



INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW REPORT

UNIVERSITY OF MORATUWA

16 – 21 December 2019



Review Panel: Prof. E.R.N.Gunawardena (Chairman)

Prof. Janitha Liyanage

Prof. Athula Ranasinghe

Prof. P.Ravirajan

Prof. K.G.P.K.Weerakoon

Dr. Tess Goodliffe

Quality Assurance Council

University Grants Commission, Sri Lanka

University of Moratuwa

Institutional Review

Prof. E.R.N.Gunawardena

Prof. Janitha Liyanage

Prof. Athula Ranasinghe

Prof. P.Ravirajan

Prof. K.G.P.K.Weerakoon

Dr. Tess Goodliffe

21st December 2019

Table of Contents

Section 1. Brief introduction to the University and its review context	4
Section 2. Review Team’s view of the University’s self- evaluation (SER).....	6
Section 3. A brief description of the review process	8
Section 4. Overview of the University’s approach to quality and standards.....	9
Section 5. Commentary on the ten criteria of Institutional Review	11
Criterion 1. Governance and Management	11
Criterion 2. Curriculum Design and Development.....	12
Criterion 3 Teaching and Learning	13
Criterion 4. Learning Resources, Student Support and Progression.....	14
Criterion 5. Assessment and Awards	15
Criterion 6. Strength and Quality of Staff	16
Criterion 7. Postgraduate Studies, Research, Innovation and commercialization	17
Criterion 8. Community Engagement, Consultancy and Outreach.....	18
Criterion 9. Distance Education	19
Criterion 10. Quality Assurance	19
Section 6. Grading of overall performance.....	22
Section 7. Commendations and recommendations	23
Criterion 1: Governance and Management	23
Criterion 2: Curriculum Design and Development.....	23
Criterion 3 Teaching and Learning	24
Criterion 4: Learning Resources, Student Support and Progression.....	24
Criterion 5: Student Assessment and Awards	25
Criterion 6: Strength and Quality of Staff	26
Criterion 7: Postgraduate Studies, Research, Innovation and Commercialization.....	26
Criterion 8: Community Engagement, Consultancy and Outreach.....	27
Section 9: Distance Education.....	28
Criterion 10: Quality Assurance	28
Section 8. Summary	30
Annexure 1. Schedule for the site visit	33

Section 1. Brief introduction to the University and its review context

The history of the University of Moratuwa (UoM) dates back to 1960 with the establishment of the Institute of Practical Technology which was later elevated to the Ceylon College of Technology in 1966. The Katubedda Campus of University of Ceylon, the successor to the Ceylon College of Technology commenced functioning on 15th February 1972. It was converted to the University of Moratuwa, Sri Lanka on 1st January 1979 as one of the six universities established under the Universities Act No. 16 of 1978. Currently, UoM consists of five faculties, namely Architecture, Business, Engineering, Information Technology, and Graduate Studies. In 2018/19 academic year, the Faculty of Engineering, the oldest faculty with 12 Departments, enrolled 974 undergraduate students followed by Architecture (370), Information Technology (296) and Business (98). The University is considered as a premium higher education institution in the country for engineering education, exemplified by the fact that 98% of the top 10% of the merit list apply for enrolment at UoM. The University has taken an initiative to establish a Faculty of Medicine, possibly within year 2020.

There are 423 full-time academic staff and 803 non-academic staff serving a population of about 10,342 of undergraduate and 2,778 of postgraduate students. The annual internal undergraduate intake of about 1,500, the number at the time of last Institutional review in 2013 has not changed until 2017/2018 academic year during which a new Faculty of Business was established with an annual intake of 100 students. With the creation of the Faculty of Graduate Studies in 2016, the postgraduate research administration and research-related activities have been streamlined for greater effectiveness, as shown by the outputs of postgraduates which increased from 22 in 2015 to 72 in 2019.

The university has also established several new units (i.e. Internal Quality Assurance Unit, Career Guidance Unit, Research Units for Faculties of Architecture, Business, Information Technology, Engineering, Media Unit) and Centres (i.e. Centre for Information Technology Services (CITeS), Centre for Open and Distance Learning (CODL), Staff Development Centre (SDC), Centre for Instructional Technologies, Centre for Enterprise). These units and centres effectively serve the staff and students, and extend their services to the society through outreach activities. In addition, new collaborations are being established with local and international partners. A significant amount of infrastructure has been added during the past five years, with a total infrastructure expenditure of over Rs. 4.8 billion during the last two years. An MIS is also currently under development, encompassing all teaching, learning and assessment, research, and administrative activities of the university. Having earned internationally recognised accreditation status from a number of international accreditation bodies, UoM degree programs are considered qualitatively equivalent to those offered by the world's best universities.

The UoM has undergone two previous Institutional Reviews: the first in 2006 and the second in 2013, according to the guidelines of QA handbook prepared by the CVCD and UGC in 2002. In both these reviews, a judgment of "Confidence" was given to the UoM. The UoM has made a clear commitment to address the eight recommendations made at the last IR in 2013. With the

establishment of the FGS, procedures related to postgraduate degrees have been centralised and formalized across the university and the impact could be seen with the output of large number of postgraduates and research publications. Deficiencies of human resources have been addressed and student support services have been improved. Student databases including the recording of the progress of postgraduates are in place. Only the provision of accommodation facilities to meet the increasing intake of student is lagging behind though a few hostels have been added during last 6 years. The limitation of land is a serious constraint to address this issue and the university is exploring various innovative approaches to solve this problem.

Section 2. Review Team's view of the University's self- evaluation (SER)

The review team learned that the Vice Chancellor has taken the initiative and led the process of preparing the SER. He has appointed a steering committee consisting of academic and non-academic members of the staff after an initial training session. Ten groups were formed to gather information related to the ten criteria. Ten leaders with the responsibility to complete tables under each criterion were assigned and the members of the group have helped the leader to gather information. This information was gathered from reports, handbooks, statistical data and from different stakeholders such as students and staff members. Several meetings were held to ensure that the information is properly accessed and documented. Finally, the information was collated, and the report was prepared by the members of the steering committee.

The SER follows the format given in the "Manual for Institutional Review of Sri Lankan Universities and Higher Education Institutions" (IR Manual). Section 1 (Introduction to the University) described the vision, mission and goals, brief history of the University, major milestones in development, performance of the UoM, organizational structure, SWOT analysis followed by an important section on major changes since last review. The SWOT analysis was comprehensive and clearly identified the strengths and weaknesses. It is to be noted that the weaknesses identified were mostly beyond UoM's control. A brief outline of the process followed to prepare the SER is given as the last part of Section 1.

Adherence to the criteria, standards, list of evidence, a description on the level of achievement with respect to 145 standards listed under 10 quality assurance review criteria prescribed in the IR, along with a list of documentary evidence to support the claims is given in Section 2. The Conclusions/Current Action list is given as the last subheading of Section 2.

Though the UoM has followed the guidelines in the QA manual, the Review Team found some difficulties in using the document during the review process. The UoM has allocated a substantial portion to provide evidence in the tabular form in Section 2 compared to the total length of the SER. For example, out of 117 pages of text, Introduction and Conclusion sections contain only 13 pages, leaving 104 pages of tables with evidence. As a result, the UoM was not able to provide an in-depth analysis as quoted under section 5/2 of the QA manual (Page 92) on Scope, Accuracy and Focus of the SER as below:

"The SER should describe and analyse in depth with supporting evidence and comments the effectiveness of ways in which the University/HEI discharges its responsibilities for maintaining academic standards, quality, ethical behaviour, and adherence to good practices".

The SER writing team of the UoM reported that they were unable to do so since there was a restriction on the number of words (i.e. between 10,000 to 12,000) which includes the evidence in the tabular form.

