



Higher Education Quality Enhancement Project (HEQEP)

Report on Overseas Training on Quality Assurance in Higher Education

Training Period	:	1 May 2016 – 14 May 2016
Venue	:	Anggerik Suite-1, Hilton Hotel, Petaling Jaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
Organizer	:	Edu Leads Consulting, Malaysia
Participants	:	Directors and Additional Directors of IQACs, Round 3 universities, Officials of UGC, QAU and HEQEP
Number of Participants	:	19

Prepared by:

Md. Moniruz Zaman
Assistant Professor, Department of English &
Additional Director, IQAC
ASA University Bangladesh

Professor Dr. Md. Sirajul Islam
Director, IQAC, Mawlana Bhashani
Science and Technology University Tangail

Training Schedule

Week One

Date	Activity	Facilitator	Venue
2 May (Mon)	Training Day 1: Introduction to the Workshop and Introduction to Quality Assurance, IQAC and SAR	Dr Jasbir Kaur Director, Edu Leads Consulting Assoc Prof Dr Rozilini Chung Vice President (Quality Assurance) HELP University	Anggerik Suite 1
3 May (Tues)	Training Day 2: Outcome Based Education	Mohamed Nadzri Mohd Yusoff (Hj.) Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Health Sciences University Technology Mara	Anggerik Suite 1
4 May (Wed AM)	Training Day 3: Assessing Outcome Based Curriculum, Mapping LO to PO and Student Achievement	Session to be conducted at HELP University	HELP University
4 May (Wed PM)	Training Day 3: Curriculum Evaluation and Review, Pedagogical Challenges – Traditional and Non-Traditional, Trending, Blending Learning	Session to be conducted at University of Nottingham Malaysia Campus	University of Nottingham Malaysia Campus
5 May (Thurs)	Training Day 4: HE Governance and Challenges	Prof Christine Ennew Provost and CEO University of Nottingham, Malaysia	Anggerik Suite 1
6 May (Friday)	Training Day 5: Visit to Universiti Putra Malaysia / Friday prayers	Visit to Universiti Putra Malaysia	Universiti Putra Malaysia, Serdang
7 – 8 May (Sat/Sun)	<i>Free</i>		

Week Two

Date	Activity	Facilitator	Venue
9 May (Mon AM)	Training Day 6: Exercise: Self-Assessment Report (SAR)	Assoc Prof Dr Rozilini Chung Vice President (Quality Assurance) HELP University	Anggerik Suite 1
9 May (Mon PM)	Training Day 6: Research and Publication in Higher Education	Assoc Prof Dr Faridah Mohd Noor Director Centre for Civilisational Dialogue University of Malaya	Anggerik Suite 1
10 May (Tues)	Training Day 7: Other Significant QA Areas	Prof Andy Seddon Director (Quality Assurance and Partnerships) Asia Pacific University	Anggerik Suite 1
11 May (Wed)	Training Day 8: Writing Audit Report	Assoc Prof Dr Rozilini Chung Vice President (Quality Assurance) HELP University	Anggerik Suite 1
12 May (Thurs)	Training Day 9: Visit to Asia Pacific University / Putrajaya Tour / Workshop Dinner	Visit to Asia Pacific University	Asia Pacific University / Putrajaya Tour / Workshop Dinner
13 May (Fri)	Training Day 10: Re-cap of Workshop and Action Plan for the Future End of Workshop	Assoc Prof Dr Rozilini Chung Vice President (Quality Assurance) HELP University	Anggerik Suite 1

Introduction:

A 19-member Bangladeshi team went on an overseas training to Malaysia under Higher Education Quality Enhancement Project (HEQEP) of the Government of Bangladesh funded by the World Bank. The team consisted of 15 delegates from the IQACs of round 3 universities under the project. They were Directors and Additional Director of respective IQACs. Besides, there were four delegates of HEQEP, QAU and UGC. The training period was May 1, 2016 – May 14, 2016 including arrival and departure days, and the venue was Anggerik Suite-1, Hotel Hilton, Petaling Jaya, Kuala Lumpur. The participants were accommodated at Hotel Hilton, Petaling Jaya. In addition to the regular workshops held at the training venue, there were visits to four universities in Malaysia and a river cruise with dinner in Putra Jaya, the administrative capital of Malaysia. The organizer of the training was Edu Leads Consulting, Malaysia.

