepared by the Gulf University (GU), an internal programme team was formed for the development of the curriculum of the Bachelor of Mass Communication and Public Relations programme offered by the College of Administrative and Financial Sciences. This team relied on a number of resources to develop the programme, especially: the report of the external examiner, the observations of the Advisory Board, the surveys of alumni and employers, and the informal benchmarking against a number of similar programmes on the regional and international level. This review process led to a change in the title of the programme from 'Bachelor of Mass Communication and Public Relations' to 'Bachelor of Communication', and also to the development of a new study plan, to go into effect from the beginning of the academic year 2016-2017, under the new title of the programme. This revised study plan covers three specialized tracks: Journalism, Radio and Television, and Public Relations. The Panel studied the programme specification for the Bachelor of Communication for the academic year 2016-2017, and noticed through examination of the courses offered by the new study plan, that there is a depth of specialized knowledge in each of the three stated tracks, where the student studies - in addition to the shared courses in mass communication - six courses by the rate of (21) credit hours in each of the three specializations. The Panel finds this step as important for deepening knowledge of the mass communication specialization in general, and of the specialized track chosen by the student. Nevertheless, the Panel is concerned about the 'Photography and Video' (COM131) course being obligatory for all students in the programme. The aim of this course is to provide students with the principles and fundamentals of photography, in order to develop their skills in preparation for the advanced photography courses, which focus in general on the specialization, such as television photography, journalism photography and public relations photography. Hence, the

Panel is concerned that there is a possibility of redundancy between some of what is taught in this course and the other advanced photography courses offered by the three tracks, particularly, in the last two years of the study plan, namely: 'Photojournalism' (JOU391A), in the journalism track, and 'Radio and Television Photography and Editing' (RTV367A), in the radio and television track, and 'Photography in Public Relations' (PRL489A) in the public relations track. Moreover, the Panel is of the view that there is a need to add in the revised study plan another course in translation. This is because including one translation course only, as in the new plan, is not enough, especially when a lot of previous observations of the BQA review report of the program emphasized that the graduates of the programme are weak in English language, particularly, in translation. Furthermore, the programme will benefit from adding a mass communication course in English; as, such courses of communication are very limited and insufficient in the new plan, and they do not reflect the benefit from the 5.5 IELTS test score specified as an English language admission criterion required to be met for acceptance into the programme. On another note, with respect to enhancing the balance between theoretical and practical knowledge in the programme, the University has developed its infrastructure and facilities, (as detailed in the paragraph of recommendation 2.4), the importance of which was confirmed during the panel's interviews with a number of students and members of the Advisory Board, who explained how these facilities helped in increasing opportunities of practical application in the discipline of mass communication. However, after studying a sample of the course files that were provided during the follow-up visit, the Panel finds that the University has not yet been able to achieve a significant balance between both theoretical and practical aspects in the delivery of some courses, which require greater practical applications than theoretical ones, such as the three courses: 'Writing for Public Relations' (PRL388A), 'Investigation and Journal Article' (JOR453A), and 'Documentary Film' (RTV471A). Since, these courses are from the three tracks and they are advanced (taught in the third and fourth years), but their distribution of hours and the study topics they cover, as described in the specification of each of them, convey a predominance of theoretical aspects over practical ones in all of them; as, the number of allocated hours for the theoretical aspects in the course of 'Writing for Public Relations' is (28) hours against (22) hours for the practical aspects, and in the courses 'Investigation and Journal Article' and 'Documentary Film', it is (16) practical hours against (28) theoretical hours and (18) practical hours against (30) theoretical hours, respectively. This is not appropriate for the nature of the courses and their Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs). The Panel recommends that the College should work on achieving greater balance between the theoretical and the practical aspects within the courses, through which the student can acquire practical skills in writing, editing, and radio and television production. Accordingly, the Panel is of the view that the College has addressed this recommendation partially.

Recommendation 1.2: *Revise the course contents, textbooks and references to ensure the coverage of the main topics of each course in accordance with the programme objectives and courses relevance.*

Judgement: *Partially Addressed*

The University worked on developing courses in accordance with the BQA review report of the Bachelor of Communication and Public Relations programme (December 2014), especially with respect to the development of an appropriate syllabus for each course. The Panel confirmed through reviewing the specifications of all courses, in general, and the courses of the new 2016-2017 study plan, in particular, that there are detailed descriptions for the courses documented in a standard template that covers many course components including: a semester-based weekly outline of topics for each course; course objectives; Course Intended Learning Outcomes (CILOs); assessment tools; textbooks; references; and other components. It became clear to the Panel also that the topics in many courses are appropriate and consistent with what is incorporated into courses of similar communication and journalism programmes offered by several universities regionally. Furthermore, the followed progression in the provision of such topics was revealed to the Panel through what is stated in the course specifications examined, such as: 'Writing for Public Relations' (PRL388A) and ' Investigation and Journalistic Articles' (JOR453A). With respect to textbooks, the University has purchased an order of current textbooks related to the field of media and mass communication, in general, and to the specific three tracks of the programme in particular. The number of these books is about (105) new books, published between 2013 and 2017, with three to five copies of each book being available. Nevertheless, despite the panel's acknowledgement of the efforts exerted by the College and the Department in addressing this recommendation, the Panel found, through direct inspection of the receipt date of these books by the college library during the follow-up visit, that the books had only arrived very shortly before the date of the visit and had not yet been classified or coded according to the library's classification system. In addition, the Panel noticed that peer-reviewed scientific periodicals relevant to the discipline were too little, with only four electronic journals and two printed Arabic periodicals available at the University during the follow-up visit. Given that the books and the references had newly arrived, the Panel did not find any evidence that this development in resources had led to improvements in the course content. Therefore, the Panel urges the College to expedite the use of the newly available references and books and their research results in further enriching the content of courses, to ensure coverage of major topics of each course in accordance with the programme's objectives and courses' currency. Consequently, the Panel is of the view that that the College has partially addressed this recommendation.