The UoM has stated its vision “to be the most globally recognised knowledge enterprise in South Asia”. The review team noted that the vision of the UoM in 2013 has changed from “to be the most globally recognised knowledge enterprise in Asia to “to be the most globally recognised knowledge enterprise in South Asia”. This change could possibly be an outcome of the comments made at the last review. While the review team in 2013 understood and agreed with the UoM’s desire to be “international” in terms of the quality of services it renders, it recommended to aim at a target which is achievable. As at present, the UoM ranks at 88 at the South Asian level and therefore, should strive to ascend in the order. The review team would like to commend the UoM by being pragmatic and realistic in formulating its vision.

There are 8 goals as listed below to achieve the stated mission of the UoM to be the leading knowledge enterprise for technological and related disciplines in South Asia. The review team is of the view that the Strategic Management Plan developed for 2017-2021 of UoM is in line with the stated goals. A substantial improvement has been made to achieve the 8 goals when compared to the status during the last review in 2013.

- Goal 1:** Achieve international recognition as a centre of excellence in higher learning.
- Goal 2:** Achieve excellence in research, innovation and enterprise with national & international relevance with global recognition.
- Goal 3:** Be a premier university in providing education responsive to the national needs and expectations of the industry and society with global orientation.
- Goal 4:** Enhance the intellectual and physical environment at the University to achieve excellence in all its activities.
- Goal 5:** Create a community of well accomplished, skilled and contented staff and students to meet the conditions of a vibrant university.
- Goal 6:** Become a leading expert service provider of advanced technology and consultancy services.
- Goal 7:** Be an advisor to the government in policy formulation and national development in all relevant disciplines and higher/professional education in Sri Lanka.
- Goal 8:** Quality assurance and efficient corporate governance to be in the culture of the University.

A few risks identified in the SWOT analysis also came to light during the review process which need to be taken in to account in the planning process. Keeping relevance, finding ways to increase student numbers, retaining staff, length of time taken to introduce new courses/degree programmes and competitors are some of them.

Section 3. A brief description of the review process

The review process commenced with the pre-review workshop for institutional reviewers held at the UGC on 5th July 2019 by the Director/QAC. The self-evaluation report of the UoM was given to the review team and the members were requested to send their desk evaluation marks to the Director/QAC before 2nd August 2019.

The review team again met the Director/QAC at the UGC on 2nd August 2019 to discuss the findings of the desk review and prepare and agree on the tentative agenda for the site visit including the assigned tasks for individual members.

The review team consisting of 6 members, 5 from local universities and one from Oman, as given below, visited the University and conducted the review from 16th to 21st December 2019. The list of members and their affiliations are given below. Prof. E.R.N. Gunawardena served as the review chair.

Prof. E.R.N. Gunawardena	(Senior Professor, University of Peradeniya)
Prof. Janitha Liyanage	(Senior Professor, University of Kelaniya)
Prof. Athula Ranasinghe	(Senior Professor, University of Colombo)
Prof. P. Ravirajan	(Senior Professor, University of Jaffna)
Prof. K.G.P.K. Weerakoon	(Professor, University of Sri Jayewardenepura)
Dr. Tess Goodliffe	(Former Deputy CEO, Oman Academic Accreditation Authority)

The Review Team was satisfied with the agenda, which is given in the annex, and facilities provided by the University. The evidence was assembled by UoM in one room, which was also assigned to the IR team during the week. Additional information was provided by the University on request.

The Review Team felt that the Vice Chancellor has given the leadership from the inception to the SER steering committee in drafting the report. The Director/IQAU and the Assistant Registrar assigned to the IQAU were available to the review team during the entire week and ensured that the review process went smoothly according to the agenda. The logistics provided to the team by the University authorities were excellent.

Section 4. Overview of the University's approach to quality and standards

There is a clear commitment to developing and implementing a quality culture at UoM as indicated in the Strategic Plan 2017-2021. 'Quality' is the first core value of the University through which it strives 'to achieve the highest quality in all its endeavours'. This is exemplified in the first goal and objective of the Strategic Plan which aims to 'ensure the quality of all undergraduate, postgraduate and external degree programmes satisfy national and international quality assurance benchmarks by 2017'. The large number of programmes which have been accredited by reputable bodies is a testament to UoM's intent to ensure that international quality standards are upheld.

The IQAU at UoM was established in line with UGC circular 4/2015 and its responsibilities are in line with those set out by UGC. These include coordinating of all quality assurance (QA) related activities in the university; implementing reviews and audits; following up on actions; monitoring and providing guidance of Faculty QA activities; facilitating and identifying good practice in academic departments; preparing QA-related guidelines and manuals for use within the institution; and conducting staff awareness training with SDC. The UoM QA Unit is located in the new administration building and was opened in November 2017; the first director was appointed in January 2018. The IQAU Committee meets monthly and extracts of meeting minutes are sent to the Senate and the Council and IQAU is a permanent agenda item in Senate meetings. The QA Policy Framework was originally developed in 2015 in line with the 2010-2015 Strategic Plan and it was presented to the Senate for approval in January and February 2017. However, it is yet to be formally approved. While the Senate has approved the policy framework in principle, there has been a request to provide two separate documents; one with policy and the other with procedures (which could eventually form the basis of a Quality Assurance Manual). Since the initial development of the policy framework, UoM has developed and implemented its Strategic Plan 2017-2021 and therefore there may be an opportunity to review the QA Policy Framework before the final approval to ensure that it is in line with the institution's current strategic objectives. There are no specific bylaws for QA at UoM.

Quality assurance documentation is made available to staff through the Document Management System (DMS). A website for the IQAU is due to be launched in January/February 2020. In the meantime, each Faculty gives information on its quality assurance cell (FQAC) and provides links to electronic versions of all key QA documents. FQACs are chaired by the Director of QA in each Faculty (apart from FGS) and include members representing each department in the respective Faculty. FQACs meet monthly and are responsible for reviewing the QA activities of the departments and the monitoring mechanisms in place. Outcomes of meetings are reported to the Faculty Boards and the IQAU. These mechanisms include course scheduling; student feedback surveys and peer review; exam paper moderation, preparation of model solutions and submission of marks, internal reviews, periodic reviews; and external reviews. As well as surveys, students have an opportunity to provide feedback through Student-Staff Liaison Committees where they are represented through batch representatives.

While student feedback is sought from UG and taught PG Master's programmes, there is no mechanism yet in place to monitor the satisfaction of research students. UoM also needs to consider seeking student satisfaction with the provision of all its services outside the classroom such as library, career guidance and counselling services.

Peer review observations are expected to take place every semester and consider the instructional methods, delivery; sequence of delivery; instructional media; content; personal qualities; and the teacher's relationship with students. However, the inconsistency in the implementation of peer review needs to be monitored and the appropriateness of the format for non-lecture-based teaching approaches (such as those used in Design-based programmes) needs to be considered. The management of the examination results process is overseen by IQAU and implemented by QA coordinators at department level and QAC Directors at Faculty level. All QA-related activities are reported by the department QA coordinators and Faculty QAC Directors monthly and these are reported through Faculty Boards, the IQAU and Senate. Faculty QA reports cover the external review of UG study programmes, moderation, model solutions, peer review, and student feedback. Faculty are also required to report on staff workload which includes student contact hours, student credits and other activities.

Each academic programme is expected to be reviewed by an external examiner during a visit every four years. The process is monitored by the relevant FQAC and the Director of Quality Assurance and external reviewer reports are submitted to faculty and senate. As noted elsewhere in the report, UoM is encouraged to ensure that all programmes are regularly reviewed by an external reviewer and that action plans are developed in response to findings and submitted to FQACs for consideration.

SDC has carried out workshops on QA for administrative staff and many academic staff have attended UGC workshops on QA. One of the areas of responsibility of the IQAU is to support the sharing of good practice and UoM is encouraged to develop mechanisms to facilitate this. It is clear that UoM has taken significant strides in developing its QA culture and now needs to fully embed its systems and support consistency of implementation in all areas of the University.