The training package covered training materials, accommodation, breakfast, lunch, transport from the airport to the hotel and vice versa on arrival and departure days, university visits and the tour to Putra Jaya with river cruise and dinner. A summary of activities and their outcomes is presented below.

Day 1

Monday, 2 May 2016

(Training Day 1)

Inaugural Session:

Activity : **Introduction to the Workshop**

Facilitators : **Dr. Jasbir Kaur**
Director, Edu Leads Consulting

Dr. Hena Mukherjee
Director, Edu Leads Consulting

In the introductory session on the first day Dr. Jasbir Kaur, Director of Edu Leads Consulting, introduced the facilitators, and the participants introduced themselves. Then she presented a general overview of the training and its objectives. Then, Dr. Hena Mukherjee, another Director of Edu Leads Consulting, talked briefly presenting the background of the Higher education project of the World Bank.

Technical Session:

Activity : **Introduction to Quality Assurance, IQAC and SAR**

Facilitator : **Assoc. Professor Dr. Rozilini Chung**
Vice President (Quality Assurance), HELP University

**Expected
Session**

Outcomes : At the end of the session, participants would be able to **demonstrate** understanding of higher education quality and quality assurance system in the global, national and institutional contexts.

In this session a major focus was on information sharing by the Directors and Additional Directors of various universities participating in the training. The facilitator requested everyone to share information about the background of Quality Assurance (QA) activities at their respective universities and the challenges they were facing in implementing the QA process.

Regarding the background of QA activities, most of the participants said that they were at the stage of establishing IQAC and starting SA activities; some of them have already started SA activities.

Representatives of UGC and HEQEP explained their roles in the QA process. They also mentioned the importance of BdREN, a networking platform among the universities.

Regarding challenges faced by the universities, most of the participants talked about some common problems. They were mainly related to the following areas:

- Convincing and the management and the teachers about the QA process
- Engaging everyone in the QA process
- Lack of quality student intake
- High ratio of teacher and student and
- Non-participatory governance, especially top-down decision making regarding academic affairs without consulting the academic stakeholders

Then the facilitator Dr. Rozilini distributed a pre-test questionnaire among the participants to evaluate the effectiveness of the training program and promised that there would be a post-test as by the end of the training program.

This session focused on the understanding of the QA process through self assessment, and the international best practices of QA. At first the facilitator presented an overview of the development of QA system in Bangladesh towards the establishment of a QA framework. Then she upheld the global practices of QA. She also discussed the steps to be followed in the QA process. Overall, the participants developed understanding of what they would have to do in assuring quality education at their respective institutions.

Day 2

Tuesday, 3 May 2016
(Training Day 2)

- Activity** : **Presentation on Outcome Based Education (OBE)**
- Facilitator** : **Mohammad Nadzri Bin Mohd. Yusoff (Hj.)**
Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Health Sciences, University Technology Mara
- Expected Session Outcome** :
- At the end of the session, the participants would be able to:
 - **Explain** the components in an outcome statement
 - **Write** effective learning outcomes for different taxonomy level of the cognitive, psychomotor and affective domains based on 3 components
 - **Explain** what Student Learning Time (SLT) is
 - **Explain** what notional hour credit is
 - **Calculate** course credit using SLT and notional hour credit

In the first session on the second day, the facilitator, Mohammad Nadzri Bin Mohd. Yusoff (Hj.), made presentation on Outcome Based Education (OBE). He showed how to write Course Learning Outcome (CLO) and map CLO into Program Learning Outcome (PLO). He focused on writing outcomes with reference to Bloom's Taxonomy.

There were some exercises done by the participants. In the exercise session the facilitator presented some examples of writing outcome and the participants were asked to evaluate whether those were good or poor writing of learning outcome.

In the second session, the same facilitator presented a new approach to the calculation of credit hours which is currently followed in Malaysia. In the new method of calculating credit not only the class contact hours, but also student's preparation hours are counted.