Recommendation 1.3: *Revise the programme intended learning outcomes to ensure their achievement and alignment with the programme study plan.*

Judgement: *Partially Addressed*

The Progress Report states that GU has revised the Programme Intended Learning Outcomes (PILOs), rephrased them, and discarded some learning outcomes that are difficult to achieve-as stated in the review report (December 2014)-which included: 'Rewrite media texts in English,' 'Develop media messages for a variety of communication means in the fields of mass communication and public relations', and 'Design public opinion surveys'. The University also revised the learning outcomes of the Bachelor of Communication programme, to all begin with an action verb instead of a noun and to be measurable. The Panel confirmed that the step of deleting some learning outcomes (such as: 'Develop media messages for a variety of communication means in the fields of mass communication and public relations', and 'Design public opinion surveys') and replacing them with other outcomes was successful, and did not adversely impact the knowledge, skills, and competencies required by the programme. On the contrary, the Panel considers the recent PILOs as suitable and can be achieved through the new study plan, except for the outcome (B4) under the category: 'Specialized Skills', which stipulates that the student will be able to 'translate media texts in English', and which is not fully aligned with the revised study plan. This is because the skill of translation cannot be fully acquired with only one mass communication translation course in the study plan, (as previously stated in paragraph: 1.1), especially when a lot of the previous observations in the BQA review report of the programme focused on the poor English language proficiency and translation skills of the programme's graduates. In addition, the English communication courses in the new plan are too little and insufficient, and do not reflect the benefit from the English language admission criterion of a 5.5 IELTS test score. In light of this, the Panel recommends that the College should address this issue. Hence, the Panel is of the view that the College has partially addressed this recommendation.

Recommendation 1.4: *Review the course intended learning outcomes to be consistent with the course contents and what is expected from these contents, and then revise the matrix of mapping the course intended learning outcomes to the programme intended learning outcomes to ensure the achievement of the programme outcomes.*

Judgement: *Partially Addressed*

The Panel reviewed the specifications of a number of courses that are offered by the Bachelor of Communication programme at GU, whether from the old study plan or from the 2016-2017 revised plan. In this review, the Panel focused especially on the

courses specified by the BQA review report of the programme (December 2014), which included: 'Introduction to Public Relations' (CPR102) and 'Public Opinion' (CPR203). The Panel confirmed that GU revised the CILOs in such a way that ensured their adequacy with the level and content of the courses. The University had also revised the mapping matrix of CILOs to PILOs, which was made available to the Panel within the extra evidence provided by the Institution. After examination of this matrix, the Panel found that the CILOs to PILOs mapping is adequate and helps in ensuring the achievement of the programme outcomes. Nevertheless, despite acknowledging the efforts exerted by the College in addressing this recommendation, the Panel is of the view that there is still a need for the College to continue to make additional efforts in reviewing the ILOs of the practical courses, whose learning outcomes should emphasize that the student can achieve practical and more significant skills in: journalistic writing and editing, radio and television production, and media production in public relations. Examples of such courses are: 'Writing for Public Relations' (PRL388A), 'Investigation and Journal Article' (JOR453A), and 'Documentary Film' (RTV471A), which are expected to enhance and enrich skills such as collecting field materials, building relationships, journalistic writing, journalistic editing, and proofreading. Consequently, the Panel finds that the College has partially addressed this recommendation.

Recommendation 1.5: *Develop accurate course specifications for the practical training course, which specifies the course intended learning outcomes along with assessment methods to evaluate students' acquisition of these outcomes during the training period.*

Judgement: *Fully Addressed*

The Progress Report states that GU doubled the number of practical training courses to two: (INT271) and (INT341A), and increased the number of training hours in the new study plan from (200) hours to (300) hours. The Department provided the Panel with a detailed description of these two courses, in addition to a number of other documents regulating the process of the practical training, such as the 'Internship Procedures' document, which was adopted by the University in September 2016. This document includes important elements related to the assessment of the internship and the responsibility of the various parties involved in the training: The University, Department, academic supervisors, and field supervisors. Additionally, the 'Training Plan' template as well as the 'Field Supervisory Evaluation' forms were also provided to the Panel. The Panel is of the view that all these organizational efforts contribute to raising the practical training level of the Bachelor of Communication programme at the College. The Panel also finds that the specifications of the two internship courses are well-documented, and include

learning outcomes that have been developed appropriately. Accordingly, the Panel is of the view that the College has fully addressed this recommendation.

Recommendation 1.6: *Revise the current marks distribution according to the type and level of each course and its intended learning outcomes.*

Judgement: *Fully Addressed*

The Progress Report states that the marks' distribution policy in the Gulf University is a part of the evaluation policy which was reviewed in 2016 and implemented in September of the same year. While the first marks distribution policy imposed a standard distribution on all courses as follows: (10%) for quizzes, (30%) for the midterm examination, and (40%) for the final examination, which did not provide faculty members with much flexibility in distributing the grades; the Progress Report includes a new matrix for distributing grades, which is more adaptable. This newly revised marks' distribution consists of five elements: discussion/participation (5-10%), classwork (10-50%), quizzes (0-20%), midterm examination (15-20%), and final examination (30-40%). This revised distribution -in principle- allows greater flexibility for the faculty members to distribute grades according to the nature and the ILOs of the courses they teach. The Panel finds this distribution appropriate and, accordingly, is of the view that the College has fully addressed this recommendation.

