



هيئة جودة التعليم والتدريب
Education & Training Quality Authority
Kingdom of Bahrain - مملكة البحرين

Directorate of Higher Education Reviews Programme Review Report

**Ahlia University
College of Arts and Science
Bachelor's Degree in Interior Design
Kingdom of Bahrain**

Site Visit Date: 3-5 April 2023

HA076-C3-R076

Table of Contents

Acronyms.....	3
I. Introduction.....	4
II. The Programme’s Profile	6
III. Judgement Summary.....	9
IV. Standards and Indicators.....	11
Standard 1.....	11
Standard 2.....	16
Standard 3.....	22
Standard 4.....	28
IV. Conclusion.....	34

Acronyms

ADREG	Admission and Registration Information System
APR	Academic Programme Review
AQAC	Accreditation and Quality Assurance Committee
AU	Ahlia University
BQA	Education & Training Quality Authority
BSID	Bachelor's Degree in Interior Design
CAQA	Centre for Accreditation and Quality Assurance
CIDA	Council for Interior Design Accreditation
CILO	Course Intended Learning Outcome
DHR	Directorate of Higher Education Reviews
HEC	Higher Education Council
HEI	Higher Education Institution
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
ICTC	Information and Communication Technology Centre
ILO	Intended Learning Outcome
SER	Self-Evaluation Report
TLAC	Teaching, Learning and Assessment Committee

I. Introduction

In keeping with its mandate, the Education & Training Quality Authority (BQA), through the Directorate of Higher Education Reviews (DHR), carries out two types of reviews that are complementary. These are: Institutional Reviews, where the whole institution is assessed; and the Academic Programme Reviews (APRs), where the quality of teaching, learning and academic standards are assessed in academic programmes within various colleges according to specific standards and indicators as reflected in its Framework.

Following the revision of the APR Framework at the end of Cycle 1 in accordance with the BQA procedure, the revised APR Framework (Cycle 2) was endorsed as per the Council of Ministers' Resolution No.17 of 2019. Thereof, in the academic year (2019-2020), the DHR commenced its second cycle of programme reviews.

The Cycle 2 APR Review Framework is based on four main Standards and 21 Indicators, which forms the basis the APR Reports of the Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

The **four** standards that are used to determine whether or not a programme meets international standards are as follows:

Standard 1: The Learning Programme

Standard 2: Efficiency of the Programme

Standard 3: Academic Standards of Students and Graduates

Standard 4: Effectiveness of Quality Management and Assurance

The Review Panel (hereinafter referred to as 'the Panel') decides whether each indicator, within a standard, is 'addressed', 'partially addressed' or 'not addressed'. From these judgments on the indicators, the Panel additionally determines whether each of the four standards is 'Satisfied' or 'Not Satisfied', thus leading to the Programme's overall judgment, as shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Criteria for Judgements

Criteria	Judgement
All four Standards are satisfied	Confidence
Two or three Standards are satisfied, including Standard 1	Limited Confidence
One or no Standard is satisfied	No Confidence
All cases where Standard 1 is not satisfied	

The APR Review Report begins with providing the profile of the Programme under review, followed by a brief outline of the judgment received for each indicator, standard, and the overall judgement.

The main section of the report is an analysis of the status of the programme, at the time of its actual review, in relation to the review standards, indicators and their underlying expectations.

The report ends with a Conclusion and a list of Appreciations and Recommendations.

II. The Programme's Profile

Institution Name*	Ahlia University
College/ Department*	College of Arts and Science
Programme/ Qualification Title*	Bachelor's Degree in Interior Design
Qualification Approval Number	Cabinet of Ministers Decision No. (1626-03) of 2001 Higher Education Council Letter No. (م 2008/81- ت أ) of 2008
NQF Level	8
Validity Period on NQF	5 years starting from its placement on the NQF
Number of Units*	45 Courses
NQF Credit	134 Credits
Programme Aims*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To equip learners with depth and breadth of knowledge and skills to express competence in the field of interior design in accordance with local, regional, and international standards. • To equip learners with transferable skills to respond to global challenges such as climate change and unexpected pandemics while maintaining aesthetics and functional design outcomes. • To equip learners with practical abilities in conceptualisation, holistic design, and project communication with professionals and clients. • To empower learners to successfully pursue careers as interior designers motivated to engage in research and sustainable life-long learning in ways that serve the societal needs.
Programme Intended Learning Outcomes*	A. Knowledge and Understanding A1. Demonstrate detailed knowledge and understanding of concepts and required theories of features, techniques, and terminologies in Interior Design.