Day 3

Wednesday, 4 May 2016
(Training Day 3)

- Activity** : **Visit to HELP University and Nottingham University, Malaysia Campus**

All the participants visited HELP University, one of the Private Universities in Malaysia. At this university there was a workshop on **Learning Outcome: Assessment Rubrics and Analysis of Student Performance**. It was a hands-on exercise facilitated by Ms. **Ng Shu Min** Senior Lecturer, Department of Information Technology, HELP University. Participants learnt how to map course learning outcome (CLO) into Program Learning Outcome (PLO) and how to analyze student performance using assessment rubrics.

After having lunch at HELP University the participants visited Nottingham University Malaysia Campus. Although as per the training schedule the expected presentation was to be on **Curriculum Evaluation**

and Review, Pedagogical Challenges-Traditional and Non-Traditional Trending, Blending, Learning, the presentations made by the Head of Pharmacy Department did not address these issues deeply. It was just a superficial informative discussion on what kind of changes they brought to their Pharmacy curriculum.

Day 4

Thursday, 5 May 2016

(Training Day 4)

Activity	:	Presentation on Higher Education Governance and Challenges Group discussion and group presentation
Facilitator	:	Professor Christine Ennew Provost and CEO, Nottingham University, Malaysia Campus
Expected Session Outcomes	:	At the end of the session, the participants would be able to: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- demonstrate understanding various levels of governance, the global standards of governance in Higher Education (HE)- compare the above with their local context- identify challenges to HE governance faced both locally and globally

The session started with a discussion on the definition of good governance. There was a group discussion on what we mean by governance and features of good governance. The groups defined governance in terms of

- decisions and execution of decisions about the operation of the university
- decisions that should move in both directions: top to bottom and bottom to top
- coordination, cooperation, transparency, accountability, flexibility, ethics, legal aspects, equity, consultation with the major stakeholders, documentation and quick dissemination of decisions through documents, credibility, fit for the purpose, right to say, and use of technology

Then the facilitator presented on various levels of governance and talked about the governance system followed in the UK.

National Level Governance:

- In UK public universities are actually private though they take a certain part of their budget from the public fund. The vice chancellor is not appointed by the government.
- Government can still have control (Only 18% is funded by the founding council that is government fund, 46% fees, 20% research, 16% others).
- Still the universities have freedom to do whatever is appropriate.
- In UK universities can decide what courses they will offer. They have no external quality assurance/approval of program. They have only internal quality standard.

Institutional Level Governance:

- In UK system the power is more delegated to the heads of the departments.
- In UK Chief information officer should be more specialized in information technology and the registrar should be specialized in administration.
- The mission of universities may vary from institution to institution like some may focus more on research, some more on engineering, some more on arts and culture and some more on society.

Four big challenges faced by HE globally:

1. Graduate mobility
2. Lack of proper execution of rule of law; quality cannot be assured due to influence of the key decision makers of the universities
3. High rate of tuition fee for international students, discrimination between native local students and internationals and
4. Lack of sense of inclusiveness in the reputed universities

There was a group discussion to identify other challenges and the participants suggested the following:

- limitation of resources
- Increasing expectations of the students
- mindset
- lack of fund for research

Day 5

Friday, 6 May 2016

(Training Day 5)

Activity : Visit to University Putra Malaysia (UPM)

On day five the participants had a visit to the University Putra Malaysia (UPM). The Director of Quality Assurance Center Prof. Dr. Iqbal Saripan presented on the structure of the quality assurance mechanism at UPM. It was learnt from his presentation that UPM is mainly a research university. They maintain their quality at such a level that the Malaysian Government declared UPM as a **self-accredited university** in 2012.

The participants got a new idea from UPM that is, UPM maintains an **ICGPA** i.e. integrated CGPA that shows a student's performance not only in curricular activities but also in extra-curricular activities.