Section 5. Commentary on the ten criteria of Institutional Review

Criterion 1. Governance and Management

The governing structure of UoM comprises the Council, the Senate, and 5 Faculty Boards established in compliance with the Universities Act No 16 of 1978 and its subsequent amendments. There is a clear division of responsibility vested with the Vice Chancellor, Deputy Vice Chancellor, Librarian, Registrar and the Bursar as shown in the organizational chart, especially with regards to Centres and Units. The UoM revises its corporate plans at 5-year intervals. The last one prepared for the period from 2017 to 2021, along with the annual action plan for 2019, was made available to the review team. Annual action plans for 2019 with specific timelines, funds required for their implementation with clear responsibilities assigned to respective officers are available. The UoM has identified 78 Key Performance Indicators under 8 goals with projections up to 2021 in the Corporate Plan. However, there is no clear mechanism available to monitor these indicators, as expressed by the members of the Council.

As in any other University, the UoM also has all its institutional arrangements and structures to enable it to fulfil its mission, goals, and objectives such as the Council, Senate, Faculty Boards and many other standing committees, amounting to more than 20 (i.e. Finance Committee, Procurement Committee, Audit Committee etc.). These committees ensure that there is wider consultation whilst delegating power to many individuals. In addition, there are various *ad hoc* committees which meet regularly, to ensure that the university is administered without major issues. The meeting of the Vice Chancellor with administrative staff at two-month intervals, progress monitoring (*pasuviparama*) at monthly intervals, are some of the examples.

According to the report released in 2017 by the Auditor General, the UoM was given a qualified audit opinion. It is to be noted that the UoM was awarded 1st runner up of the best annual report and the award for public sector 2017-University Category- by the Association of Public Finance Accountants of Sri Lanka. Not providing the committed funds by the treasury, lengthy bureaucratic procedure for procurements, and training of young staff in the audit division, especially in areas such as risk auditing, are some of the observations made by the review team.

Poor maintenance of buildings and infrastructure were reported by several student groups. Discussion with those responsible for the management of buildings and infrastructure reported that this was due to a combination of several reasons. One was the inadequate funds in the recurrent budget. The difficulty in selecting a responsible contractor (when outsourcing is done) is a major issue. It is recommended that when outsourcing is done, the specification for bids in Maintenance Contracts be reviewed to enable only those with proven track records to be entitled.

The University has policies that are enforced on academic honesty and integrity, conflict of interest and ethics. However, the Review Team could not locate the evidence that it has been

communicated explicitly to all sections of the academic community. However, the Review Team did observe the preparation of Internal Circulars prepared at some institutes based on the UGC circular. It is recommended that this be formalized for all faculties and institutes.

The University has an explicit policy and a framework on internationalization that includes international student recruitment, staff/student exchange, alliances with off-shore University/HEIs, student support services and cross-border delivery. The university had an intention to increase the number of foreign students to 400 at the last review in 2013. However, this could not be achieved primarily because the UoM adopts a very high entry qualification.

The University has a policy which promotes and rewards innovations in research and community engagement and allocates resources accordingly. The university has been practicing an award system for outstanding research for several years.

The university has developed comprehensive policies regarding Gender Equity and Equality (GEE) and Sexual and Gender Based Violence (SGBV). The University has also put into practice a comprehensive policy and has strategies to curb ragging under the UoM By-Law no 14 of Board of Residence and Discipline. There is evidence that the UoM has taken action to maintain discipline using the above by-laws.

Criterion 2. Curriculum Design and Development

The UoM has established necessary mechanisms to maintain conformity of academic programmes in course design and development and regular monitoring and reviewing. The university has appointed a Curriculum Revision Committee in its early days and later, a Faculty Academic Committee in each faculty. Some faculties have developed flowcharts for curriculum development and the approval process. All faculties keep minutes and records of the relevant meetings. Most faculties conduct market surveys and get external review reports with recommendations. Some faculties have Curriculum Development documents with program evaluation policies and procedures. Further the details of codes of practice, employment market signals, and external expertise (industry, employers, etc.) comments for undergraduate taught courses are available. Only some faculties have adopted the credit accumulation and transfer policy. Student handbooks of the (Faculty/Department) show the graduate profiles, program specification including ILOs, course content, teaching and learning methods, recommended reading and assessment methods. However, the four-year degree programmes of all faculties exceed the total credit value of 120 as specified by the SLQF. Alignment of program curriculum with the graduate profile of the area of specialization is implemented. Some faculties consider the requirements to become members of the professional bodies (e.g., IESL) and they are included in the curriculum. All lectures are scheduled and given to students online at the beginning. The University offers both NGPA and GPA courses in the area of professional development, inter-disciplinary and multidisciplinary programme curricula. The University has transformed the majority of its academic programmes to outcome based.

Criterion 3 Teaching and Learning

Student-centred learning, or learner-centred education, is a globally accepted method used in higher education as part of outcome-based education. For this method to be embedded in the learning culture, an education institute should adapt multiple teaching methods to ensure the right knowledge, skills and attitude are passed to the students. Faculty level and programme level planned modules are significant in this context and the academic staff and students should have proper awareness, responsibility and understanding. The university needs to ensure that this teaching or learning process is supported by all stakeholders connected to the process. In these aspects, the teaching or learning strategies of UoM are at a higher level within the university system.

The UoM has five faculties that accommodate nearly 13,000 undergraduate and postgraduate students. All the study programmes have student course handbooks with formal approval of faculty board and the senate. All faculties have updated their own course units to include Intended Learning Outcomes and have introduced teaching methods to reflect student centred outcome-based teaching/learning strategies. The university ensures continuous enhancement of the quality of education by having external reviews and external accreditation. Most of the degree programs in the Faculty of Engineering and Faculty of Architecture have been accredited by the local and international professional bodies and, therefore, their ILOs have been developed in accordance with the competencies expected by those professional bodies. As part of the accreditation process, evaluation by external examiners has been made compulsory. According to external examiner comments, the university continuously updates its curriculum as well as examination methods. Therefore, some of the degree programmes of the Faculty of Architecture and some of the degree programmes in the Faculty of Engineering have revised curricula and assessment criteria on a regular basis.

The university has approved policy and mechanisms on curriculum design such as sample exam papers, external assessors' and moderators' reports. In addition, the university obtains student feedback and conducts peer evaluation using standard formats every semester. Accordingly, regular peer and student review of teaching are carried out in many faculties. However, evidence of formal analysis of the reviews, follow-up actions and provision of feedback to the teacher for self-improvement was not available in most of the faculties.

All faculties use ICT-based teaching and learning facilities and a well-established learning management system (MOODLE). Except for delivering teaching and learning materials and submission of assignments, MOODLE is used for interactive sessions such as group discussions quizzes, question answer sessions and feedback sessions. All the faculties, except the faculty of business, are well-equipped with the required computer labs facilities and relevant software.

Group projects that involve field visits and group work are a common interactive study method used in every faculty. Many field visits are planned by all the faculties. When creating a group, they follow a mix-up method considering performance, gender, race etc. Hence students have the opportunity to form formal peer groups.

Assessment methods are a major part of the curricula and the university ensures that all study programmes have integrated, continuous and innovative assessment methods as teaching and learning strategies. They follow summative assessments (individual and group presentations, viva, etc) and formative assessments (open book and objective tests, quizzes, exit notes after classroom sessions, one-minute summaries, etc). The assessments are used to test student understanding of the materials and the degree of students' interest in classroom sessions as well as to innovate teaching and learning practices. Some of the programmes have aligned their assessment methods with ILOs.

All the faculties have the practice of maintaining records of the delivery of lectures/ tutorials/ practical and the workload of academic staff using student attendance record sheets/ attendance summary sheets of lectures/ tutorials/ labs/ studios etc.

Well-qualified academic staff is a strength of the university and staff development plays an important role in the strengthening of the academic staff. Academic staff has more opportunities to develop their teaching skills, student/learner centred teaching and outcome-based education concepts and methodologies. All the staff members follow diploma courses in teaching for higher education conducted by the staff development centres of the University of Colombo or UoM. The university monitors staff performance using appraisal documents and records on active learning (i.e. utilization of language and computer laboratories and library etc.).

