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Extract

Areas of Concern

1. Response from faculties on feedback from lecturers delivering the courses in UiTMM is not forthcoming. This has resulted in a state of uncertainty for issues related to curriculum especially for diploma programmes.

2. For some programmes, UiTMM is deemed as anchor campus but without any formal definition and document to support this. UiTM should explicitly define and formalise the anchor campus roles. This will clarify the expectations and requirements and more importantly, the authority accorded to the anchor campus, KP, RP and coordinators in coordinating the programmes with other campuses which offer similar programmes.

1. There is a high percentage of part time and full time staff especially for APB. Hence, these staff were left with little training especially in the context of OBE.

2. Some programmes in UiTMM are running on their own without much support from the respective faculties in Shah Alam in matters pertaining to TLA. In case FPHP for which Melaka is purportedly the anchor campus, there is hardly any support.

3. It is imperative that UiTMM in proposing the new programmes (Diploma in Zakat Management, Diploma in Halal Food Management, B.A. (Hons) Photo Journalism, B. Sc. Sports Tourism, Diploma in Communication Design and Techno-Entrepreneurship, Diploma in Translation and Linguistics and Diploma in English for Hospitality), indicate at least
generally the resources needed to deliver the programmes. Staff requirements for Sports Science need to be planned as currently none is available at UiTMM.

4. The campus has exceeded its planned capacity. The resources are stretched (classes at night; lecturers in cramped rooms), resulting in unfavourable workplace condition. This may affect effective T&L.

5. The panel is concerned that the **7 new programmes that have been planned can be an added burden to the currently over-stretched resources.** While UiTMM has sensibly limited this number, in view of its capacity, the panel recommends that UiTMM start with only 2 or 3 programmes initially while the rest can take off when the Jasin campus is ready.

6. The training provided is inadequate to fully realise what OBE is all about. The training that has been provided only guides academic staff on how to start the journey. **There is a need for further training** to fully benefit from the OBE curriculum. UiTMM is strongly suggested to obtain help from iLQaM.

7. With OBE, there are different types of data collected. However, the data have not been analysed to initiate improvement in TLA. The panel recommends that UiTMM reflect on all aspects under OBE. **The many unsettled issues (e.g. when and how changes will be made to the curriculum, OBE committee and KP (overlapping work)) should be reported to the Rector.**

8. The purpose of the Student Portfolio is not clear to students and staff. It serves as various functions across programmes. There is urgent need to be clear about the purpose and to adopt a standardised approach across programmes within the campus.

9. With respect to practical training assessment for BM220, the requirement is for 2 visits by the academic supervisor which accounts for 40% of the marks. However, academic supervisors are only allowed 1 visit. This raises questions about meeting the programme requirements. The matter must be discussed with the faculty for immediate resolution.

10. For MAcc & EMBA, there is little appreciation of the need for control over final examinations. **The general rules of final examinations are not adhered to by these programmes.** For final exams, students can appeal hence official scripts have to be used and retained. This concerns both final examination and post graduate regulations.
12. **Assessment:**
   
a. Despite having second examiners, **the panel found mistakes in addition of marks on final exam scripts.** It is recommended that IQA take a more extensive sampling when auditing such processes and that UiTMM review the responsibilities of the second examiner.

b. Variations in mark allocation were noted between different lecturers despite using the same answer scheme.

c. **Second examiners are not utilised across all programmes.** The panel would like to emphasise that where assessments are subjective, it is imperative to have a second examiner to avoid arbitrariness.

d. The panel found the quality (content and language) of final examination questions for some diploma courses to be unsatisfactory, due to poor editing/vetting.

e. KPs of relevant programmes need to find out who the external examiners for their programmes are, and obtain the reports from the faculty for improvement. If possible, the campus should invite the examiners to visit UiTMM.

f. **The panel observed KI assessors, including lecturers do have sufficient knowledge of each candidate assigned to them, to carry out effective assessment.** The emphasis is on completion and not validity and reliability. Generally, students do not view KI as important. The online system used to manage KI does not allow for analysis at the campus level. Without analysis, the campus cannot contemplate suitable action to improve KI administration.

g. **Rubrics that have been developed were not applied to some programmes sampled.**

13. The panel concurs that the **SuFO data must be carefully and cautiously used.** The practice of students resorting to the default value in their haste to complete the survey must be checked. The SuFO data must be analysed and used to encourage and also develop lecturers. Data from sections A and C should be used for course and physical resource improvements.