Day 6-7

Saturday-Sunday, 7-8 May 2016
(Weekend)

Day 8

Monday, 9 May 2016
(Training Day 6)

Session 1

Activity : - Presentation on Requirement under Self Assessment Manual
- Review of SAR

Facilitator : **Assoc. Professor Dr. Rozilini Chung**
Vice President (Quality Assurance), HELP University

Expected Session

Outcome : At the end of the session, participants would be able to:
- critically **analyze** a selected standard from the Self-assessment Manual and
- **critique** the proposed report on that standard of a team

Requirements under Self Assessment:

In this part of the session the facilitator discussed the requirement for the SA process according to the SA Manual. First she focused on the **major steps in the SA Process**, then she discussed the **5-point guideline for SAR**.

The major steps are:

1. Collect and review data according to the scope of the assessment
2. Do a SWOT analysis
3. Develop strategies for maintenance, rectification and enhancement
4. Submit SAR for external peer review and track implementation of strategies

The 5-point guidelines are as follows:

1. What is the scope of the selected standard?
2. What is the information/evidence required?
3. Where can the information be obtained?
4. How can I obtain the information?
5. Who should I consult/engage/interview?

Other important observations of this session were:

- Even after the SA committee prepares the SA report, the IAQC Director/Additional Director must triangle the report by verifying the data, e.g. physically going into the classroom and checking whether the seating arrangement is comfortable or not by sitting there for 30 minutes.

- While writing report about graduate profile, if there is no existing practice of maintaining graduate profile, we must say that we do not have any GP at this moment but we can develop it in next six months or so. Our graduate may have these skills but since we do not have some documented terms of reference we are not sure of it.
- For every standard to check we must consult the 5 points guidelines for SAR

At this stage there was an exercise in pair to prepare report rubric based on the 5-point guideline for SAR. Each pair of participants took a standard, prepared the rubric and made presentation on it. Feedback was given by the facilitator as well as by the participants. It was a very effective session.

Then the facilitator gave homework. It was to critiquing one of standards addressed by a previous group and write a report on it.

Session 2

Activity : **Presentation on Research Extension**

Facilitator : **Assoc. Professor Dr. Faridah Mohd Noor**
Director, Center for Civilization Dialogue
University of Malaya

Expected Session

Outcome : At the end of the session, participants would be able to:

- **demonstrate** understanding of research and research extension
- **Compare** the global standards and best practices to their local context
- **Identify** the key areas to be assessed in the SA process related to research and research extension

In this session the facilitator made a presentation on research and research extension. At first she defined these concepts. Then she discussed the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research and best practice guideline on publication. Finally, she related research and research extension to SA report writing in which the participants were provided guidelines on how to conduct SA activities and write SAR related to research extension.

After the presentation the participants were given group work. Each group was given a task of indentifying individual and institutional needs and best practices related to research publication; assessing the publication capacity of the individuals and as well as that of the institutions; identify the existing procedures to support research publication; and identifying the areas to be improved. The participants actively took part and made presentations on the findings of respective group.

Day 9

Tuesday, 10 May 2016

(Training Day 7)

Activity : **Presentation on Connecting with industry, innovation and entrepreneurship, student support, and open discussion**

Facilitator : **Professor Andy Seddon**
Director (Quality Assurance and Partnerships), Asia Pacific University

In this session the facilitator made presentation and arranged interactive discussion on 4 significant areas of quality assurance in higher education. Those were-

1. Connecting with Industry
2. Innovation and entrepreneurship
3. Student support
4. Professional development

He also shared the experience in UK and in Malaysia related to these four areas. According to a survey (2012) among British employers regarding employers' expectation, most of the employers expect employability skills. Employers have identified required skills for the current and near future job markets and informed the universities about those skills and the universities reviewed their curriculum. Even in UK there is a huge gap between what employers want and what they get. In UK and Malaysia employers advise universities to review curriculum.

Connecting with industry creates opportunities to know the employers' needs related to **employability skills**. Employability skills are those skills, attitudes and actions that enable workers to get along with their co-workers and supervisors and to make sound, critical decisions. They can be divided into three categories:

- Basic academic skills
- Higher-ordered thinking skills
- Personal qualities

In order to bring **Innovation** in learning, teaching and assessment of students, incorporation of certification in curriculum, hiring guest lecturers from industry, arranging industry visits and internships, research funding (single or joint grants), joint ventures related to student projects, and commercialisation of products are some of the key steps

For **student support**, it is necessary to encourage and support extra-curricular activities, internship placement and development of soft skills.