Academic staff at UoM conducts a large amount of research activities in collaboration with the industry and participation of the students. Most of the research activities are done as part of students' semester projects and opportunities are given to the students to engage with industry and acquire industrial experience. The research outcomes are presented in journal papers with student collaborations. The annual research award ceremony is a good practice conducted in appreciation of staff research.

Criterion 4. Learning Resources, Student Support and Progression

The UoM provides and maintains infrastructure facilities for teaching/learning activities for its large student population at a satisfactory level. However, the newly established Faculty of Business has serious limitations for lecture rooms.

The University website provides all the necessary information regarding faculties, departments, degree programmes, curricula, student support services, student activities, etc. A website feedback system is used to improve the information services via the university web. An information pack containing information on bursaries and hostel accommodation is sent to new students along with notices and instructions for registration. Information on obtaining the degree certificate, academic transcript, and results sheets are given in the website. Supplication information is also provided, and students supplicate through MIS through a process that is self-explanatory.

Faculties and departments update their student information pack annually. The Welfare Division of the university provides up-to-date information on financial aid. Academic calendars are updated in the website. General information on examinations are given in a handbook, and particular details of examinations are updated as relevant in MOODLE.

The university has been using MOODLE for a long time. The system itself is built up with many tools for collaborative working and online interaction. Most items in LMS (Learning Management System) and MOODLE are provided in a self-explanatory manner, and the user manual provides further guidance.

The library of the university primarily uses its website to facilitate student access, download, and contain the most appropriate information for their academic work by compiling lists of resources and presenting them in a useful manner with links. This comprises a Library Management System that students can use to search through shelves and digital resources.

All faculties organize orientation programmes for new entrants and take measures to integrate them with the student community. Mentoring/counselling sessions are organized and conducted during orientation periods by many faculties, though no designed, long-term mentor/mentee programmes are available.

Students are made aware through the orientation programme of the resources and services available for them. Most clubs and societies use social media platforms to disseminate information and to attract members. In fact, the Career Guidance Unit also uses social media to reach the students.

The quality and maintenance of student hostels are at an acceptable level, but facilities are limited. However, the University has attempted to publish information on the web about private hostel facilities for students and it is good landmark activity for the entire university system.

The University provides reasonable health facilities through the medical centre. The students were able to perform well in inter-university sports competitions despite the limited facilities available to them.

An annual tracer study is conducted during the convocation of graduates and the data is available on career progression of graduates, but analysis of above data is needed for remedial actions. A student satisfaction survey is conducted along with the employability survey. Student satisfaction is included also in the survey conducted at completion of degree by faculty undergraduate studies division, and it shows high satisfaction in all programmes.

Criterion 5. Assessment and Awards

All 15 standards under Assessment and Awards can be broadly classified into 6 groups; as procedures (1, 4, 10 and 15), alignment of assessments to ILOs (5, 6 and 7), transparency (3, 11, 12 and 14), updating of procedures (2), composition of assessment (8) and efficiency (9, 13).

Some of the strong attributes of the assessment criteria are recorded under commendations and attributes which require further improvements are listed under recommendations in the review report.

In general, the observations of the review team have identified several good practices in assessments and awards such as the use of both summative and formative assessments. This was particularly found with workshop related assignments where the students carry out a task under the supervision of a staff member. Students can learn by doing the work under the guidance of the supervisor. This can be classified as a mixed approach with attributes of formative methods as well as summative methods. At the same time, at least occasionally, opportunities for peer feedback on group assignments were also recorded in the SER. The UoM also has an appeal procedure for its undergraduates whenever students are dissatisfied with the results.

However, absence of a proper second marking system and proper alignment of ILOs with assessment (at least for some course units) are identified as aspects for improvement. At the same time, the credit transfer facility from other (local and international) higher education institutes was not in practice although it is in UoM by-laws.

In the current practice, it is the moderators' responsibility to check the ILOs against questions and then to moderate the marks. Due to large numbers in classes, it may be practically difficult to practice second marking of all scripts. However, at least a sample of second marking is recommended.

Criterion 6. Strength and Quality of Staff

The University has a comprehensive human resource policy on recruitment, performance appraisal and career development. The University maintains the details of approved and available cadre, and it is kept updated with data on filled and vacant cadre positions. In general, it has the qualified and competent staff needed for effective high-quality programmes and student services. It is worth noting that about 70 % of staff from the Faculty of Engineering is highly qualified, with MPhil/PhD qualification earned mostly from abroad. However, about 60% of academic cadre positions at the Faculty of Information Technology remain to be filled while 60% of non-academic cadre positions must be filled in the Faculty of Business. Students/Teacher ratio is higher (15:1) than recommended by the UGC (10:1) in all faculties. In the Faculty of Information Technology, it is too high (37:1).

Although the Staff Development Centre has conducted a few Continuous Professional Development (CPD) programmes, especially on outcome-based education and student-centred learning, it has not conducted Induction programmes (150 hrs) to new recruits for the last few years. Although SDC allocates funds up to LKR 30,000/- per staff member for attending CPD programmes, it has not been effectively utilised by the staff. There is no evidence found on conducting regular Management Committee (MC) and Programme Committee on Staff Training (PCST) meetings as per UGC circular 937. The SDC should be adequately resourced to conduct

induction programmes for new staff and CPD programmes for all categories of staff. The SDC also needs to carry out need analysis periodically.

In general, the University ensures that the allocation of workload to staff is transparent and fair as observed by the timetables and workload prepared by the department for each semester. The university developed a proper definition of work norms and way of calculating workload of academics. The contribution of the academic staff to the teaching, research, administration and outreach activities is evaluated against their agreed work norms through annual self-appraisal reports.

Rewards are given to outstanding performance in teaching and research. Peer evaluation of staff should regularly be practiced in all departments and a monitoring mechanism should be adopted to assess the progress and to take remedial action. The University is encouraged to develop and implement mechanism to monitor staff satisfaction and develop action plans to respond to the findings. Although evidence of obtaining staff feedback on course offerings and peer evaluation of the academic staff are available in most of the departments, regular peer observation records or regular feedback forms were not available in a few faculties / departments. Further, it is also not clear who handles and addresses the issues on under-performance/ poor performance, if revealed through peer evaluations and whether the remedial actions are taken.

Criterion 7. Postgraduate Studies, Research, Innovation and commercialization

The university offers many postgraduate courses and research degrees in various disciplines leading to Master of Science, Master of Engineering, Master of Business Administration, Master of Philosophy and Doctor of Philosophy through its Architecture, Business, Engineering, and IT faculties. Each faculty has a postgraduate director. In January 2015, the university established the Faculty of Graduate Studies with the goal of enhancing the postgraduate and research degree programmes. The faculty has clear procedures for selection, admission and enrolment. The annual enrolment to the research programmes has doubled over the past 4 years to reach 120 in 2019. The faculty conducts a joint PhD programme with foreign universities to strengthen their PhD programme and provide opportunities for international exposure to the research students. The university supports eight Multidisciplinary Research Centres (MRCs). These facilitate synergistic collaboration among different faculties and departments, as well as with other local and foreign universities and industry.

The University recognizes postgraduate training, research innovation, scholarship, and commercialization as core functions as reflected in the Strategic Plan and organizational structure. The University has established By-laws and Regulations, subject-specific guidelines for postgraduate degrees which are readily available to students, staff, and examiners in the form of a handbook. The candidate must satisfy the minimum number of publication requirements to be considered for MPhil/PhD qualifications. These must be met at the time of the initial submission of the thesis. The published/accepted articles must be in journals and conference proceedings which should be listed in one of the following indices: Thompson

Reuters Web of Science Core Collection (SCI Expanded, Social Science Index, Arts and Humanities Index, Emerging sources citation index) or Scopus. Therefore, the University has in place effective arrangements to maintain academic standards and enhance the quality of most of the postgraduate taught and research programmes. However, the one-year MSc research programme should be aligned with the SLQF. The University promotes a research culture and research excellence through offering incentives and rewards to those who excel in research and innovations and dissemination. The University ensures an appropriate policy for postgraduate supervision with guidelines for supervisors and students. It appoints supervisors with appropriate skills and subject knowledge, and enough time to support and encourage research students and to monitor their progress effectively. The University has in place transparent mechanisms to monitor and review progress of postgraduate programmes periodically. It ensures that postgraduate students adhere to ethical guidelines, intellectual property rights and authorship criteria.