14. The panel finds the instrument (SuFO) to contain items (alignment of assessment to outcomes, appropriateness of teaching method) which impose unfairness upon the students. With little understanding and experience in teaching, it is inappropriate to expect reliable assessment of these items by the students.

15. **The panel suggests that a handbook be prepared and posted on the web for the students to download and use, and which can be updated within minimal costs.**
16. **In UiTMM, the coordinators/RPs should carry out an annual programme review that addresses admission requirements, teaching and assessments, resource requirements, practical training (if applicable), and share best practices with other campuses and faculties.** This review can be incorporated into the annual self review of the campus. UiTMM should encourage lecturers to develop, validate and share innovative TLA. These innovations should be documented and even presented in IID and KIK for recognition and promotion of best practice sharing.

17. It is recommended that **UiTMM undertake studies to estimate the Teaching Preparation Time (TPT) to objectively assess the reported claims of greater preparation required for conducting courses under the OBE.**

18. **The panel urges the OBE Committee to seek clarification from HEA as there were no clear policies on the appointment of Ketua Program and identification of anchor campus.** There were differences between 4 programmes sampled in terms of the appointment of Ketua Fakulti/Ketua Program/ Koordinator Program/ Resource Person. There were also differences in practice and frequency of feedback meetings between the faculties in Shah Alam and relevant representatives in UiTMM. There was also no evidence of clear guidelines on improvement feedback flow especially from UiTMM to Shah Alam.

19. The opportunity for variation in marking between lecturers and between campuses is a strong possibility. There is **no evidence of coordination between campuses on programmes offered in multiple sites.** This raises an important question of common assessment standards. The 4 programmes sampled showed variation from the more standardised syndicated marking to marking by a single examiner (second examiner is only required for borderline marks).

20. Pending the procurement of plagiarism detection software by UiTM Shah Alam, the panel **recommends that UiTMM encourage lecturers to use free online software to check student’s work.** In fact, students should also be encouraged to self check their work before submission.

21. **The panel is also concerned that KI programme does not provide for appeal by students against unfair assessment by hostel or academic mentors.** The panel urges TR HEPA and HEP Shah Alam to consider ways of informing students of their end of semester evaluation results and to develop process for appeals by students.

22. The panel observed that formative assessments are subjected to less rigorous checks compared with final examinations. Coordinators and
resource persons should include this as part of the annual programme and course review.

23. The panel recommends that in any future review of the SuFO reporting system, the management needs of the academic managers be obtained and accommodated in the system to make it more useful to academic managers.

24. The panel also found that SuFO (Part C) did not identify the location of classroom/facilities being evaluated. Hence, feedback could not be provided to relevant authorities to facilitate corrective or preventive actions.

25. The panel's interview with students reveals that students view the SuFO exercise as a means of obtaining their transcripts. The panel suggests that UiTMM HEA carry out focus group studies on student’s attitude and approach in completing the online survey, and the reliability of the data.

PREVIOUS QUALITY ASSURANCE AND PROGRESS REPORTS

As this is the first External Review carried out using COPIA and ISO 9001:2008, no previous audits are available for reference and follow-up action. The panel however, examined the Internal Quality Audit Reports and the actions taken.

REPORT OF THE FINDINGS

Area 2: Curriculum Design and Delivery

1. UiTMM presently offers 29 programmes within 9 faculties all of which have been developed at the faculties in Shah Alam. As a campus with the second largest student enrolment (exceeding 12,000), UiTMM has taken the initiative to work with several faculties and centres to develop curriculum ideas for consideration. Seven new programmes (5 diplomas and 2 degrees) have recently been agreed to by HEA UiTM. Two of these were initiated by the respective faculties but will be offered at UiTMM once ready. These programmes are aligned with the theme identified for the campus: Arts, Heritage, Communication and Tourism. The panel commends UiTMM for keeping their planning of future programmes focused on their niche areas and beneficial for the state.

2. The new programmes show a marriage of various disciplines and are too specialised (for the diploma level). As such, the panel recommends that the courses offered be a blend of the disciplines (rather than having separate courses from each discipline). As in the
case of B.Sc (Hons) Sports Tourism (BST) which was initiated by FSR Shah Alam, FPHP and FSR should consider formally appointing senior staff from UiTMM to their curriculum committee since the programme will be offered at UiTMM. This will provide them with the experience in developing home grown diploma and degree programmes in line with becoming an autonomous campus.

