

Self-Assessment Report (SAR): A suggested format

(See page 35 of IUCEA Handbook 1 <http://tinyurl.com/RoadMapVol1>)

Title page

Name of the programme under review

Date of the report

Table of Contents

Acronyms used in the report

Executive Summary – Principal Findings (SWOT): maximum two pages

1.0 Introduction

1.1.1 How was the self-assessment carried out - including the composition of the SAR team

1.1.2 Brief description about the University – AKU [refer to website – locate the programme in it]

1.2 The programme [Brief description of the programme in such a way that an outsider has a good idea about the content of the programme]

2.0 Chapter One: SWOT analysis of programme Use seven themes as listed below; make explicit reference to the relevant 18 cells, as analyzed in the appendix – for improvement and recognition, for example, good practices]

3.0 Chapter Two: Improvement plan, including table [alignment with weaknesses identified in SAR]
The Improvement Plan should be aligned with the findings of Chapter One.

Improvement Plan Matrix

(a part of Chapter two)

Cell title (where applicable)	Areas of Improvement and Intended Outcomes	Action to be taken (Short 1 yr) (Medium 2-3 yrs) (Long term 4-5yrs)	Responsible person(s)

The improvement plan should identify the Short (1 yr), Medium (2-3 yrs) and Long Term actions (4-5 yrs)

4.0 Appendix [Cell-by-cell analysis of 18 cells, as shown in the sample template in Attachment 1]

The report should be approximately 40 pages. The main body of the report should be in the range of 15-20 pages; the remaining pages are devoted to the Appendix.

Note: The self-assessment report must refer, wherever possible, to the national quality agency where the programme is located for meeting its QA and cell requirements. For example, HEC in Pakistan; QAA in the UK; CUE in Kenya; TCU in Tanzania; and NCHE in Uganda.

Supporting document for the SAR report

7 THEMES – CHAPTER 1 (reference on page 1)

7 Themes [Use these 7 themes to do SWOT analysis of a programme in Chapter 1 with explicit reference to the relevant 18 cells as described in the appendix]

1. Stakeholders (Cell 1 and 18)
2. Programme Content and Structure: Learning Outcomes (Cell 2,3,4,5,14)
3. Teaching and Learning, and Assessment (Cell 6,7,13)
4. Quality of staff and Staff Development (Cell 8,9,15)
5. Students (Cell 10, 11, 17)
6. Facilities and Infrastructure (Cell 12)
7. Benchmarking (Cell 16)

18 Cells (reference on page 1 – 4.0 appendix)

1. Needs of stakeholders
2. Expected learning outcomes
3. Specification of the programme (programme description)
4. Content of the programme
5. Programme organization
6. Didactic concept (Teaching and Learning strategy including mode(s) of delivery)
7. Student assessment
8. Quality of academic staff
9. Quality of the support staff
10. The students
11. Student advice / support
12. Facilities & Infrastructure
13. Student evaluation
14. Curriculum design
15. Staff development activities
16. Benchmarking
17. Achievements / graduates
18. Satisfaction stakeholders

Comments:

1. The findings of the self-assessment have to be grounded in evidence. Each cell should make references to the documentary evidence. In case of overlap, wherever needed in description and analysis of another cell, cross references should be made.
2. All collected documented evidences put in the 18 box file or electronic folders – one for each cell shall be available to the external peer reviewers to verify.
3. Record the scoring of each applicable cell, as per the consensus of members; if it needs to be changed, change and make necessary changes in respective cell and accompanying text.

Attachment 1: Example Template of a Cell

Cell 1: Requirements from Stakeholders

Description [Brief comments on cell]

Critical Analysis of the Cell [score identified items within the cell on a scale of 1-7 using as full a range of scores as possible as provided description of scoring below]

The quality of the different aspects of the programme will be assessed on a scale of 1-7.
 1=absolutely inadequate; immediate improvements must be made, 2=inadequate, improvements necessary, 3=inadequate, but minor improvements will make it adequate, 4=adequate as expected, 5=better than adequate, 6=example of good practice, 7=excellent

Items-[List area as mentioned on pg. 38-41, vol 1: guidelines for self-assessment]	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
About the relevant needs and requirements of the government							
About the relevant needs and requirements of the labor market.							
About the relevant needs and requirements of the students/parents.							
About the relevant needs and requirements of the academic world.							
About the relevant needs and requirements of the society.							

The assessment should be based on a **consensus** of the self-assessment team and be the basis for identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the program. The checklist provided with all its 18 aspects and 68 sub-criteria should be used to do this (p. 38-41 handbook)

Ideally the above rating of the cells between 4 and 7 should be taken as strengths and those below 4 as major weaknesses that require improvements and place in as part of the Improvement Plan.

Overall Rating and Justification

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Remarks
Requirement by stakeholders								The program operating under national agency and is approved by the xxxx. The curriculum has been frequently reviewed, with the involvement of xxxxx stakeholders.

Analyze situation of the cell! What is the SAR team opinion about it? The formulated criteria have been met or not, and evidence provided.

List Evidence for meeting the criteria [brief characterization and link to Learning Outcomes (see chapter 1)]

Strengths and Weaknesses

Describe the strengths and weaknesses concerning the aspects of the cell in bullets.

List Action Plans for Improvement

Use above similar format for remaining 17 cells