For **staff development**, feedback from the students, monitoring of class by senior academics and positive feedback with clearly stated problems and a time frame to improve, and institutional support are some of the key steps.

In all the four areas the participants were given the task of identifying the present scenario in Bangladesh and need for improvement. They took part in the tasks actively and made presentations on their findings.

Day 10

Wednesday, 9 May 2016

(Training Day 8)

Activity : **Presentation on Writing SA Report, group discussion and group presentation, critiquing SAR, and exercise of writing a short SAR**

Facilitator : **Assoc. Professor Dr. Rozilini Chung**
Vice President (Quality Assurance), HELP University

Expected
Session

Outcome : At the end of the session, participants would be able to:

- **demonstrate** an understanding of the Self-assessment Manual, and organization and structure of audit reports
- **write** a short report on a selected sub-criteria for self assessment in Bangladesh for their respective institution

In this session the facilitator made presentation on the key areas of writing SAR and the participants had a hands-on experience in critiquing some sample SAR prepared by the previous training team from Bangladesh, and writing a short SAR selecting one of the SAR standards.

General guidelines for SAR writing:

1. Include all relevant observations and comments
2. Contain only statements that are factually accurate and unambiguous
3. Be objective and constructive
4. Be useful for future benchmarking
5. Provide specific recommendation for continuous quality improvement activities
6. Be written in style which is clear, concise and readily accessible to its intended readership
7. Provide professional judgement based on the format and scale provided
8. Asking smart questions and critical thinking are very important for writing report
9. In report writing honestly say what you have and what you do not have. Regarding what you do not have clearly mention that in next 6 months, or one year it will be done. There must be an executive summary and action plan at the beginning
10. There must be a section on limitation where we can mention if anything seems to be biased
11. Being constructive means without saying that the quality of a particular program is bad, we must say it can be further improved by
12. We must go by the standards one by one
13. If there is no lesson plan, just say that at this moment the program does not have a practice of formal lesson plan but in next six months it will be developed

14. After finishing the conclusion and before writing action plan and strategies we must review the whole document
15. Evidence can be given in the appendix, but if it is too thick or if there is something confidential, just mention that it is taken from e.g. chapt. of ... handbook and it will be available for audit on request.
16. At the beginning of SA activities there must be a checklist of what the institution HAS and what it DOESN'T HAVE. Then there can be some recommendations to develop what it DOESN'T HAVE.
17. Give the checklist to the SACs and ask them to find out what they have and what they don't have. Then they will come back with their findings, and the IQAC can request the Vice Chancellor to provide those things for a better representation of the university in the SAR
18. IQAC must be in close interaction with the SAC from the beginning because the report is ultimately IQAC's product. It is the IQAC that is the key entity to assure quality in the institution.

Lessons from Audit Report Critique

1. Don't incorporate irrelevant information
2. Don't repeat
3. Don't be apologetic
4. Don't make up data/info
5. Don't create new info just to do the report
6. Don't use bad/poor language (grammar)
7. Don't present in a confusing order
8. Don't be biased
9. Don't disregard the standards
10. Don't conclude without data/evidence
11. Don't use table/graphs without explaining it
12. Don't forget to pay attention to the sequence of report
13. Don't forget conclusion
14. Don't forget action plan / strategies
15. Don't forget methodology

Day 11

Wednesday, 12 May 2016

(Training Day 9)

Activity : **Visit to Asia Pacific University, in the morning and visit to Putrajaya in the afternoon**

Facilitator : **Professor Andy Seddon**
Director (Quality Assurance and Partnerships), Asia Pacific University

The training team visited Asia Pacific University where Professor Andy Seddon welcomed the team. He had a presentation on various aspects of the University. The team came to know that there were more than 200 students from Bangladesh studying at Asia Pacific University. The university has some very

good research labs for computer and engineering subjects. The team had a visit to those labs. Then they were served with lunch, and after lunch the team left for the hotel.