3. The Diploma in Zakat Management and the Bachelor of Sports Tourism (Hons) offer the greatest promise and the latter is awaiting Senate approval in September 2011. The campus has sensibly focused on a few programmes which exploit the synergy that exists between centres and faculties. The Panel suggests (OFI) that the CDC for Zakat management very carefully consider the scale of the market (for sustainability of the programme) and also the nomenclature as it suggests a dominant body of knowledge rather than a specialisation within management or business studies. The panel also suggests that the CDC consider the option of upgrading the programme into a postgraduate diploma which can tap those working in zakat institutions but need specialized knowledge. If both markets exist, it can be offered as two different level programmes addressing different target market.

4. In the case of the proposed new programmes, the lack of such programme itself should not be the criteria for its appeal. More serious market study is needed to ensure long term viability of the programme. Given that HEA, UiTM has “endorsed” the programme proposal, the market studies are likely to be treated as perfunctory requirements. It is recommended that HEA upon seeing the promise in the idea or concept of the programme, urge the faculties and campuses to carry out market studies before giving strong approval to develop the curriculum. This will prevent self serving and selective market studies.

5. UiTMM has no powers at this time to “design” and review existing curriculum. All 29 programmes offered in this campus are within the purview of the related faculties. Generally, faculty members in UiTMM are not involved in the process unless invited. They merely manage the programmes at UiTMM subject to the guidelines of the faculty and UiTMM. The interviews with heads of programmes provided no evidence of any official definition of anchor campus along with the responsibilities and authorities from HEA except for AM110. This definition will clarify the expectations and requirements and more importantly, the authority accorded to the anchor campus in coordinating the programmes with other campuses which also offer similar programmes.
6. The Programme Coordinators who are managing the programmes in this campus provide feedback to the faculties on the areas of review. The feedback is provided through reports and also through participation in the programme meetings hosted by the faculties. The feedback to the faculties (Accounting and Business) is minimal with respect to the postgraduate programmes where role of the faculty is dominant. The Postgraduate Coordinators’ (MAcc & EMBA) role is mostly administrative. The contribution is most evident in the case of programme for which UiTMM has been identified as the anchor campus – AM 110. The panel recommends (AOC) that the faculties formally appoint the campus faculty to their programme review committee to ensure appropriate (experienced) expertise is brought to bear on the review of the diploma programmes which are not conducted in Shah Alam.

7. UiTMM is identified with programmes from FKPM, FPHP and FSSR under the theme of Art, Heritage, Communication and Tourism. For many years UiTMM has offered diploma programmes at Lendu campus. Degree and Masters programmes started in 2007 and are located at KBM. The campus is rightly focusing on new and homegrown programmes. The panel recommends that UiTMM conduct a detailed analysis of the existing and additional resources be it facilities or human resource. This will help UiTMM in planning for recruitment and training of lecturers including postgraduate studies.

8. The panel also recommends that the resources needed for the new programmes be stated very clearly to ensure better appreciation of the additional resource needs in the form of teaching staff. This is especially important in view of the enrolment exceeding the planned capacity and signs of intensive utilisation of staff (ATA exceeding 20 hrs and significant (17%) use of full time, part time academic staff) and physical resources. In view of resources being stretched to the limit as a result of an increase in student enrolment from 7000 to 8000, the panel is concerned that new programmes without additional resources will result in quality decline.

9. Internal quality management system, IQA and also visits from relevant faculties ensure that the curriculum is delivered as required. However there was evidence that some programmes in FSSR and FPHP did not observe the requirements specified.

10. The co-curricular participation is mandatory. The importance rather than effectiveness of the co-curricular components in enriching student’s experiences and fostering personal development is very evident. The panel recommends that co-curricular activities be equally examined in ensuring meeting of outcomes. Under the OBE changes, co-curricular courses are also required to define the outcomes and also
demonstrate the levels of achievement. The KI programme with semesterly assessment of extra-curricular involvement is a small incentive for students to expand their involvement beyond the mandatory co-curriculum.