A2. Use specialised level of skills to apply research methods in the field of interior design to keep the students aware of contemporary issues in the field.

A3. Get insights into technical aspects in the field of professional interior design practice and responsibilities towards various stakeholders.

B. Subject-specific skills

B1. Demonstrate creativity in solving design problems relevant to design brief, user expectations, and site constraints while keeping aesthetic and socio-cultural factors in mind.

B2. Use specialised level of skills to deal with technical details, systems, and finishing materials to meet desired needs within realistic constraints of building and safety codes.

B3. Use specialised manual and digital tools necessary for interior design practice.

C. Critical-Thinking Skills

C.1 Use range of approaches to analyze specific interior design problems / solutions with a view to practical implementation in interior design.

C.2 Demonstrate insight in integration of information and concepts within the common understanding of interior design to generate a cohesive conclusion.

C.3 Demonstrate creative and innovative design solutions for specific types of interior spaces and related products.

D. General and Transferable Skills

D.1 Operate at specialised level of skills to communicate ideas and make formal presentation on design related topics using effective written, verbal, and visual mediums.

D.2 Operate with a significant responsibility as a member of a team on specialised activities in the field of interior design.

D.3 Demonstrate ability to engage in scientific life-long learning to improve professional and sustainable organisational skills.

	D.4 Gain insight into ethical dimensions on interior design and the role of the interior designer as a positive agent to improve the quality of livable contexts at the local, regional, and international levels.
--	--

* Mandatory fields

III. Judgement Summary

The Programme's Judgement: Confidence

Standard/ Indicator	Title	Judgement
Standard 1	The Learning Programme	Satisfied
Indicator 1.1	The Academic Planning Framework	Addressed
Indicator 1.2	Graduate Attributes & Intended Learning Outcomes	Addressed
Indicator 1.3	The Curriculum Content	Addressed
Indicator 1.4	Teaching and Learning	Addressed
Indicator 1.5	Assessment Arrangements	Addressed
Standard 2	Efficiency of the Programme	Satisfied
Indicator 2.1	Admitted Students	Addressed
Indicator 2.2	Academic Staff	Partially Addressed
Indicator 2.3	Physical and Material Resources	Addressed
Indicator 2.4	Management Information Systems	Addressed
Indicator 2.5	Student Support	Addressed
Standard 3	Academic Standards of Students and Graduates	Satisfied
Indicator 3.1	Efficiency of the Assessment	Addressed
Indicator 3.2	Academic Integrity	Partially Addressed
Indicator 3.3	Internal and External Moderation of Assessment	Addressed
Indicator 3.4	Work-based Learning	Addressed

Indicator 3.5	Capstone Project or Thesis/Dissertation Component	Addressed
Indicator 3.6	Achievements of the Graduates	Addressed
Standard 4	Effectiveness of Quality Management and Assurance	Satisfied
Indicator 4.1	Quality Assurance Management	Addressed
Indicator 4.2	Programme Management and Leadership	Addressed
Indicator 4.3	Annual and Periodic Review of the Programme	Addressed
Indicator 4.4	Benchmarking and Surveys	Addressed
Indicator 4.5	Relevance to Labour Market and Societal Needs	Addressed

IV. Standards and Indicators

Standard 1

The Learning Programme

The programme demonstrates fitness for purpose in terms of mission, relevance, curriculum, pedagogy, intended learning outcomes and assessment.

Indicator 1.1: The Academic Planning Framework

There is a clear academic planning framework for the programme, reflected in clear aims which relate to the mission and strategic goals of the institution and the college.

Judgment: Addressed

- The Bachelor's Degree in Interior Design (BSID) programme offered by the College of Arts and Science at Ahlia University (AU) was developed based on a clear planning framework. The Panel was provided with the Strategic Plan and the Teaching and Learning Excellence Plan (2021-2025) of the University, which are reflected in the Annual Operational Plans of the College and its Departments. These plans are developed in line with vision, mission and goals of the College and the University. Therefore, the Panel is satisfied that these plans along with the associated processes to enforce them, as described during interviews, constitute suitable mechanisms to ensure that the programme is relevant, fit for purpose, and complies with the existing regulations.
- During interviews with senior management, the Panel found that the Department Council identifies potential risks related to the quality of the programme, its delivery and academic standards and raises them to the College Council. Moreover, there is a standing committee at the university level that oversees risk management and identifies potential risks at the college and programme levels. The provided University Council decisions shows that identified risks were acted upon. However, the Panel suggests that a risk register on the programme level should be kept, to better ensure that risk assessment and actions are formally and effectively handled at the programme level.
- The Panel examined a sample of the students' certificates and is of the view that the programme's title is concise and indicative of the qualification's type and content and is accurately documented on the certificates, the programme description documents and the university website.