2. Indicator 2: Efficiency of the Programme

This section evaluates the extent to which the Bachelor of Communication programme of GU, has addressed the recommendations outlined in the programme review report of December 2014, under Indicator 2: Efficiency of the programme; and as a consequence provides a judgment regarding the level of implementation of each recommendation for this Indicator as outlined in Appendix 1 of this Report.

Recommendation 2.1: *Review the admission policy to be in line with the college's objectives, and ensure that admission criteria are appropriate for the requirements of the programme.*

Judgement: *Partially Addressed*

The Progress Report of GU states that the programme review team conducted an informal benchmarking of the programme's admission policy against similar programmes at the local, regional and international level. As a result of this informal benchmarking process, the admission policy was revised to be consistent with the programme's objectives and its learning outcomes, through the addition of two admission requirements, which are: the passing of an Arabic language exam with a minimum passing score of (65%), and the passing of a personal interview conducted by the Admissions Committee. This interview is composed of two parts: one part including general personal questions, and the other part including questions that are related to the mass communication field, which are assessed on the basis of a scale of (1-5) points. Although the Panel notes the efforts of the College in the diversification of the personal interview questions, the Panel is of the view that the interview form is in need of further development, since it does not explain the significance of each of the (1-5) scale points for the level of knowledge or skills being assessed, which, in the Panel's view, leads to the lack of transparency and fairness of the assessment. These two additional criteria are supplementary to the University's admission requirements, such as the requirement of holding a secondary school certificate, or its equivalent, with a high school Cumulative Grade Point Average (CGPA) not less than (60%). In cases when an applicant's CGPA is lower than the required, they are registered in the Foundation programme, which includes preparatory courses that are determined by the College. Additional admissions' requirements include passing the advanced placement test in computer skills (with a 65% as a minimum passing score), or holding the equivalent (ICDL), and passing the English placement test (with 65% as a minimum passing score), or its equivalent, such as the TOEFL examination (with a success rate of PBT 500 / IBT 61), or the IELTS examination (with a success rate of 5.5), or the FCE examination (success rate of 60%). Additionally, in any case where an applicant has failed in a placement test, they are required to study preparatory courses that are relevant to the placement test they did not pass. The

Panel confirmed the informal benchmarking process of the admission policy through the benchmarking report of the programme, which was provided among the submitted evidence, and also through interviews with faculty members and senior management of the programme during the follow-up visit. Moreover, the Panel found -within the provided evidence- several meeting minutes which stated that the admission policy was reviewed, adjusted, approved by the University Council on 29 February 2016, and put into place in the beginning of the 2016-2017 academic year. However, although the administrative staff confirmed that the new amendments of the admission policy, especially the interview requirement, have led to the acceptance of high school graduates with CGPA levels higher than the previously admitted students; the Panel noticed that the CGPAs of admitted students -as reported in the provided statistical information about admissions for the academic years 2016-2017, and 2017-2018- are mostly in the range of (60%-80%), with some averages outside this range, including ones that are less than (60%), which is permitted as per the admissions policy. The Panel, therefore, is of the view that, despite the introduced modifications, there is still a need to ensure the admission policy's consistency with the objectives of the programme. Hence, the Panel recommends that the College should measure both performance and progression levels of the admitted students against the new admission criteria and requirements, to ensure the alignment of the admission requirements with the programme needs. Consequently, the Panel finds that the College has partially addressed this recommendation.

Recommendation 2.2: Conduct a study to verify the reasons behind the high dropout rates and measure the fitness of admitted students for the programme requirements.

Judgement: Not Addressed

The programme Improvement Plan, which was submitted by GU, stated that the Council of Mass Communication and Public Relations Department in the College of Administrative and Financial Sciences will study the phenomenon of high student drop-out rates, and will offer more activities that provide students with informal learning opportunities and enrich their learning experiences. The Panel noticed during the follow-up visit some quality improvement in the university facilities and in the academic competencies of the faculty (see paragraphs 2.4 and 2.3 of this report, respectively), as well as in the activities and services that are provided to the students. In addition to that, evidence was provided to the Panel with respect to student cohorts' analysis and in relation to a comparison between the number of enrolled students, on the one hand, and the number of withdrawals on the other. Despite the gradual increase in retention rates from the year 2013 to the year 2018, the retention percentages do not reflect a real representation of these cohorts, due to the differences in their completed programme stages. In addition, they don't provide

a clear and accurate understanding of the reasons behind withdrawal from the programme. Nonetheless, with respect to ensuring the compatibility of admitted students with the programme requirements, members of the senior management and the academic staff expressed- during interviews with the Panel- their satisfaction towards the quality of students who have been admitted and their appropriateness for the programme requirements, which they believe have been ensured through the new admission policies and criteria, mainly, the personal interview with each student. In result, the College did not conduct any formal study to verify this the students' fitness or appropriateness for the programme. In light of this, the Panel recommends that the College should adhere to the Programme Improvement Plan through formal and direct monitoring of the withdrawing students, to explore the reasons behind the lack of their retention. The Panel also recommends that the College should develop a formal mechanism to verify the appropriateness of admitted students for the programme and its requirements. Hence, the Panel is of the view that this recommendation has not been addressed.