**Curriculum Content and Structure**

11. The OBE programmes are in the third semester of implementation (except for AM110). Gradually, the OBE curriculum will replace the existing curriculum. Complete OBE documents from Shah Alam have been received by all programme managers. These documents have been revised to the format prescribed by HEA. Core contents of the disciplines are incorporated in this programme. The staff interviewed have had some OBE training. They concur that OBE has its benefits and drawbacks. They appreciate that the OBE curriculum ensures more structured TLA activities, hence reduces variation across groups/lecturers/campuses. However, the administration of entrance-exit surveys and analysis, required to measure the effectiveness of the OBE curriculum, has added to the responsibilities of the lecturers. **The panel recommends that lecturers be given support (eg. through SKP or typists) to key-in data from these surveys as well as produce associated statistics.** This would help lecturers to focus on interpreting the feedback for continuous improvement and innovation in TLA.

12. For AM110, the OBE curriculum is in the fifth semester of implementation, hence there is only one group left of the non-OBE curriculum. As the OBE curriculum is nearing full completion of one cohort for AM110, a review (Bengkel Pemurnian FSPPP OBE) has been planned in June by FSPPP which will be attended by faculty members from UiTMM and other campuses. **This practice should be emulated by other faculties.**

13. Two postgraduate programmes are managed by UiTMM. Master of Accounting (MAcc) has not implemented the OBE syllabi while MBA has implemented it for the current semester (Jan-April 2011). **The Panel commends the coordinators and the Quality Unit for ensuring that all programme and course related documents are maintained.**

14. **The MBA OBE syllabi do not conform to a standard course information format as prescribed by HEA.** The course status, prerequisites and also date of review and/or implementation vary between syllabi (see for e.g. ECO 740, HRM 730, ACC 720). A standard format is not an issue of presentation as it is provided for in the HEA curriculum guidelines. The Coordinator is urged to raise this matter with AAGBS in the forthcoming meetings.
15. A review of the curriculum for both postgraduate programmes shows that final examination is only applicable to a minority of courses. There is little awareness that postgraduate academic regulations permit students to appeal final examination results. The necessary implication for this is to ensure examination questions and scripts are retained for a specified duration in accordance with this regulation. The Panel also found that both final examination questions are not prepared and presented in a standardised format as provided by UiTM. Even if the present format for final examination question rules are not applicable to postgraduate, it is desirable to have a standardised format. IPSis is strongly recommended to develop a common format for final examinations.

16. Where final examinations are conducted, programme managers must ensure that official answer booklets are used and the scripts retained after grading for a specified period in view of the appeal requirements. Presently, the students are not required to use the official answer booklet and the lecturers are expected to retain the answer scripts after grading. The Panel is concerned that present practices can cause complications if students appeal.

17. The programme managers must also be mindful that courses with no final examination provide no avenue for student appeal against results (see postgraduate Academic Regulations, 2010). This is inconsistent with COPPA and COPIA benchmark standard (3.3.1).

Management of Programmes

18. UiTMM has a system of Heads or Coordinators and resource persons, together with some committees i.e. examination, timetabling, discipline, OBE to manage the programmes. The Heads or Coordinators are responsible for ensuring adequate staff and resources for effective delivery.

19. The students are provided with information on the academic system, the programme and their courses and also the regulations to be observed. Handbooks provided for Part 1 students contain programme-based information. There is no comprehensive handbook that contains other important information. The panel suggests that such a handbook be prepared and posted on the web for students to download and use, and which can be updated within minimal costs.

20. A system of academic advisors is used to support, guide and motivate students in all programmes. The number of students assigned to each lecturer ranges from 16 to 50. It is recommended that the effectiveness of this support system be evaluated and improved as and when necessary.
21. The student portfolio which was introduced with OBE requires some attention. The purpose and role of the portfolios are variously understood. Students in UiTMM are at the initial stage of preparing their portfolios. **Clearer understanding is needed. The portfolio should hold only selected and significant work of students and not all paperwork generated.**

22. UiTMM only collects data on programmes to be used for monitoring their quality objectives. However, these data only represent the overall performance of students in UiTMM but not each programme. As such, the data are not utilised for programme review as per the COPPA requirement. **The panel recommends that UiTMM take advantage of the processed data for programme reviews that address admission, progression, teaching, lecturers, assessment, facilities, practical training (if applicable) and compare/benchmark them with other campuses & faculties.** This review can be incorporated into the annual self review of the campus.