The University considers avoiding plagiarism as one of the major requirements of the degree programme. The Library provides facilities for checking the similarity of candidate's thesis to other sources. The current tool used for this is TurnItIn. The University must develop complaints and appeals procedures appropriate to all categories of postgraduate research students.

The University has established a significant number of collaborations/partnerships with local, national, regional and international organizations to share knowledge, expertise, human resources, services and research. It is also closely interacting with several industries and wider society providing new avenues for applied research (such as research incubators). The University has policies, institutional arrangements and procedures for research/ innovation and commercialization. The university attracted a significant amount of financial assistance from industries for research due to close association of the academic staff.

Criterion 8. Community Engagement, Consultancy and Outreach

The UoM is doing very well on the activities related to Community Engagement, Consultancy and Outreach activities. It has a clear well-established Policy on Accepting and carrying out Consultancy Work and Ancillary Services and promotes consultancy services for external agencies. It maintains a good relationship with the external agencies. The staff are engaged in national level consultancy services and those services build the image of the university to a higher level. Those activities are reflected in monthly council memos and it encourages the staff to engage in more similar activities. The university collaborates with external partners and has signed many MoUs. The relationships developed are included in the curriculum as community services. The university provides facilities (e.g., vehicles for transport, publicity through newsletters) for community services and outreach programs. The Review Team is happy to see that each student gets an industrial training for 24 weeks which counts for 6 credits though it is non-GPA. Though qualifications of the internal staff are provided and seemed adequate, the external staff involved in those activities were not recorded. In the staff

recruitment policy emphasis is given to professionals having industry collaborations. Many staff members are holding key positions in relevant professional bodies which is a very good indication of their professional engagements.

Criterion 9. Distance Education

The criterion on distance education has standards which can be grouped into 8 broader sub-groups as institutional arrangements (1, 2 and 11), admission criteria (3), facilities (5, 6 and 7), SLQF (8), number of students (4), non-discrimination (9), copy rights of learning materials (10), and quality standards of external collaborators (12, 13). Currently, opportunities for distance learning at undergraduate level are available only through the BIT program offered by the Faculty of Information Technology.

As far as the UGC standards are concerned, the BIT program has met all the standards of establishing of CODL. The quality assurance mechanism of the BIT program is also found to be solid. The UoM has a system of visiting the partner institutes with a comprehensive check list and strict rules on maintaining quality standards of facilities in partner institutions which is commendable.

The criteria for admission to the BIT program is highly commendable. Students with AL qualifications as well as those with other qualifications such as Diplomas and Higher Diplomas in relevant fields are recruited. All the learning materials are provided through a separate MOODLE to BIT students.

The aspects that need further improvement are that the UOM has designed the internal and external degree programs so that the external graduates can easily be differentiated from the internal graduates. This is against the parity criterion. Further, it was also noticed that the digital library facilities are not available for BIT students.

Criterion 10. Quality Assurance

As noted above, quality underpins the strategic direction of the University, as indicated in the Strategic Plan 2017-2021 in which UoM aims 'to achieve the highest quality in all its endeavours'. The UoM Quality Office has been in place since 2013; the responsibilities of the IQAU, established in 2017, align with those set out by the UGC. The IQAU is chaired by the DVC and members include the institutional Director QA, Deans of Faculties, Registrar, Bursar, Librarians and Directors of Faculty Quality Assurance Cells (FQACs), the Director of SDC and the Chairperson of Centre for Open and Distance Learning (CODL). The IQAU meets on a monthly basis and its meeting minutes are submitted to the Senate and then forwarded to the Council. Faculty Quality Assurance Cells (FQACs) are also required to meet on a monthly basis. A review of the IQAU and FQAC meeting minutes indicated an issue with attendance: UoM needs to ensure that members regularly attend these meetings as there are a considerable number of absentees. In terms of effectiveness, a significant number of matters arising is not reported or followed up on and the reasons for this needs to be explored and issues addressed.

While the IQAU website is still under construction, the Faculties include QA information and documentation on their web pages. As noted earlier, the draft QA Policy Framework, developed in 2015, is still awaiting Senate approval. This framework includes templates for key programme documentation as well as for the review of academic programmes (periodic performance reviews every three years and a compliance review on an annual basis) and annual review of administrative functions. This framework indicates that quality assurance processes involve all sections of the University and are integrated into the normal planning and administrative processes.

FQAC meetings are held on a monthly basis with representation from HoDs; these cells report to Faculty Boards which has wide representation, including students. IQAU meetings are held on a monthly basis and report to the Senate. While the structures and systems are in place, there needs to be monitoring of implementation regarding attendance and following up on matters arising such as through clear action planning and identifying areas for responsibility in order to support accountability. There is also inconsistency in the degree of coverage in each meeting; perhaps a list of standing agenda items can be developed for all FQACs.

As well as the establishment of committees and quality reporting structures, there are also regular internal audits and findings of these are communicated to the Director of the IQAU. There are monthly quality faculty reports which cover key pillars of quality such as moderation, peer observation and student feedback. A workshop on the role of quality assurance was delivered by the Staff Development Centre to non-academic staff in October 2018. Student feedback is sought on teaching and materials and the review team heard examples of positive changes that have been made in response to this. However, UoM is encouraged to analyse the qualitative statements made by students in their feedback and develop and implement a mechanism to respond to feedback and provide information to students on changes that have been made in response to their feedback (which may also encourage greater participation). The Review Team was informed that some faculties have introduced mid-semester feedback to respond to student views in a timely fashion which may be worth considering as a positive practice throughout the University. Quantitative student feedback results show little variation on the Likert-scale (ratings are mostly 5 or 4) on a five-point scale; UoM is therefore encouraged to consider other mechanisms to monitor student satisfaction, such as focus groups. Student-staff liaison meetings are also useful forum for discussion. Views on student satisfaction should also be sought in areas such as library and other student support services in order to support quality improvement.

Peer observation has been introduced to support the quality assurance of teaching although its implementation varies from faculty to faculty. Peer reviews are expected to take place on a semester basis and the schedule is prepared by the QA coordinator. Faculty are usually observed by the review moderator and outcomes of the observation are shared with the HoD who will discuss any improvements required with the lecturer. Peer observation rating system has been introduced which needs to be monitored for effectiveness. One of the remits of the IQAU is to provide a forum for the sharing of good practice; this role needs to be highlighted and opportunities to share good QA practice need to be identified and communicated. The

IQAU and FQACs are meeting on a regular basis and seem to be operating in line with UGC guidelines but there are issues with attendance and following up on agreed actions, as noted above. UoM is also encouraged to consider developing and implementing mechanisms to monitor academic and non-academic staff satisfaction, such as through a staff satisfaction survey.

Programmes are regularly reviewed, and performance targets are identified through KPIs. Quality assurance of programmes is also supported through faculties seeking external accreditation of their programmes, such as the accreditation of Engineering programmes in line with the Washington Accord and accreditation from the Royal Institute of British Architects for the UoM Architecture programme. External reviewers are used to monitor programme quality. While there is evidence of responses to findings of external reviewers in some Faculties, this needs to be more systematically and consistently implemented. For example, in one faculty, the content of external review reports from 2015-2018 was practically cut and pasted from one year to the next; Faculties need to assure that these reports are useful and fit for purpose.

The majority of recommendations from the 2013 external quality assurance report have been addressed: however, there are still issues with recruitment of academic cadre and the MIS is still in development. Overall, UoM has taken clear steps to integrate quality assurance in all its activities and support the establishment of a quality culture throughout the institution.

Section 6. Grading of overall performance

The review team’s assessment of the level of accomplishment of quality expected of the University of Moratuwa, based on the grading of performance with respect to the prescribed standards of the 10 review criteria as specified by the “Manual for Institutional Review of Sri Lankan Universities and Higher Education Institutions”, is given in Table 6.1 below.