Recommendation 2.3: *Develop and implement a plan to recruit new faculty members with degrees and academic qualifications in the required specialisations to cover the various courses of the programme and its different fields of specialisations.*

Judgement: *Partially Addressed*

The Panel was informed, through interviews with the faculty members and from the provided evidence, that the College of Administrative and Financial Sciences follows the recruitment policy of the University, by which the needs of the Department are identified and then job openings are advertised locally and internationally, and on the university website. This is followed by the approval of several committees on applicants who have been nominated based on examination of their CVs and personal interviews, after which the University Council endorses their employment. The Panel examined the provided evidence related to the faculty members, such as their CVs and the schedule of their assigned tasks, including: teaching, supervising students and projects, participation in committees, and scientific research. The Panel also studied a table outlining their specialties and the courses they teach, in addition to a list of their research works, which were published since joining the University, as well as their participation in scientific conferences and a sample of their published works. On the basis of this, the Panel finds an adequate consistency between the faculty members' degrees and scientific qualifications, on the one hand, and the number of students (161) registered since the academic year 2015-2016, the programme requirements, and its various tracks, on the other hand. Nonetheless, the Panel is of the view that the programme still needs another faculty member in the public relations track. The faculty members confirmed during interviews with the Panel that the number of courses they teach is in line with the HEC policy related to

the assigned tasks of faculty members, and that it was never previously required from any academic member of staff to teach a course outside their area of specialization. Although the Panel acknowledges the efforts of both the College and the Department in addressing this recommendation, the Panel is nevertheless concerned with the fact that most of the current programme faculty members, who work full-time, including the Head of Department (HoD), are newly recruited; as, the majority of them were appointed in the academic year 2016-2017. In addition, their total number (5) is equal to the number of faculty members who work on a part-time basis. The Panel is concerned about this as it indicates a lack of stability among the faculty members. Furthermore, no evidence was submitted to the Panel in relation to a long-term and comprehensive recruitment plan, despite the Panel's request for one. Rather, all that was presented to the Panel during the follow-up visit as evidence of a recruitment plan was a summary table of needed faculty, which lacked detailed information and included only the required number of staff to be recruited and their academic degrees, without reference to the required disciplines. Thus, the Panel recommends that the College should develop and implement a clear, comprehensive, and long-term recruitment plan, to ensure stability in the provision of faculty members, who are qualified to serve the programme in all its tracks and courses, and capable of enriching the programme through new and relevant scientific research. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the College has partially addressed this recommendation.

Recommendation 2.4: *Provide the necessary teaching and learning facilities to enable the Department to achieve the intended learning outcomes of the practical courses and provide students with the practical skills by utilising the necessary studios and laboratories.*

Judgement: *Partially Addressed*

The Progress Report indicates that the GU- based on several recommendations of more than one side including the BQA- has established and equipped several educational facilities, to provide a balance between theoretical and practical aspects of mass communication. The Progress Report states that these facilities include a television and radio studio and a multimedia lab to serve journalism and public relations courses. The Panel toured these facilities and noticed that the studio is well-equipped with both hardware and software and is supported by an adjacent room, which is equipped as a workshop to support activities carried out in the studio, and it is mostly used for video and audio editing activities. Both faculty members and students confirmed, during their interviews with the Panel, that the studio and its adjacent workshop are available for the students to use outside of formal lecture sessions, and there is a specialized supervisor who is in charge of running the studio and supporting its users. The Panel was informed that there is a company from

outside the University responsible for the maintenance and safety of the equipment in these facilities. Despite acknowledging the efforts of the College and the Department in establishing and equipping the television studio with its adjacent workshop, which can sometimes also be used as a radio studio; the Panel finds that this studio serves mainly the television activities, as it is not adequately or properly well-equipped for use as a radio studio, which would be normally set up differently and in a specific way. The Panel also notes from touring the two multimedia laboratories that although these facilities are equipped with a sufficient number of suitable software and hardware for the courses and activities of public relations, radio and television; they lack software specific for journalism. The Panel commends that the College established and adequately equipped the television studio, its workshop, and the multimedia labs, which are enabling continuous training opportunities for students. The Panel, nevertheless, recommends that the College should establish a radio studio and provide special software for journalism courses, in order to create an integrated learning environment for all students from the different tracks, while ensuring the quality of teaching and learning. Consequently, the Panel is of the view that the College has partially addressed this recommendation.

Recommendation 2.5: *Introduce a comprehensive system to track the usage of all university's teaching and learning resources and facilities to evaluate their utilisation.*

Judgement: *Not Addressed*

The Panel noted during its tour of the university facilities and from interviews with faculty members, students and administrative staff that there are multiple systems to monitor the utilization of resources and educational facilities. All of these systems generate on a regular basis reports that are forwarded to the programme's senior management. These systems include 'LABSTATS' for measuring the use of computer hardware and software inside the laboratories, 'MOODLE' to monitor the utilization of some e-learning resources, and the electronic system in the library 'AIMS' for following up on the borrowed, returned, and overdue books. However, the Panel was not provided with evidence indicating that the reports of these systems are being collectively used to support strategic planning and decision-making on a more holistic level, as recommended in the BQA review report. In addition, although the Panel was informed that the library is going to procure a library management system, there was no evidence provided of that. Similarly, the Panel discovered, through interviews with the administrative staff, that there is a new information management system under construction by the information technology unit of GU. This system is known as 'Creatrix Campus' and it is intended to be used as a unified system for student registration, e-learning, and tracking of resources and facilities. In

addition, this system features modules such as student applications, tuition fees' payment, and evaluation of courses and instructors. In spite of this, the system was not yet activated during the follow-up visit, nor was it yet adopted and endorsed by the University Council. The Panel acknowledges the attempts to establish a comprehensive tracking system such as 'Creatrix Campus'; however, it also notes that this system is just the result of a personal initiative of one staff member and not the result of strategic planning on the part of the College or the University. Accordingly, the Panel is of the view that this recommendation has not been addressed and recommends that the College should expedite the adoption and implementation of a comprehensive tracking system, to monitor the use of all university facilities and educational resources, and evaluate their utilization.