23. The postgraduate programmes (MBA & MAcc) are managed in accordance with the rules laid down by the respective faculties. However, the assessment is entirely local i.e. the assigned lecturer will set the assessments and grade them based on the course syllabi. There is **no coordination or moderation** between lecturers teaching the same course in different campuses or moderation within the same campus. Some informal moderation is carried out within the MAcc programme by senior lecturers and others teaching the same courses in the campuses. To ensure common standard, **the Panel recommends that the RPs for the courses in MAcc and MBA develop means to review assessments (samples will suffice) and also the grading. The assessment should be based on marking scheme.**

24. The SuFO requirement for postgraduates is likely to offer better insight into the TLA within the postgraduate programmes.

25. The lecturers’ workload (ATA) ranges between 16 to 18 hours. Those involved in OBE-based courses are reported to carry a greater burden of non-teaching duties in the form of data collection, collation, analysis etc. In 2 years’ time all academic staff will be experiencing the same burden. **It is recommended that UiTMM undertake studies to estimate the TPT to objectively assess the reported claims of greater preparatory work. The panel also recommends that top management find ways to assign additional support staff to handle the clerical and routine work e.g filing, maintenance of records and documents, and data entry.** Despite this added burden, the morale among academic staff is good and spirit of camaraderie is high.
26. It is observed that there are a total of 99 part time academic staff, all being language lecturers and some have served for more than three years. UiTMM had applied for full time lecturers to serve the campus but was not successful. The high percentage of part timers does not augur well for a campus that is on the way to becoming autonomous as a significant portion of the budget is spent on their claims and training needed in view of the OBE implementation. **The panel recommends that the Human Resource Department of UiTM review the current overall recruitment of academic staff and distribution of administrative staff for the whole of the UiTM system in light of the tremendous increase in student enrolment and new programmes.**

27. Interviews with students show that lecturers are creative and innovative in TLA. However, this is not shared among faculty members resulting in efforts not recognized as best practice. The panel recommends UiTMM provide a platform for innovative TLA sharing sessions that can lead to research on TLA. In addition, from the students’ perspective, OBE has made their learning process more enjoyable and effective; hence, making them more responsible towards learning (eg. preparation and revision done before class, guided by SLT).

28. The focus on implementing the new OBE syllabus has priority and the belief that staff are to follow the prescribed TLA has further dampened efforts to be creative. **The panel recommends that the OBE Committee formally address the issue of creativity and innovation in TLA so as to allay any misconceptions within OBE curriculum.**

**Linkages with External Stakeholders**

29. Feedback was obtained from several sources to improve the curriculum such as practical training, co-teaching with industrial experts and final project assessment. The Fine Arts department in UiTMM, for example, invites prominent artists to give talks and also assess the students’ final projects at the Art Gallery. Views of employers are also sought although not through regular and formalised mechanism. Similar practice was not evident in most Diploma programmes that do not require practical/industrial training.

30. Since curriculum improvement responsibilities lie with the faculties in Shah Alam, UiTMM efforts are seen as complementary. Tracer studies and SuFO were the only form of feedback from students. However, there was insufficient evidence to show that data from other stakeholders were gathered for programme improvement.
Area 3: Assessment of Students

Relationship between Assessment and Learning

31. The programme and course outcomes and the required assessments are presently determined by the respective faculties. The OBE-based curriculum has been streamlined and aligned to the programme outcomes and the MQF learning outcomes domain (OBE Module and Training). The campus implements the curriculum as provided to it by the faculties.

32. Only AM110 is currently implementing OBE in the fifth semester. They have another semester to complete one OBE cycle that will enable them to evaluate the effectiveness of OBE. The current practice in UiTMM is to measure effectiveness of every course every semester. The resource person for PAD120 has undergone training to measure achievement of MOHE LO of every course and has demonstrated the ability to compute the measurement as required by UHEK. However, there are difficulties in interpreting the effectiveness of assessment and reviewing this data for improvement. The panel recommends the current training module on OBE be reviewed to identify gaps and areas for improvement.

33. Although the panel has reservation about asking students to state their opinion on the extent of alignment between assessment and course outcomes (in SuFO), the panel did not see any use of this information in the assessment of alignment through the CDL exercise. Besides the issue of validity (whether it is a good measure) of this information, the utility (usefulness) is a further concern.

34. With respect to postgraduates, the generic and integrated rubrics developed for MBA and DBA create confusion about the levels. These rubrics should ideally be separated. Our review shows that marking guides are not kept by all lecturers in the course files, hence making the appeal process difficult (e.g. MGT 780 March 2011) There should be more evidence that the prescribed rubrics are actually used in the assessment of the student’s work. The panel recommends that the appropriate rubrics used or to be used are appended to assignments for the benefit of students, lecturers, reviewers, resource persons etc.

