

# **CRITERIA REFERENCED PROGRAM ASSESSMENT**

## Criteria Referenced Evaluation

### Introduction

1. Assessment can be of two types subjective (norm referenced) or criteria referenced (rubric approach). The self assessment manual is an example of subjective assessment (norm reference).
2. Descriptive (norm referenced) assessment varies amongst individuals whereas criteria referenced assessment provides three functions:
  - Minimize variations due to subjective judgment
  - Very useful when assessment is to be carried out by group of people
  - Identifies clearly areas that need improvement.
3. A criteria referenced evaluation is a scoring tool that lists the criteria for a piece of work or what the level of performance expected for several levels of quality. These levels of quality may be written as different ratings (5, 4,3,2,1, etc).

	<b>Poor performance in most of the areas.</b>	<b>Fair performance in most of the areas.</b>	<b>Good performance for most areas / No poor performance in any areas.</b>	<b>Good to excellent performance in all areas.</b>	<b>Excellent performance in all areas.</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Criterion 1</b>						
<b>Criterion 2</b>						
<b>Criterion 3</b>						
<b>Criterion 4</b>						
<b>Criterion 5</b>						
<b>Criterion 6</b>						
<b>Criterion 7</b>						
<b>Criterion 8</b>						

## **CRITERIA REFERENCED SELF ASSESSMENT – METHODOLOGY AND EVALUATION TOOL**

### **Scoring of Criterion Items**

1. Key areas of each criterion are to be scored normally by considering the approach taken by the university and the results achieved. Maximum score for each items is 5 and the minimum is 1. The visiting team is required to award the score by encircling one of the entries against each item. The total of the encircled values (TV) for each criterion will be determined and normalized in percentages. Each criterion has a weight allocated to it. Scores pertaining to a particular criterion will be the product of TV and its weightage. Following are the guidelines to be used to awarding score to each key area.

<b>Result</b>	<b>Score</b>
Poor performance in most of the areas.	1
Fair performance in most of the areas.	2
Good performance for most areas. No poor performance in any areas.	3
Good to excellent performance in all areas.	4
Excellent performance in most of the areas.	5

## Criteria Referenced Self Assessment – Methodology and Evaluation Tool

<b>Criterion 1 – Program Mission, Objectives and Outcomes</b>							<b>Weight = 0.05</b>					
<b>Factors</b>							<b>Score</b>					
1	Does the Program have documented measurable objectives that support faculty / college and institution mission statements?	5	4	3	2	1						
2	Does the Program have documented outcomes for graduating students?	5	4	3	2	1						
3	Do these outcomes support the Program objectives?	5	4	3	2	1						
4	Are the graduating students capable of performing these outcomes?	5	4	3	2	1						
5	Does the department assess its overall performance periodically using quantifiable measures?	5	4	3	2	1						
6	Is the result of the Program Assessment documented?	5	4	3	2	1						
<b>Total Encircled Value (TV)</b>												
<b>Score 1 (S1) = [TV/(No. of Questions *5)] *100 *Weight</b>												
<b>Criterion 2 – Curriculum Design and Organization</b>							<b>Weight = 0.05</b>					
<b>Factors</b>							<b>Score</b>					
1	Is the curriculum consistent?	5	4	3	2	1						
2	Does the curriculum support the program’s documented objectives?	5	4	3	2	1						
3	Are theoretical background, problem analysis and solution design stressed within the program’s core material?	5	4	3	2	1						
4	Does the curriculum satisfy the core requirements laid down by respective accreditation bodies? (refer Appendix A of the Self Assessment Manual)	5	4	3	2	1						
5	Does the curriculum satisfy the major requirements laid down by HEC and the respective councils / accreditation bodies? (Refer to appendix A of the Self Assessment Manual)	5	4	3	2	1						
6	Does the curriculum satisfy the general education, arts and professional and other discipline requirements as laid down by the respective / accreditation bodies / councils? (Refer to Appendix A of the Self Assessment Manual)	5	4	3	2	1						
7	Is the information technology component integrated throughout the program?	5	4	3	2	1						
8	Are oral and written skills of the students developed and applied in the program?	5	4	3	2	1						
<b>Total Encircled Value (TV)</b>							5	4	3	2	1	
<b>Score 2 (S2) = [TV/(No. of Questions *5)] *100 *Weight</b>												