After the Juma prayer the team had a visit to Putrajaya, the administrative capital of Malaysia. There they had a river cruise with dinner.

Day 12

Wednesday, 13 May 2016

(Training Day 10)

Activity : **Re-cap of Workshop and Action Plan for the Future, End of Workshop**

Facilitator : **Assoc. Professor Dr. Rozilini Chung**
Vice President (Quality Assurance), HELP University

This was the final day of the training program. The facilitator recapped the whole training program and provided guidelines for the participants with a to-do list. After going back home the participants would:

- Share with the key persons of the university what they have learnt
- Prepare an action plan
- Motivate faculty members
- Make a coordination among various groups trained in different countries
- Report to QAU
- Arrange meeting with QAC
- Team building
- Encourage different SACs to share information

The participants shared their views on various aspects of the training. Finally the training program ended with certificate award ceremony and group photo session. The next day the team came back to Bangladesh.

Conclusion:

According to the opinion of the participants, the training program was overall a successful one. It covered most of the areas of QA process like SA activities and writing SAR, OBE, writing CLO and PLO, ensuring good governance, students support and graduate mobility, research and research extension and so on. However, the main focus in the whole program was on SA activities and writing SAR. The participants shared their views that this would be most helpful for them since one of the major responsibilities of the IQACs is to identify the weaknesses and strengths of their respective institutions through SA activities and prepare improvement plan with a view to preparing the institution for accreditation. They were hopeful that they would be able to implement what they had learnt from this training.

Annexure-I

List of Participants:

Sl.	Name & Address	E-mail	Cell
1	Prof. Dr. Md. Sirajul Islam Director, IQAC, MBSTU, Tangail	islamstazu@yahoo.com	01710 660209
2	Dr. Helal Uddin Add. Director, IQAC, P. Asia Univ.	helalpau@yahoo.com	01819453019
3	Dr. Md. Shahabuddin Add. Director, IQAC, JKKNI Univ.	badalpr@gmail.com	01712745758
4	Dr. M. M. Mosharrif Hossain Add. Director, IQAC, JUST	mmiron_bau@yahoo.com	01731143787
5	Dr. Md. Forhad Hossain Director, IQAC, BUTEX	enrg_forhad@yahoo.com	01714322070
6	Dr. Md. Masud Reza Director, IQAC, PUB, Dhaka	rezaedu10@yahoo.com	01818608503
7	Md. Khaled Bin Chowdhury Director, IQAC, BGC Trust Univ.	mdkhaledchowdhury@ymail.com	01712651193
8	Dr. Harun-Ar-Rashid Director, IQAC, SUB, Dhaka	harun.rashid@sub.edu.bd	01711351000
9	Dr. Parvez Ahmed Add. Director, IQAC, Green Univ.	parvez.law@green.edu.bd	01720491119
10	Md. Moniruz Zaman Add. Director, IQAC, ASA Univ.	mz.asaub@yahoo.com	01711074076
11	Mr. Hadaate Ullah Add. Director, IQAC, S. Univ.	sendbablu_apee@yahoo.com	01718-279536,
12	Dr. Ahmed Tazmeen Add. Director, IQAC, NSU	ahmed.tazmeen@northsouth.edu	01193105975
13	Mohammad Moniruzzaman Add. Director, IQAC, BU, Dhaka	psolutionbd@gmail.com	01610744901
14	Md. Rezaul Karim Director, IQAC, Leading Univ.	tahrez2005@yahoo.com	01711467396
15	Md. Arifuzzaman Director, IQAC, USTC, Chitg.	larif67@yahoo.com	01712894317
16	Md. Kamal Hossain Add. Director, UGC	kamalugc63@yahoo.com	01819994806
17	Dr. Durga R. Sarker Deputy Director, PUD, UGC	Durga68@yahoo.com	01711196600
18	Md. Safiul Muz Nabeen Deputy Director, HEQEP, UGC	muznabeen@gmail.com	01816316843
19	Md. Moklesur Rahman Program Officer, HEQEP, UGC	mrahmantipu1977@yahoo.com	017189056