Table 6.1. Grading of Overall Performance of Quality by the University of Moratuwa

No	Criterion	Weighted minimum score*	Actual criterion-wise score**
1	Governance and Management	90	143
2	Curriculum Design and Development	60	101
3	Teaching and Learning	50	83
4	Learning Resources, Student Support and Progression	40	70
5	Student Assessment and Awards	50	80
6	Strength and Quality of Staff	50	76
7	Postgraduate studies, Research, Innovation and Commercialization	50	87
8	Community Engagement, Consultancy and Outreach	30	60
9	Distance Education	20	30
10	Quality Assurance	60	86
Total score (out of 1000)			816
Total score (out of 100)			81.6
Grade			A
Performance Descriptor			Very Good
Interpretation of Descriptor			
<i>“High level of accomplishment of quality expected of an academic institution; should move towards excellence”</i>			

* Represents 50% of the maximum achievable standardized criterion-wise score.

** All Criteria received more than the weighted minimum score.

Based on the above evaluation made, the review team recommends that the University of Moratuwa is awarded the grade of ‘A’, with the performance descriptor of “Very Good” which is interpreted as “High level of accomplishment of quality expected of an academic institution; should move towards excellence”.

Section 7. Commendations and recommendations

Criterion 1: Governance and Management

Commendations:

- The University fully complies with the governance and management systems as per the University Act, Establishment Code and relevant circulars etc.
- The Strategic Plan was developed through an inclusive process and regularly updated annual action plans are available.
- The progress of action plans is monitored through KPIs.
- The financial procedure complies with government and university regulations.
- The policies and procedures for seeking and receiving funds from external sources are available.
- The progress made in using DMS is commendable.
- Policies and procedures to ensure academic honesty, integrity and ethics are in place.
- The University has well defined work norms which are monitored regularly.
- The policies and procedures to promote Gender Equality and Equity and prevent Sexual and Gender Based Violence and ragging are available.

Recommendations:

- The faculty annual action plans aligning with University plans need to be developed and followed.
- The progress of the action plans needs to be communicated to the Council in an acceptable format so that the governing body could be appraised.
- Inconsistency of some of the programmes with the SLQF needs to be resolved with the UGC.
- Use of ICT in teaching and learning needs to be further improved across all the faculties.
- The MIS needs to be further improved to cover all the units and administration.
- The University should strive to upgrade the facilities for teaching and learning.

Criterion 2: Curriculum Design and Development

Commendations:

- University Alumni are involved in curriculum development as external experts.
- The Student Handbook provides all required information to students.
- The University has faculty academic committees to develop and review curricula.
- There is evidence that curricula of the degree programs are aligned with the graduate profile of each area of specialization.
- The University conducts a student exit survey at the convocation.

Recommendations:

- Periodical curriculum revision should be implemented in all faculties.

- Curriculum development and approval processes should be visible in all faculties.
- Adherence to SLQF should be considered, especially the maximum notional hours for a year.
- The credit accumulation and transfer policy should be internalized.
- Consideration should be given to the requirements to obtain memberships of professional bodies when developing the curriculum.
- All faculties should get external review reports on the curriculum, assessment and implementations.
- The undertaking of tracer studies for employability is recommended for all faculties.

Criterion 3 Teaching and Learning

Commendations:

- All faculties have adopted student-centred teaching learning approaches in keeping with outcome-based education.
- All faculties ensure that students actively engage in the learning process through practicing multiple teaching and learning strategies and assessment methods.
- All faculties have an accessible learning management system which is commendable.
- Evaluation of department level student projects by industry professionals is highly appreciated.
- Innovation and creative work of students included in the teaching learning process is significant.
- Student participation in faculty research conferences is at a commendable level.

Recommendations:

- Regular analysis of peer observation/student feedback must be practiced, and results must be used to improve individuals as well as the teaching learning process and outcomes should be maintained as a regular department document to ensure future improvements in teaching and learning.
- Develop a detailed course handbook for every degree programme including curriculum mapping, aligning assessment methods with ILOs.

Criterion 4: Learning Resources, Student Support and Progression

Commendations:

- Some faculties provide opportunities to create an environment that proactively encourages students to engage with staff positively which is appreciated.
- The University website gradually maintaining all information/ links with up-to-date information is highly commendable.
- Progress made by all faculties, in many aspects of teaching/learning and student support is highly commendable.

- The academic and personal counselling coordinated by the chief student counsellor and her team should greatly be appreciated for their dedicated services provided to the students.
- The University has a resourceful library and its maintenance system, library resources and E-library system, plagiarism checking system and student familiarization programmes about library resources need special commendation.
- Student participation level in sports activities is admirable amidst their busy academic schedules.
- All faculties conduct orientation/induction programmes for new students, often collaborating with student unions.
- Outcome Based Education and Student-Centred Teaching/Learning are practiced in all faculties.
- It is appreciated that the University has uploaded the details about private hostel facilities which is made available to students in their website.

Recommendations:

- Teaching materials of the Department of Languages should follow the plagiarism policy of the university.
- Hostel facilities are not enough for the students and gradual action needs to be taken to address the issue.
- Student satisfaction surveys for all areas of support service need to be carried out on a regular basis and remedial action should be taken to resolve the issues highlighted.

Criterion 5: Student Assessment and Awards

Commendations:

- Workshop related assignments have formative and summative features.
- Group assignments give opportunities for peer effect on learning process.
- Appeals process is in place, giving students an opportunity to seek justice if any injustice occurs.
- Continuous Assessment (CA) is in several forms. Therefore, the risk of failing the exam is minimized.
- Uploading of results into LMS is a good practice.

Recommendations:

- Implement independent second marking system as in all other universities with at least second marking of a sample of scripts.
- Alignment of assessment against ILOs is found to be irregular, and therefore, it is recommended to prepare the alignment matrix of ILOs and evaluation criteria in the course outline. It is recommended to start this immediately.
- Delays in releasing results were discussed in several meetings. It is found that the delays are now minimal. However, further action to bring it down to zero are recommended.

- While appreciating the initiative made to upload results to LMS, it is noted that there are some delays in uploading the results to the LMS. Making it faster would be a step to improve the ranking/grade of university further.

Criterion 6: Strength and Quality of Staff

Commendations:

- The University has qualified, competent staff needed for effective high-quality program and student services. It is worth noting that about 70% of staff from the Faculty of Engineering is highly qualified, with MPhil/PhD qualification.
- Job descriptions of all non-academic staff are available.
- Performance of staff is appraised regularly against work norms, and due recognition, incentives and rewards are given for outstanding performance in teaching and research.

Recommendations:

- Necessary steps should be taken to fill the existing teaching staff vacancies in all faculties, especially Faculty of Information Technology, where about 60% of the academic cadre positions have to be filled with qualified staff.
- The Staff Development Centre (SDC) should consider conducting induction programs annually for the new recruits, especially the academic staff, who are being trained in other universities, and regular Continuous Professional Development (CPD) programs for all categories of staff aligned with identified professional development needs.
- The young academic staff members need to be encouraged and supported to obtain their PhD qualifications from other universities or preferably from abroad to avoid inbreeding.
- Peer evaluation of staff should be practiced in all departments regularly and a monitoring mechanism should be adopted to assess the progress and to take remedial action.

Criterion 7: Postgraduate Studies, Research, Innovation and Commercialization

Commendations:

- The University has implemented an effective infrastructure and administrative financial mechanisms for research and postgraduate degrees which has resulted in an increase in output.
- A progress review committee (PRC), consisting of a supervisor, a field expert and the departmental research coordinator, closely monitors the progress of postgraduate and research projects regularly.
- All the research and postgraduate degree programmes except one-year full time Master's degrees by research are aligned with SLQF.
- The University has made good progress in publishing a good number of articles in Scopus indexed peer reviewed journals during the last six years.