<b>Criterion 3 – Laboratories and Computing Facilities</b>		<b>Weight = 0.10</b>				
<b>Factors</b>		<b>Score</b>				
1	Are laboratory manuals / documentation / instructions etc. for experiments available and readily accessible to faculty and students?	5	4	3	2	1
2	Are there adequate number of support personnel for instruction and maintaining the laboratories?	5	4	3	2	1
3	Are the university's infrastructure and facilities adequate to support the program objectives?	5	4	3	2	1
<b>Total Encircled Value (TV)</b>						
<b>Score 3 (S3) = [TV/(No. of Questions *5)] *100 *Weight</b>						
<b>Criterion 4 – Student Support and Advising</b>		<b>Weight = 0.10</b>				
<b>Factors</b>		<b>Score</b>				
1	Are the courses being offered in sufficient frequency and number for the students to complete the program in a timely manner?	5	4	3	2	1
2	Are the courses in the major area structured to optimize interaction between the students, faculty and teaching assistants?	5	4	3	2	1
3	Does the university provide academic advising on course decisions and career choices to all students?	5	4	3	2	1
<b>Total Encircled Value (TV)</b>						
<b>Score 4 (S4) = [TV/(No. of Questions *5)] *100 *Weight</b>						
<b>Criterion 5 – Process Control</b>		<b>Weight = 0.15</b>				
<b>Factors</b>		<b>Score</b>				
1	Is the process to enroll students to a program based on quantitative and qualitative criteria?	5	4	3	2	1
2	Is the process above clearly documented and periodically evaluated to ensure that it is meeting its objectives?	5	4	3	2	1
3	Is the process to register students in the program and monitoring their progress documented?	5	4	3	2	1
4	Is the process above periodically evaluated to ensure that it is meeting its objectives?	5	4	3	2	1
5	Is the process to recruit and retain faculty in place and documented?	5	4	3	2	1
6	Are the processes for faculty evaluation & promotion consistent with the institution mission?	5	4	3	2	1
7	Are the processes in 5 and 6 above periodically evaluated to ensure that they are meeting their objectives?	5	4	3	2	1

8	Do the processes and procedures ensure that teaching and delivery of course material emphasize active learning and that course learning outcomes are met?	5	4	3	2	1
9	Is the process in 8 above periodically evaluated to ensure that it is meeting its objectives?	5	4	3	2	1
10	Is the process to ensure that graduates have completed the requirements of the program base on standards and documented procedures?	5	4	3	2	1
11	Is the process in 10 above periodically evaluated to ensure that it is meeting its objectives?	5	4	3	2	1
<b>Total Encircled Value (TV)</b>						
<b>Score 5 (S5) = [TV/(No. of Questions *5)] *100 *Weight</b>						
<b>Criterion 6 – Faculty</b>			<b>Weight = 0.20</b>			
<b>Factors</b>		<b>Score</b>				
1	Are there enough full time faculty members to provide adequate coverage of the program areas / courses with continuity and stability?	5	4	3	2	1
2	Are the qualifications and interests of faculty members sufficient to teach all courses, plan, modify and update courses and curricula?	5	4	3	2	1
3	Do the faculty members posses a level of competence that would be obtained through graduate work in the discipline?	5	4	3	2	1
4	Do the majority of faculty members hold a PhD degree in their discipline?	5	4	3	2	1
5	Do faculty members dedicate sufficient time to research to remain current in their disciplines?	5	4	3	2	1
6	Are there mechanisms in place for faculty development?	5	4	3	2	1
7	Are faculty members motivated and satisfied so as to excel in their profession?	5	4	3	2	1
<b>Total Encircled Value (TV)</b>						
<b>Score 6 (S6) = [TV/(No. of Questions *5)] *100 *Weight</b>						

<b>Criterion 7 – Institutional Facilities</b>						<b>Weight = 0.10</b>				
<b>Factors</b>						<b>Score</b>				
1	Does the institution have the infrastructure to support new trends such as e-learning?	5	4	3	2	1				
2	Does the library contain technical collection relevant to the program and is it adequately staffed?	5	4	3	2	1				
3	Are the class rooms and offices adequately equipped and capable of helping faculty carry out their responsibilities?	5	4	3	2	1				
<b>Total Encircled Value (TV)</b>										
<b>Score 7 (S7) = [TV/(No. of Questions *5)] *100 *Weight</b>										
<b>Criterion 8 – Institutional Support</b>						<b>Weight = 0.10</b>				
<b>Factors</b>						<b>Score</b>				
1	Is there sufficient support and finances to attract and retain high quality faculty?	5	4	3	2	1				
2	Are there an adequate number of high quality graduate students, teaching assistants and Ph.D students?	5	4	3	2	1				
<b>Total Encircled Value (TV)</b>										
<b>Score 8 (S8) = [TV/(No. of Questions *5)] *100 *Weight</b>										

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT SCORE = S1 + S2 + S3 + S4 + S5 + S6 + S7 + S8 + S9 + S10**

= \_\_\_\_\_

**Remarks:**

---



---



---

# **QEC'S REVIEW OF THE SELF ASSESSMENT REPORT**



# QEC'S REVIEW OF THE SELF ASSESSMENT REPORT

## PROGRAM SELF ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

1. The following is a summary checklist of the main criteria and the associated standards that need to be addressed in the program self-assessment report.