3. Indicator 3: Academic Standards of the Graduates

This section evaluates the extent to which the Bachelor of Communication programme of GU, has addressed the recommendations outlined in the programme review report of December 2014, under Indicator 3: Academic standards of the graduates; and as a consequence provides a judgment regarding the level of implementation of each recommendation for this Indicator as outlined in Appendix 1 of this Report.

Recommendation 3.1: *Develop rigorous assessment mechanisms to ensure that programme graduates acquire the intended graduate attributes.*

Judgement: *Partially Addressed*

It was indicated from the Progress Report of GU and from interviews conducted by the Panel, that there is a consistency between the university graduate attributes and those of the Bachelor of Communication programme, as outlined in Table 2-3 of the Progress Report. Moreover, as indicated in Table 3-3, there is consistency between the programme's graduate attributes and its ILOs. In addition to this consistency, the Bachelor of Communication programme depends on specific tools for direct assessment of the achievement of the CILOs, which are aligned with the PILOs; these tools include quizzes, examinations, projects, the internship assessment, and the submitted assignments of students. The Panel confirmed the application of these tools through interviews with the university management, HoD, faculty members, and students, and through studying a sample of course files. Moreover, during the interviews, and from the provided evidence, it was emphasized that the college's Teaching, Learning, and Assessment Committee acts as a moderation committee and that the HoD examines and reviews the courses' specifications and their assessments on a regular basis. Although the Panel notes the followed procedures in terms of ensuring consistency, direct assessment, and internal moderation; nevertheless, upon reviewing the course assessments, which were provided within the course files, the Panel discovered that there are several aspects still in need of development, in particular, those related to the level of examination questions and to assessment criteria in general, and which had gone unnoticed through the verification and moderation processes (see paragraph 3.3). As a result, the Panel is of the view that the existence of such issues among others, reveals the ineffectiveness of the mechanisms implemented for ensuring the validity and reliability of assessments, and this, consequently, hinders the accurate verification of students' acquisition of the required attributes. In light of this, the Panel is of the view that the College has partially addressed this recommendation.

Recommendation 3.2: *Conduct formal benchmarking in line with the university policy, which is not limited to the programme structure and study plan, and includes benchmarking of the minimum pass score in the courses.*

Judgement: *Partially Addressed*

The Progress Report of GU and the interviews that were conducted during the follow-up visit confirmed that the benchmarking practices, which were performed by the University for the Bachelor of Communication programme, included a number of aspects, such as: the admissions' policy, programme objectives, teaching methods, and the minimum passing score in the courses. Nonetheless, those benchmarking practices happened to be informal and based on data from the Internet. It is noteworthy to mention though that the University provided, as evidence for the Panel, cooperation agreements that include formal benchmarking with a number of regional and international universities, which are still awaiting approval from the HEC in the Kingdom of Bahrain. Furthermore, GU provided a detailed report on the informal benchmarking that was conducted with a number of American, British, and Australian universities, as well as with Arab and Arabian Gulf universities. Such efforts reflect the University's interest in benefiting from global and regional experiences in the development of the Bachelor of Communication programme. The Panel finds that these implemented benchmarking practices have led to fundamental adjustments in the programme, and to some notable positive results, especially in the programme's educational objectives. This indicates that although the benchmarking practices were informal, this doesn't diminish their importance. Consequently, the Panel recognizes that these benchmarking processes are suitable for addressing this recommendation, but at the same time, the Panel recommends that the College should expedite conducting formal benchmarking of the programme in the near future, in order to take advantage of such a type of formal comparative exercise. Therefore, the Panel finds that the College has partially addressed this recommendation.

Recommendation 3.3: *Document the changes and amendments resulting from the internal moderation process, and evaluate the effectiveness of this process.*

Judgement: *Partially Addressed*

The University has implemented internal pre-and-post moderation for (24) courses of the Bachelor of Communication programme for the academic year 2016-2017, in accordance with the university policy and procedures of moderation. The internal moderation report revealed a number of important observations, including: inappropriateness of some examination questions for the levels and types of courses; ambiguity in the structure of some questions; in addition to some printing and spelling errors. The Panel reviewed internal and external moderation forms for some

courses offered by the Department of Mass Communication at the University. The internal moderation report for the courses: 'Public Opinion and Propaganda' (COM282A) and 'Media Organizations Management' (CPR 219), mentioned a few and limited observations, which are beneficial for developing the courses offered by the Department. However, the Panel is of the view that there are still some aspects in need of development in the internal moderation processes. This is demonstrated through the external evaluation form of the course: 'Media Organizations Management' (CPR219), which provided important reviews and comments about the final examination of the course, as well as the skills' level that it is required to measure, and about the inaccurate distribution of marks, all of which had not been earlier detected through the internal moderation process. Moreover, the Panel noticed through studying the course files, which were provided during the follow-up visit, that there is in the examination questions a greater focus on information retrieval rather than on the use of higher-order thinking skills, especially in some advanced courses such as 'Art of Persuasion and Propaganda' (CPR409A) and 'Writing to Public Relations' (PPRL386A), in addition to the lack of clear assessment criteria in certain assignments and major projects of such courses, for example: assignment no.1, and quiz no.1 in the course: 'Principles of Sociology' (COM141A); assignment no.1 , and the group project in the course 'Writing to Public Relations' (PPRL386A); and assignment no.2 in the course 'Public Opinion and Propaganda' (COM282A). Accordingly, the Panel is of the view that the existence of such issues as well as others indicates the limited effectiveness of the internal moderation process. Thus, the Panel considers that this recommendation has been partially addressed.