- The University regularly organizes national and international conferences for dissemination of its research outcomes.
- A clear procedure on selection, admission and induction of postgraduate programmes is available.
- The establishment of seven multidisciplinary research centres is commendable for further improving research with industrial collaboration.
- Well-equipped research laboratories at the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology have been built through External Research Grants.
- The University has entered into collaboration/partnerships with local, national, regional and international organizations to share knowledge, expertise, human resources, services and research with criteria for monitoring and evaluation.

Recommendations:

- One-year Master's degree by research has to be aligned with SLQF. Suitable labelling should also be identified.
- Final reports of completed University research grants should be evaluated by outside experts in order to improve the quality of research.
- A university level research committee should be established with representation from each faculty and director of multidisciplinary centres to administer financial and physical progress of the grants.

Criterion 8: Community Engagement, Consultancy and Outreach.

Commendations:

- The University has a well-established Policy on Accepting and carrying out Consultancy Work and Ancillary Services.
- The University maintains a university-industry consultative board in each department.
- The University maintains good relationships with external agencies.
- Community services are incorporated in the course curriculum (as Non-GPA modules)
- The services provided get good publicity through university newsletters and public media
- There are a large number of MoUs signed with outside partners.
- Collaboration with the industry is emphasised in the staff recruitment policy.

Recommendations:

- Records on the Monitoring and Evaluation of Community Engagement, Consultancy and Outreach activities should be kept.
- Appropriate strategies to improve the understanding and enhancement of its reputation among the community should be adopted.
- The qualifications of the external staff who engage in the industry placement activities need to be included.

Section 9: Distance Education

Commendations:

- CODL has been established according to the UGC directions.
- The University has a very good practice to ensure the quality of external partners in BIT program. Regular visits of partner institutes with a comprehensive check list and strict rules on the maintaining quality standard of facilities in partner institutions are commendable.
- Multiplicity of the entry criteria to BIT program is highly commendable. Students with AL qualifications as well as those with other qualifications such as Diplomas and Higher Diplomas in relevant fields are recruited.
- All the learning materials are provided through a separate Moodle to BIT students.

Recommendations:

- Internal and External graduates can be clearly identified from the titles of the two degree programs (Internal and BIT: External) and from the certificate. It is recommended to use the same titles in the degree certificate as per the guidelines of the UGC.
- It is observed that the BIT students do not have access to the Digital Library of the university, and therefore, it is recommended to provide that facility to them as well.
- The University policy on copyright of study materials is not clear. Some measures should be implemented to assure the copyright of study materials produced by faculty members and also about the use of other sources as study materials.
- Work norms of staff members in internal programs are in line with the UGC directions. However, these are not found in external programs. It is recommended that UoM prepare work norms for BIT and also PG programs as well. The workload of each staff member in internal, external and PG programs can be displayed in one spread sheet.

Criterion 10: Quality Assurance

Commendations

- The university has made a clear commitment to establishing a quality culture through the inclusion of quality in its strategic objectives and the introduction of the IQAU and FQACs.
- The efforts to develop and implement institution-wide student feedback surveys and peer observation needs to be recognised.

Recommendations

- The University would benefit from monitoring the effectiveness of the IQAU and FQAC meetings to ensure they are supporting the implementation of quality assurance practices.
- The University is encouraged to develop mechanisms to monitor student satisfaction with its support services, such as Library and counselling.

- The IQAU should consider developing approaches to facilitate the sharing of good practice across faculties.
- The University is encouraged to develop mechanisms to monitor staff satisfaction and respond to findings.

Section 8. Summary

The UoM has undergone two Institutional Reviews, in 2006 and 2013. The University has largely addressed the recommendations made at the last IR in 2013. There is a clear commitment to developing and implementing a quality culture at the UoM as indicated in one of the goals in the Strategic Plan of 2017-2021 which aims to 'ensure the quality of all undergraduate, postgraduate and external degree programmes satisfy national and international quality assurance benchmarks by 2017'. The large number of programmes which have been accredited by reputable bodies is a testament to UoM's intent to ensure that international quality standards are upheld.

The UoM revises its corporate plans at 5-year intervals. Annual action plans of 2019 with timelines, funds required for their implementation with clear responsibilities assigned to respective officers are available. The UoM has identified 78 KPIs under 8 goals with projections up to 2021. The University has all its institutional arrangements and structures in place to enable it to fulfil its mission, goals, and objectives. Regular meetings of such statutory bodies and committees ensure that the university is administered without major issues. The financial management is also found to be satisfactory.

The University has policies that are enforced on academic honesty and integrity, conflict of interest and ethics. However, the Review Team could not locate the evidence that these have been communicated explicitly to all sections of the academic community. Policies on GEE and SGBV and strategies to curb ragging are available.

The UoM has established necessary mechanisms to maintain conformity of academic programmes in course design and development and regular monitoring and reviewing. Most faculties conduct market surveys and get external review reports with recommendations. Student handbooks of Faculties/Departments show the Graduate profiles, Program specification including ILOs, course contents, teaching and learning methods, recommended reading and assessment methods though the programs do not comply with SLQF, because the total number of credits exceeds that specified in the SLQF for a four-year degree programme.

All faculties use ICT-based teaching and learning facilities and a well-established learning management system (MOODLE). Except for delivering teaching and learning materials and submission of assignments, Moodle is used for interactive sessions such as group discussions quizzes, question answer sessions, feedback sessions etc. All the faculties are well-equipped with the required computer labs facilities and relevant software.

Assessment methods are a major part of the curricula and the university ensures that all study programmes have integrated, continuous and innovative assessment methods. They follow summative as well as formative assessments. In the current practice, it is the moderators' responsibility to check the ILOs against questions and then to moderate the marks. Due to large numbers in classes, it may be practically difficult to practice second marking of all scripts. However, at least a sample of second marking is recommended.

The UoM provides and maintains infrastructure facilities for teaching/learning activities for its large student population at a satisfactory level. However, the newly established Faculty of Business has serious limitations of lecture rooms. The University website provides all the necessary information regarding faculties, departments, degree programmes, curricula, student support services, student activities, etc with a feedback system. Most clubs and societies use social media platforms to disseminate information and to attract members. The Career Guidance Unit also uses social media to reach the students. The quality and maintenance of student hostels are at acceptable level, but facilities are limited. Though not adequate, the University provide reasonable health and sports facilities.

In general, the UoM has the qualified and competent staff needed for effective high-quality teaching programmes and student services. It is worth noting that about 70% of staff from the Faculty of Engineering is highly qualified, with MPhil/PhD qualification earned mostly from abroad. However, about 60% of academic cadre positions must be filled in the Faculty of Information Technology. The University ensures that the allocation of workload to staff is transparent and fair.

The Faculty of Graduate Studies with the goal of enhancing the postgraduate and research degree programmes has clear procedures for selection, admission and enrolment. The annual enrolment to their research programmes has doubled over the past 4 years to reach 120 in 2019. The faculty conducts a joint PhD programme with foreign universities to strengthen their PhD programme and provide opportunities for international exposure to the research students. One of the problems encountered in the postgraduate programme was the non-alignment of the one-year MSc by research with the SLQF.

The University has established a significant number of collaborations/partnerships with local, national, regional and international organizations to share knowledge, expertise, human resources, services and research. It is also closely interacting with several industries and wider society providing new avenues for applied research (such as research incubators). The University has policies, institutional arrangements and procedures for research/ innovation and commercialization. The university attracted significant amount of financial assistance from industries for research due to close association of the academic staff.

The UoM has a well-established policy on accepting and carrying out Consultancy Work and Ancillary Services and promotes consultancy services for external agencies. Many staff members holding key positions in relevant professional bodies is a very good indication of their professional engagements.

Currently, the distance learning opportunities at undergraduate level is available only in BIT program in the Faculty of Information Technology. The BIT program has met all the standards of establishing of CODL. There is an issue with the parity of internal and external degree programme which needs to be addressed.