Department / Program: \_\_\_\_\_

CRITERIA AND ASSOCIATED STANDARDS		Addressed	Not Addressed
<b>Criterion 1 – Program Mission, Objective and Outcomes</b>			
<b>Standard 1-1</b>	Program Measureable Objectives		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Table 4.1 program objectives assessment</li> </ul>		
<b>Standard 1-2</b>	Program Outcomes		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Table 4.2 outcomes versus objectives</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employer Survey</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alumni Survey</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Graduating Students' Survey</li> </ul>		
<b>Standard 1-3</b>	Assessment Results and Improvement Plans		
<b>Standard 1-4</b>	Overall Performance Using Quantifiable Measures		
<b>Criterion 2 – Curriculum Design and Organization</b>			
Courses detailed outline as in item E, Criterion 2 of the Self Assessment Manual			
<b>Standard 2-1</b>	Course Vs Objectives		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Table 4.3 Curriculum course requirement</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Table 4.4 courses versus outcomes</li> </ul>		
<b>Standard 2-2</b>	Theory, Problem Analysis / Solution and Design in Program		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Table 4.5 Standard 2-2 requirements</li> </ul>		
<b>Standard 2-3</b>	Mathematics & Basic Sciences Requirements		
<b>Standard 2-4</b>	Major Requirements as specified by Accreditation Body		
<b>Standard 2-5</b>	Humanities, social Science, Arts, Ethical, Professional & Other Requirements		
<b>Standard 2-6</b>	Information Technology Content Integration throughout the Program		
<b>Standard 2-7</b>	Communication Skills (Oral & Written)		

<b>Standard 3 - Laboratories and Computing Facilities</b>			
<b>Standard 3-1</b>	Lab Manual/Documentation/Instructions		
<b>Standard 3-2</b>	Adequate Support Personnel for labs		
<b>Standard 3-3</b>	Adequate Computing Infrastructure and Facilities		
<b>Standard 4 - Student Support and Advising</b>			
<b>Standard 4-1</b>	Sufficient Frequency of Course Offering		
<b>Standard 4-2</b>	Effective Faculty/Student Interaction		
<b>Standard 4-3</b>	Professional Advising and Counseling		
<b>Standard 5 - Process Control</b>			
<b>Standard 5-1</b>	Admission Process		
<b>Standard 5-2</b>	Registration and Student		
<b>Standard 5-3</b>	Faculty Recruitment and Retention Process		
<b>Standard 5-4</b>	Effective Teaching and Learning Process		
<b>Standard 5-5</b>	Program Requirements Completion Process		
<b>Standard 6 – Faculty</b>			
<b>Standard 6-1</b>	Program Faculty Qualifications and Number		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Faculty resumes in accordance with the format in Appendix B of Self Assessment Manual.</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Table 4.6 Faculty distribution by program's areas</li> </ul>		
<b>Standard 6-2</b>	Current Faculty, Scholarly Activities & Development		
<b>Standard 6-3</b>	Faculty Motivation & Job Satisfaction		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Faculty Survey</li> </ul>		
<b>Standard 7 – Instructional Facilities</b>			
<b>Standard 7-1</b>	New Trends in Learning (e.g. E-Learning)		
<b>Standard 7-2</b>	Library Collections & Staff		
<b>Standard 7-3</b>	Class-rooms & Offices Adequacy		
<b>Standard 8 – Instructional Support</b>			
<b>Standard 8-1</b>	Support & Financial Resources		
<b>Standard 8-2</b>	Number & Quality of GSs, RAs, & Ph.D Students		
<b>Standard 8-3</b>	Financial Support for Library, Labs & Computing Facilities		

Department Program Team Coordinator: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

# **ASSESSMENT TEAM REPORT FORMAT**

## ANNUAL ASSESSMENT TEAM REPORT FORMAT (To be used by QEC)

<b>REPORT CONTENTS</b>		
Does the report contain primary contact person and information?	Y	N
Does the report clearly indicate the name of the program, the college to which it reports, and the year covered by the report?	Y	N
Does the report include names and particulars of the members of the Program Team?	Y	N
Does the report indicate the time frame for completing the Report?	Y	N
Does the report contain a summary of the assessment method(s) for outcome assessed?	Y	N
Does the report contain a summary of the assessment results?	Y	N
Does the report identify the group(s) who participated in the discussion of the assessment result and proposed changes?	Y	N
Does the report provide specific recommendations for changes or improvements based on the assessment result?	Y	N
Does the report specify who will be responsible for implementing the proposed change(s)?	Y	N
Does the report identify the resource needed to implement the proposed change(s)?	Y	N

<b>Feedback on Report Contents</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<i>Assessment Methods / Results</i>	
Does the summary indicate any modifications from the method(s) outlined in the Program Assessment Plan?	
Does the summary clearly identify the person responsible and the procedures employed for data collection and analysis?	
Does the summary provide specific details of the results of the assessment?	
Does the summary identify the extent to which the outcome was achieved?	
Does the summary provide a description of the process used to disseminate the results and with whom they were compared?	