Recommendation 3.4: *Ensure that students' work, especially the practical ones, are appropriate to the type of the programme and its intended learning outcomes, and review the course files to ensure that they include samples of students' marked work.*

Judgement: *Not Addressed*

During the follow-up visit, a number of course files were provided to the Panel for review. It was revealed through the provided files that they contain all the required components, including samples of students' assessed work. The Panel noticed through inspection of the course files that the students' assessed works are varied based on the characteristics of each of the courses. In addition, it was evident to the Panel that there is a diversity of assessment tools, which vary between assignments, quizzes, examinations, including some short-answer questions, and some essay questions, as well as major projects. The Panel is of the view that the use of such tools for student assessment is appropriate in general when being used in courses that require mainly information retrieval or short descriptive answers rather than application, research, or analysis. However, things are different with respect to some courses that focus more on the practical side {e.g. 'Writing for Public Relations'

(PRL388A), 'Investigation and Journal Article' (JOR453A) and 'Documentary Film' (RTV471A)}, as these courses require practical assessments, which encourage students to develop and display higher-order thinking skills and other advanced skills as a part of their academic and professional development. The Panel noticed that some of these courses and others as well (such as CPR409A and PPRL386A), lack these types of assessments, as was mentioned earlier in paragraph (3.3) This, as a result, leads to a considerable difficulty in determining if students' achievement is appropriate for the level and type of the programme, whether in Bahrain or at the regional and international levels. In light of this, the Panel is of the view that this recommendation is not addressed. Hence, the Panel recommends that the College should closely monitor the design and development of the assessment tools, including their individual components, to ensure the implementation of assessments that are appropriate for the type, level, and ILOs of the courses and the programme.

Recommendation 3.5: *Adopt a clear and rigorous mechanism to ensure that the level of the graduates' achievement meets the programme objectives and intended learning outcomes.*

Judgement: *Partially Addressed*

The University provided a number of mechanisms for measuring the achievement level of the graduates, and how it meets the level of the programme objectives and its intended learning outcomes. Four matrices were provided to indicate the consistency between the university graduate attributes and those of the programme, as well as the consistency between the CILOs and the PILOs, and the consistency between the programme objectives and its outcomes. The Progress Report stated that achieving the CILOs supports achievement of the programme objectives and its ILOs. The Report also noted that internal and external verification and moderation processes for the final results of the student grades, assert its accuracy, consistency, and integrity, while ensuring that graduates meet the programme objectives and its ILOs. Furthermore, it was stated in the Report that the direct evaluation system measures clearly the achievement level of the graduates, and to what extent this level meets the programme objectives and ILOs, and the University had applied this system on four graduates of the programme for the academic year 2015-2016. The measurement results then showed that the graduates achieved the PILOs, with achieving the highest level in the outcomes of knowledge and understanding (88.7%), and the lowest level in the outcomes of specialized practical skills (78.8%). The Panel checked the level of the graduates' achievement in meeting the programme objectives and intended learning outcomes based on the final results, the distribution of grades, and analysis of the views of both graduates and employers. The Panel notes as a result of this investigation that the programme sets a CGPA of 2.0 as a target level for the achievement of the PILOs. However, the distribution of grades in a few courses is a

bit skewed toward a high level of grades (such as in CPR443A and CPR409A), and this is mainly due to using assessment tools that rely mainly on information retrieval only rather than on practical application and the use of higher-order thinking skills, such as critical and analytical thinking, as was previously mentioned in paragraphs (3.3) and (3.4). Additionally, the Panel was informed through the analysis reports of alumni surveys for the academic years 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 and employers' survey about the 2016 graduates, that despite high alumni satisfaction levels with their educational programme, they feel some weaknesses or deficiencies in terms of applying media technology that serves their specialization and in the translation of media texts into English. Similarly, this weakness was also revealed by the employers, which supports the panel's view of the importance of developing assessments that require such applications and skills. Although the Panel acknowledges the effort of GU in developing a clear mechanism to ensure that the achievement levels of the graduates meet programme objectives and intended learning outcomes, the Panel finds that these achievement levels are not parallel with the expected level of graduates of such a programme. Consequently, the Panel considers that the College has partially addressed this recommendation.

Recommendation 3.6: *Review and revise the internship implementation mechanism adopted for the practical training course, to ensure real supervision of its content, level of implementation, and assessment methods, and to ensure that students practice the skills they acquired during their study.*

Judgement: *Partially Addressed*

The University developed a number of procedures and mechanisms to improve the implementation of the practical training which became spread over two courses: Internship-1 (INT271), and Internship-2 (INT341A). The University also provided a detailed description of the two courses and organized the training operations through the utilization of a number of forms, which the Panel reviewed samples of. The Panel finds that the actual academic supervision of trainees on the part of the University is still weak, and that the evaluation of the internship, especially in (INT341A), focuses too much on reports which are written by the students about their training period and their implemented works; while, performance assessment should focus on real life works that are produced by the students during the internship period, such as: journalistic field works, television, and radio programmes and real public relations activities for broadcasting, publishing, and final presentation to the public. In this context, the Panel, therefore, reviewed only very few models of students' works which were produced during the internship. Consequently, the Panel recommends that the College should include the student's file of practical training works within the assessment requirements outlined in the syllabi of the two internship courses, and should focus on it and its contents in the

evaluation of the student intern's performance, particularly in the second internship course (INT341A). Hence, the Panel is of the view that the College has partially addressed this recommendation.