35. The Applied Research Project (MBA) and Dissertation (MAcc) were reviewed. The projects are supervised and assessed in a serious manner. However, the decision not to have presentation of the dissertation by MAcc students reduces the opportunity to detect work that is plagiarised. Even though dissertations are checked using publicly available software (e.g. Viper) for plagiarism, presentation offers the best opportunity to ensure and reduce plagiarism.
36. Presently, it is neither a requirement nor a common practice to have MBA Applied Research Projects checked for plagiarism. The MAcc dissertations are checked using publicly available software (e.g. Viper). The panel recommends that all Applied Research Projects (MBA) and also the dissertations (MAcc) be checked using Turnitin which is available through IPSis.

**Assessment Methods**

37. A variety of traditional assessment methods ranging from tests, projects, quizzes, assignments and presentations are used but they are strictly limited to those stated in the syllabus. Programmes in FSSR rely heavily on projects as the main or primary assessment of student achievement. However, from 3 courses sampled, 1 did not adhere to assessment as stated in the syllabus. Assessment can be subjective but it cannot be arbitrary. Hence, the need to be guided by the rubrics that have been developed for assessment. The root cause of such incidents can be attributed to the lack of communication and periodical monitoring by the faculty in Shah Alam as well as absence of clear definition of an anchor or lead campus from HEA. The panel recommends that TR (HEA) play an active role to encourage communication and rapport through the TD (HEA) at the respective faculties.

38. Despite having second examiners, miscalculation of marks was observed in some sampled examination scripts. Variations in marks were also noticed between different lecturers despite using the same answer scheme. The panel is concerned about the role of the second examiners in ensuring fair and objective assessment. In addition, the panel recommends that IQA audit beyond compliance and probe further into the process effectiveness.

39. Lecturers are aware of plagiarism among students but are not clear about actions to be taken when such acts are detected. Lecturers routinely warn students of the perils of “cut and paste” culture. UiTM should explain the meaning of section 8A of the Act 176, Educational Institutions (Discipline) Act which outlines the different forms of plagiarism. Pending the procurement of plagiarism detection software by UiTM Shah Alam, the panel recommends that UiTMM encourage lecturers to use free online software to check student work. In fact, students should also be encouraged to self check their work before submission. The assessments should be designed to focus on student’s creativity and higher order skills rather than ability to search and produce work or parts of the work from various Internet sources. The zero tolerance of plagiarism policy must be reinforced by all lecturers in class. Students caught plagiarising despite warning must be dealt with firmly.
40. The Kemahiran Insaniah (KI) programmes presently concern students in parts 1 to 3 only. The panel observed serious issues of validity, reliability and fairness in the implementation of these programmes. The students have poor knowledge of KI and how it affects their interests. The students do not view this assessment as important and hence, show little interest or enthusiasm in presenting themselves to the various assessors for informed assessment and the results obtained at the end of the semester. Many have not accessed their scores and do not seem interested to do so. This attitude will complicate matters for HEPA in managing this assessment in a serious manner. HEPA needs to review feedback from all parties involved in the assessment process including the potential employers.

41. The panel is also concerned that KI programme does not provide for appeal by students against unfair assessment by hostel or academic advisors. **The panel urges HEPA to consider ways to notify students of their KI results and incorporate appeals by students.**

**Management of Student Assessment**

42. The Practical Training Coordinator for BM220 (course: MKT661 and MKT662) handles all aspects of student placement, monitoring and assessment for more than 600 students. The assessment/monitoring process was not carried out as outlined in the syllabus. UiTMM allows lecturers to visit students only once during practical as part of frugal expenditure (instead of two as required). As a result, students are only assessed once by their academic supervisor during the duration of their placement (i.e. in the middle) and this one visit contributes to 40% of their assessment marks. **The panel is concerned about the potential for variance in the assessment of practical training. Any change should be carried out in consultation with the faculty to ensure common requirements.**

43. The practical training guidelines for MKT661 require three reports to be generated: Report A (Employer), Report B (Lecturer) and Report C (Student). There was no evidence of Report C to serve as a feedback mechanism and evaluation on the overall industrial training and the host organisation and to be reviewed by the faculty for future and current improvement. In the absence of Report C, the panel is concerned that there was no feedback from students to generate improvement. **The panel recommends that the guidelines be followed closely.**