The UoM Quality Office has been in place since 2013; the responsibilities of the IQAU, established in 2017, align with those set out by the UGC. Student feedback is sought on teaching and materials and positive changes have been made in response to this. Peer observation has been introduced to support the quality assurance of teaching although its implementation varies from faculty to faculty. Overall, the UoM has taken clear steps to integrate quality assurance in all its activities and support the establishment of a quality culture throughout the institution.

Annexure 1. Schedule for the site visit

Day 1: Monday –16th December 2019

Time	Activity	Coordinator	Venue
08.00-08.15	Private meeting of the Review Team with QA Council representative	Dir/QA	Registrar's Board Room
08.15-08.30	Finalizing the Agenda by the Review Team with the Director /IQAU	Dir/QA	Registrar's Board Room
08.30-08.45	Meeting with the Vice-Chancellor (Courtesy visit)	AR/EAP	Vice Chancellor's Room
08.45-09.30	Presentation by the Vice-Chancellor (in the presence of Council, Deans, Directors of Centres, Units, IQAU Director, Registrar, Bursar, Librarian, Marshall, Senior Medical Officer, Wardens, Senior Student Counsellor etc.)	AR/EAP	Main Board Room
09.30-10.30	Discussion (with Tea)		
10.30-11.15	Meeting with Members of the Council	Registrar	Registrar's Board Room
11.15-12.00	Meeting with the Administrative Staff (Registrar, DR,SAR, AR)	DR/AI	Registrar's Board Room
12.00-12.30	Meeting with Bursar, SABs, ABs	DR/AI	Registrar's Board Room
12.30-13.30	Lunch	DR/IA	University Lodge
13.30-14.00	Meeting with Internal Audits	DR/IA	Registrar's Board Room
14.00-14.30	Meeting with the members of the Internal Quality Assurance Unit, Team leaders of SER writing team	AR/EAP	Registrar's Board Room
14.30 -15.30	Meeting with the Librarian and staff, Observing facilities	AR/Library Services	Registrar's Board Room, The Library
15.30-15.45	Tea Break		
15.45 –16.15	Meeting with Director/CGU, Observing facilities	Dir/CGU	Registrar's Board Room, CGU
16.15-17.00	Meeting with the Head and Staff of the Department of Languages; Observing facilities	Head/Dept. of Languages	Registrar's Board Room, Dept.of Languages
17.00- 18.30	Review of documents	AR/EAP MsSriyani-DVC Office	Registrar's Board Room
18.30-19.00	Discussion among members of the Review Team	Registrar's Board Room	

Day 2: Tuesday 17th December 2019

Faculty of Engineering			
Time	Activity	Coordinator	Venue
08.00-08.45	Meeting with the Dean, Heads of Departments, Coordinators	Dean/FoE, AR/FoE	FOE Board Room
08.45-09.30	Meeting with Academic staff	Dean/FoE, AR/FoE	FOE Board Room
09.30-09.45	Tea Break		
09.45-10.20	Meeting with Non-Academic staff	Dean/FoE, AR/FoE	FOE Board Room
10.20-11.20	Meeting with Students	Dean/FoE, AR/FoE	FOE Board Room
11.20-12.30	Observing Facilities	Dean/FoE, AR/FoE	Visit
12.30-13.30	Lunch	DR/IA	University Lodge
Faculty of Architecture			
13.30-14.15	Meeting with the Dean, Heads of Departments, Coordinators	Dean/FoA, AR/FoA	FoA Board Room
14.15-15.00	Meeting with Academic staff	Dean/FoA, AR/FoA	FoA Board Room
15.00-15.15	Tea Break		
15.15-15.50	Meeting with Non-Academic staff	Dean/FoA, AR/FoA	FoA Board Room
15.50-16.50	Meeting with Students	Dean/FoA, AR/FoA	FoA Board Room
16.50-18.00	Observing Facilities	Dean/FoA, AR/FoA	Visit
18.00-18.30	Discussion among members of the Review Team	Registrar's Board Room	

Day 3: Wednesday 18th December 2019

Faculty of Information Technology			
Time	Activity	Coordinator	Venue
08.00-08.45	Meeting with the Dean, Heads of Departments, Coordinators	Dean/FoIT, AR/FoIT	Main Board Room
08.45-09.30	Meeting with Academic staff	Dean/FoIT, AR/FoIT	Main Board Room
09.30-09.45	Tea Break		
09.45-10.20	Meeting with Non-Academic staff	Dean/FoIT, AR/FoIT	Main Board Room
10.20-11.20	Meeting with Students	Dean/FoIT, AR/FoIT	Main Board Room
11.20-12.30	Observing Facilities	Dean/FoIT, AR/FoIT	Main Board Room
12.30-13.30	Lunch	DR/IA	University Lodge
Faculty of Business			
13.30-14.15	Meeting with the Dean, Heads of Departments, Coordinators	Dean/FoB. AR/FoB	Registrar's Board Room
14.15-15.00	Meeting with Academic staff	Dean/FoB. AR/FoB	Registrar's Board Room
15.00-15.15	Tea Break		
15.15-15.50	Meeting with Non-Academic staff	Dean/FoB. AR/FoB	Registrar's Board Room
15.50-16.50	Meeting with Students	Dean/FoB. AR/FoB	Registrar's Board Room
16.50-18.00	Observing Facilities	Dean/FoB. AR/FoB	Visit
18.00-18.30	Discussion among members of the Review Team	Registrar's Board Room	

Day 4: Thursday 19th December 2019

Faculty of Graduate Studies			
Time	Activity	Coordinator	Venue
08.00-08.45	Meeting with the Dean, Heads of Departments, Coordinators	Dean/FGS, AR/FGS	Registrar's Board Room
08.45-09.30	Meeting with Academic staff	Dean/FGS, AR/FGS	Registrar's Board Room
09.30-09.45	Tea Break		
09.45-10.20	Meeting with Non-Academic staff	Dean/FGS, AR/FGS	Registrar's Board Room
10.20-11.20	Meeting with Postgraduate and Research students	Dean/FGS, AR/FGS	Registrar's Board Room
11.20-12.30	Observing Facilities	Dean/FGS, AR/FGS	Visit
12.30-13.30	Lunch	DR/IA	University Lodge
13.30-14.30	Meeting with Senior Student Counsellors/ Student Counsellor; Observing facilities	Chief Student Councillor	Registrar's Board Room
14.30-15.00	Visit Health centre and observe facilities	Chief Medical Officer	Registrar's Board Room
15.00-15.15	Tea Break		
15.15-15.45	Visit the Office of Research	Dir/Research	Registrar's Board Room
15.45-16.15	Visit the Office of International Relation	AR/EAP	Registrar's Board Room
16.15-18.30	Discussion among members of the Review Team	Registrar's Board Room	

Day 5: Friday 20th December 2019

Time	Activity	Coordinator	Venue
8.00 – 10.00	Visiting Hostels & Canteens; Observing facilities, meeting with wardens, students	SAR/Welfare Warden-Male Warden-Female	Registrar's Board Room, Visit
10.00 – 10.30	Meeting with the staff of Physical education department	Dir/PE	Registrar's Board Room
10.30 – 11.00	Meeting with staff of Centre for Information Technology Services	DVC	Registrar's Board Room
11.00- 11.30	Meeting with staff of Consultancy services	Dean/FoA	Registrar's Board Room
11.30-12.00	Meeting with the Alumni	MsVisakaNana yakkara	Registrar's Board Room
12.00-12.30	Meeting with staff of Centre for open and distance learning	Chairperson/C ODL, AR/CODL	Registrar's Board Room
12.30-13.30	Lunch	DR/IA	University Lodge
13.30-15.30	Discussion among members of the Review team and summarise findings		Registrar's Board Room
15.30-15.00	Discussion among members of the Review team and write up		Registrar's Board Room
18.00-18.30	Discussion among members of the Review Team		

Day 6: Saturday 21st December 2019

8.00-10.00	Discussion among members of the Review team and write up		Registrar's Board Room
10.00-12.00	Wrap-up meeting with the VC, Deans, Directors etc.	Dir/QA	Main Board Room
12.00	Departure		