Recommendation 3.7: *Activate the role of the Advisory Board and ensure that it meets regularly in accordance with the university policy so that it has an active role in enriching the learning process.*

Judgement: *Fully Addressed*

As indicated in the Progress Report, the Department of Mass Communication has an advisory board consisting of experts in areas related to the Bachelor of Communication programme. This Board helps in providing valuable information on labour market needs and current challenges, along with the available job opportunities, and the skills and competencies that are expected in the specialization of the mass communication profession in general. The decision to establish the Advisory Board was endorsed on 19 November 2015, and the CVs of the Board members reveal their distinction with respect to their field experiences in journalism, radio, and television. This is in the best interest of the programme and its continuous development. During the follow-up visit, the Panel was able to meet with only two members of the Advisory Board; while, the remaining members apologized for not being able to attend the scheduled interview session with the Panel, due to other obligations, despite a previous set agreement with them about this interview. The interview conveyed to the Panel, along with the review of submitted evidence such as the minutes of meetings, that the Advisory Board members were meeting on a regular basis in a rate of two meetings per year in the academic years 2015-2016 and 2016-2017. The Panel is of the view that this system of meetings followed by the Advisory Board must be continued, along with maintaining the investment of these meetings in the development of the Bachelor of Communication programme at the University. The Panel also observed the role of the Advisory Board in developing a new study plan for the Bachelor of Communication programme and in the establishment of the television studio, in addition to developing the specifications of the courses and their practical applications, along with the supervision of the internship, the graduation projects, and other topics. Thus, the Panel acknowledges the effective role of the Advisory Board and, accordingly, considers that this recommendation is fully addressed.

4. Indicator 4: Effectiveness of Quality Management and Assurance

This section evaluates the extent to which the Bachelor of Communication programme of GU, has addressed the recommendations outlined in the programme review report of December 2014, under Indicator 4: Effectiveness of quality management and assurance; and as a consequence provides a judgment regarding the level of implementation of each recommendation for this Indicator as outlined in Appendix 1 of this Report.

Recommendation 4.1: *Revise the programme's management and provide an effective leadership at the university level.*

Judgement: *Partially Addressed*

The Improvement Plan submitted by GU refers to meeting the academic and administrative needs of the Department of Mass Communication as one of the procedures needed to address the recommendation outlined in the BQA review report of the programme. This is in addition to developing and implementing a training programme to improve the leadership capabilities of both the HoD and the faculty members. The Panel found, through interviews and the examination of provided evidence, that the programme has an academic body that is qualified to cover all the tracks of the programme; although, the programme could still benefit from the recruitment of another faculty member in the public relations track, as previously stated in paragraph (2.3) of this Report. The faculty members work under the direction of the HoD, who was appointed in 2017, and who cooperates with the Dean and Vice President of Academic Affairs in the decision-making process within the programme. Moreover, there are several committees and councils at the college and the university level, which support the decision-making process. At the top of these is the Department Council headed by the HoD, where all the issues of the programme are discussed and addressed, and which forwards all its recommendations and reports directly to the College Council and to the Dean. From there, the recommendations and the reports are sent then to the Teaching, Learning and Assessment Committee, in addition to the Quality Assurance (QA) committees at the college and university level and the Centre of Development and Quality Assurance (CDQA), which along with its new units that were introduced in the year 2016 (such as: Planning and Development Unit, Professional Development Unit, and the Unit of Research and Institutional Performance Measurement), are responsible for following up on and ensuring the academic standards. During the interviews, the Panel noted a common understanding of the line of responsibilities among the academic and the administrative staff, which indicates, in general, that there is an effective management and leadership for the programme. With respect to implementing a training programme for the development of leadership capabilities

of the HoD and the faculty members, as mentioned in the Improvement Plan, the Panel found in the training plan of the academic year 2016-2017, which was provided within the evidence, that there had been only one workshop conducted which focused directly on leadership or on a relevant topic; although, the recommendation of the BQA review report of the programme clearly emphasized effective leadership, and the corresponding improvement plan of the College concentrated on developing leadership capabilities of the HoD and the faculty members. As a result, the Panel recommends that the College should adhere to the programme's Improvement Plan, by providing a wider range of training opportunities, to develop leadership capabilities among the academic staff. The Panel is also concerned about the instability of the department's faculty members (see paragraph 2.3 of this Report), which may affect the effective management of the programme. Consequently, the Panel is of the view that the College has partially addressed this recommendation.

Recommendation 4.2: *Implement quality assurance policies and procedures in a more regular and accurate way.*

Judgement: *Fully Addressed*

The Panel noticed, during the follow-up visit that the QA centre (or CDQA) is responsible for monitoring and ensuring the quality of implementation of policies and procedures at the University, as mentioned also in the Progress Report. Additionally, this was confirmed to the Panel during interviews with senior management and administrative and academic staff. Furthermore, the Panel was provided with several pieces of evidence indicating the central role of the CDQA in systematically ensuring the implementation of quality assurance policies and procedures. One of these evidences is the formal document of the university's QA framework (undated), which describes the purpose of establishing the Centre and the role played by each of its units, and explains the programme's QA audit procedures, which are implemented periodically during the months of October and March of each academic year. During these QA audits, faculty members from each department participate, under the supervision of the college's Quality Assurance Committee, in the preparation of evidence and documents that are required for the auditing processes. The Committee in turn ensures that all documents are well-prepared and are available for the review sessions. The purpose of such auditing processes is to monitor the implementation of university policies and procedures, as well as compliance with quality assurance standards. The Panel confirmed the participation of faculty members in the auditing process through the interview sessions held with them during the follow-up visit. The Panel was also provided with a sample of internal audit reports, which are usually sent by the QA centre to the assigned colleges and departments, in order to utilize them in making decisions and developing new plans for the improvement of the quality management process

within their practices. Consequently, the Panel appreciates that there is a QA management structure within the College of Administrative and Financial Sciences, which houses the Department of Mass Communication. Additionally, the keenness of the QA centre in ensuring continuous improvement was further confirmed through a set of QA workshops that it held since the year 2016, which contribute to the spreading of a quality culture and the creation of a common understanding of the policies and procedures of the University. After reviewing the evidence related to these workshops, the Panel is of the view that the efforts exerted in addressing this recommendation are appropriate and, thus, urges the College to ensure applying them continuously and rigorously. Accordingly, the Panel considers this recommendation as fully addressed.