44. In addition, there is no evidence Reports A and B were analyzed. It is unclear how the information is utilised for curriculum improvement as well as for purposes of student placement, training and workplace exposure. The employers’ reports provide a wealth of information on students’
performance including the soft skills. UiTMM should use these data to triangulate other soft skills measurement in force like the KI and discuss the discrepancies, if any. The root cause of the absence of analysis could be due to the administrative aspects of practical training and the large number of students that is handled by the Practical Training Coordinator. **The panel recommends that administrative aspects of practical training be handled by support staff.** The Practical Training Coordinator can instead focus on thinking about the placement system – quality of practical training experience, the supervision, the visits and also utilising the feedback for curriculum improvements.

**Area 7: Programme Monitoring and Review**

45. UiTMM has multiple systems for monitoring the delivery of the programmes. The T&L of academic staff are actively monitored and action taken where necessary. In addition to this, the part time staff (full-time, part-time) are subjected to special teaching observations to assess their competence to continue teaching the courses in the coming semester. **The panel commends UiTMM for conducting teaching quality assessment over and above what HEA requires.** In the assessment, senior lecturers assess teaching quality of junior lecturers at the beginning and end of semester. Interviews with lecturers reveals that they find this a more effective tool as compared to SuFO and Jawatankuasa Keberadaan as it provides the lecturers with actionable feedback for improvement.

46. An online student feedback system (SuFO) gathers data on teaching quality, classroom facilities and student preparation for classes. The data are used to identify staff who are in need of special attention to improve their class/teaching performance. **The panel however finds the instrument (SuFO) to contain items (alignment of assessment to outcomes, appropriateness of teaching methods) which impose unfairly on the students.** Such items should be assessed by Subject Matter Experts. The SuFO instrument should be subjected to review to ensure that it is valid and reliable. The SuFO data should be made more readily available to the academic managers for analysis and reporting for campus use. The present SuFO reporting may not fully serve the purposes of the campus academic managers. **The panel recommends that in any future review of the SuFO reporting system, the management needs of the academic managers be obtained and accommodated in the system.** The panel also found student feedback on classroom facilities is not provided to and used by facilities management unit. The panel also suggests that UiTMM HEA carry out focus group studies to insight into how students approach and complete this feedback. The panel’s interview with students shows that students are rather hurriedly completing the instrument because it is a precondition to obtaining the examination transcript.
47. In addition, UiTMM, like other campuses, has a committee that organises and carries out random checks on scheduled classes on 4 aspects namely: attendance, punctuality, staff and student dress code and the use of English in teaching. The reports scrutinised by the panel show that there are no problematic observations. The panel observed that UiTMM carried out this exercise mainly to meet the requirements of HEA Shah Alam. The committee and its work are viewed as signifying the lack of trust in the staff. The panel was told that beginning last semester, staff from other campuses also make surprise visits to check classes. The panel views the work of this committee as redundant in view of the substantially similar data obtained from students on staff performance (SUFO). The panel strongly recommends that UiTMM continue with its teaching observation that has been used to observe staff performance in classes with the stated purpose of helping them improve their teaching skills.

48. The OBE Committee is actively overseeing the monitoring and, to a limited extent, the review of the courses which are based on the revised curriculum. The CDL exercise forms a regular review of the achievement of the course outcomes. While the panel accepts the merit in this review, the self reported surveys are unreliable as an indirect indicator of attainment. The panel urges the committee to review with HEA the approach to reviewing attainment as reflected in the standard template provided by HEA. The panel is also concerned that the data collection, collation and analysis does not result in improvement actions. These reviews and the outcomes are, for now, seen as analysis that must be forwarded to HEA for further instruction. The panel is concerned with the lack of clarity on what changes to the OBE curriculum can be made at the campus level. The panel urges HEA to state the areas, and the degree of changes that can be made without approval from the faculties since the faculties are still the owners of the programmes and must eventually approve and make the changes as indicated by the reviews - CDL.

49. There is no formal programme review carried out by the campus programme managers. There are some reviews for specific processes – examination, enrolment, resources, MRM, IQA but an annual programme-based review is not in place. It is recommended that each programme manager carry out a self review of the programme using related data and review outcomes (JKP, SUFO, observations, visits, practical training reports, KI, examination results, timetabling, staff training etc.). This review should involve the various RPs and staff involved in coordinating the programme. Such review outcomes should be provided to the related faculty for input into faculty programme review.

The End