Recommendation 4.3: *Utilise internal and external feedback about the programme in more depth when conducting the periodic review of the programme.*

Judgement: *Partially Addressed*

The University has policy and procedures for the periodic review of the programme every (4-5) years. The Progress Report states that the first periodic review of the program took place after the graduation of the first cohort of students. It also indicates that the periodic review is based on internal and external stakeholders' feedback and input, such as: the opinions of students, alumni, and employers; the minutes of meetings of the committees and boards; moderation and evaluation reports; internal audit reports; observations of the Advisory Board; the results of external reviews; and the benchmarking reports, which are collected and analyzed by the Department Council. After analyzing the feedback, suggesting amendments, and developing a plan for improvement by the programme team, the College Council reviews these comments and submits its recommendations to both the college and university committees responsible for the review and development of programmes. These committees, in turn, implement further verification and ensure that the suggested amendments are properly aligned with the university's vision, mission, and core values; the graduate attributes; and with the national and international standards. After the approval of all committees and the College Council, these recommendations are finally sent to the University Council for final endorsement and for issuing an official proclamation for the implementation of the developed programme. The Panel examined the report of the previous programme review for the academic year (2013-2014), which had been prepared by the programme review team at the time and, in light of which, the currently offered programme was developed. This report serves as a periodic review report for the previous programme and based on an examination of its content, as well as a review of other related evidence, the Panel concludes that the College of Administrative and Financial Sciences, which houses the Bachelor of Communication programme, has a

good direction in making more comprehensive use of internal and external feedback in the periodic review of the programme. The Panel is, thus, of the view that there is remarkable progress in expanding the scope of the review process, which covered different aspects of the programme, such as learning resources and facilities. Moreover, the Panel notes a progress in communication with external stakeholders, mainly, with the Advisory Board of the programme; although, the communication with employers- especially with field supervisors- in a regular and effective way, is still unclear, as demonstrated by the provided evidence and the field visit. This is despite the fact that the surveys, which were conducted by the programme review team in October 2015 for a number of media companies and media leaders, to identify the knowledge and skills that graduates of mass communication have to possess, did include field supervisors' opinions and views as feedback when reviewing the programme. Furthermore, the Panel finds that although the programme review expanded to include resources and facilities; the programme is still lacking facilities and additional hardware, such as the radio studio and the journalism software. This indicates that the programme review process was not well informed by feedback from the stakeholders. While the Panel acknowledges with appreciation the efforts of the College and the Department in addressing this recommendation, the Panel, nevertheless, recommends that the College should also be informed by internal and external feedback in a deeper and more accurate way during the periodic review of the program, to ensure achieving a higher degree of comprehensiveness and clarity in the results of the review process. Accordingly, the Panel is of the view that the College has addressed this recommendation partially.

Recommendation 4.4: *Adopt more scientific and formal methods to scope the labour market needs.*

Judgement: *Fully Addressed*

The Progress Report prepared by GU stated that the College relied on a study that was conducted and published by the University in 2016, under the title: 'Study of the Needs of the Labour Market in Bahrain and the Arab Gulf Countries', whose results referred to the urgent need to provide a large number of graduates in the mass communication specialization and its multimedia fields. In addition, the programme team had conducted in October 2015 a survey for (40) media leaders in (40) media foundations and companies, in order to identify the knowledge and skills that the graduates of mass communication have to possess. The results of this study have contributed to planning the desired trend to be followed in reviewing the Bachelor of Communication programme, in order to ensure its currency and its relevance to the needs of the labor market. Moreover, and based on what is stated in the Progress Report and what was mentioned during the interviews with the senior management of the programme, the programme team has conducted an informal and non-

documented analysis of new studies and research about the needs of the labour market in the Kingdom of Bahrain and the Arab Gulf Countries, whose results pointed collectively to the importance of integrating technology skills into each discipline, particularly into the mass communication discipline. The Progress Report also noted that the College of Administrative and Financial Sciences relies mainly on feedback from the Advisory Board members, who represent employers in the mass communication field and its different tracks, to determine the needs of the labour market and what is expected from a Bachelor of Communication programme. This was confirmed by the Panel during the field visit. Moreover, the Progress Report stated that the programme team relies on feedback from the internship field supervisors, as well as from employers and alumni, which is used in determining the degree of compatibility between graduates' skills on the one hand, and labour sector's expectations on the other. This helps in identifying the currency of the programme and its relevance to the labour market. Nonetheless, the Panel finds that the communication with these stakeholders and the utilization of their feedback is still limited, as detailed in paragraph (4.3). Despite this, however, the Panel acknowledges the efforts of the College in addressing this recommendation and, accordingly, finds this recommendation as fully addressed.

5. Conclusion

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

The Bachelor of Communication programme offered by Gulf University has made Adequate Progress and as a result, the programme will not be subjected to another follow-up visit.

Appendix 1: Judgement per recommendation.

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

Appendix 2: Overall Judgement.

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