- From the various stakeholders' interviews and the submitted, the Panel confirmed that the programme aims, structure and content are regularly revised in consultation with relevant stakeholders, such as the BSID External Advisory Board, alumni, internship providers, employers and students.
- The programme has four aims and 13 Programme Intended Learning Outcomes (PILOs) aligned with the professional standards of the Council for Interior Design Accreditation (CIDA). Moreover, the programme aims are mapped with the PILOs, which embed the university graduate attributes. In addition, the SER clearly clarifies how the university mission relates to the college mission and goals and the programme aims. Based on this and the evidence provided, the Panel is satisfied that the programme aims contribute to the college and the institution mission and strategic goals.

Indicator 1.2: Graduate Attributes & Intended Learning Outcomes

Graduate attributes are clearly stated in terms of intended learning outcomes for the programme and for each course and these are appropriate for the level of the degree and meet the NQF requirements.

Judgment: Addressed

- AU has 10 graduate attributes defined at the institutional level, which are embedded in the PILOs. These attributes are reflected in the Curriculum Skills Map and the course specifications. The Panel examined the PILOs and is of the view that these are clearly stated and linked to the programme aims and are appropriate for its type and level. Furthermore, the provided evidence and interviews with senior management and faculty confirmed that international norms are met through benchmarking and by adhering to CIDA standards. The Panel also finds that there are mechanisms in place to ensure that PILOs are measurable and meet the National Qualifications Framework (NQF) requirements.
- The Panel was provided with the course specifications and the mapping scorecards, which include the Course Intended Learning Outcomes (CILOs) and CILO/PILO mappings. Based on the interviews with senior management and faculty, the Panel confirmed that BSID programme uses suitable mechanisms to ensure that the CILOs are appropriate for the level and course content. This is done through the programme periodic review, which takes place every three years. The programme also benefits from feedback from stakeholders, external evaluators, benchmarking, etc. in this regard. In addition, the course content, CILOs and assessment methods are internally and externally reviewed and moderated every semester.

Indicator 1.3: The Curriculum Content

The curriculum is organised to provide academic progression of learning complexity guided by the NQF levels and credits, and it illustrates a balance between knowledge and skills, as well as theory and practice, and meets the norms and standards of the particular academic discipline.

Judgment: Addressed

- The Panel was provided with evidence which indicates that the curriculum is regularly updated. The evidence includes the BSID Benchmarking Study, an External Programme Evaluation Report and the BSID programme alignment with professional certification. During the interviews with the senior management, the Panel learned that the current Study Plan of the programme was developed in 2018-2019. However, as result of the periodic review, a new Study Plan consisting of 134 credit hours was recently approved and will be implemented in the first semester of the next academic year 2023-2024. The Panel examined the new Study Plan of 2023-2024 and noted that there is an appropriate course-by-course progression in term of levels and suitable student workload.
- The Panel notes that there is a balance between theory and practice, and between knowledge and skills in the curriculum. During interviews, the faculty clarified that PILOs and CILOs mappings are done at the course level to ensure the balance between practical application and theoretical understanding. The provided course portfolios also show that course contents cover the expected elements in term of depth and breadth.
- During the interviews, the Panel learned that textbooks and references are reviewed through the internal verification process conducted every semester to verify if the course specifications are up to date and relevant. This was confirmed by the Panel when scrutinising the course portfolios and other relevant evidence. Moreover, some faculty members explained during interviews how they are using their research findings and current professional practice to update course materials and teaching and learning activities.

Indicator 1.4: Teaching and Learning

The principles and methods used for teaching in the programme support the attainment of programme aims and intended learning outcomes.

Judgment: Addressed

- AU has a Teaching and Learning Policy and a Teaching and Learning Excellence Plan 2021-2025, which promote the use of different teaching and learning methods. However, the Panel is of the view that these are generic documents, and the programme is in need for more accustomed guidelines of teaching and learning, tailored to suit the programme

nature and type. Therefore, the Panel advises the College to develop and implement a teaching and learning policy or strategy and guidelines for the BSID programme.

- Based on the provided evidence and interviews with faculty members, the Panel acknowledges that the teaching and learning methods stated in the programme specifications are in line with the institution's Teaching and Learning Excellence Plan and are informed by current research findings to enable the attainment of the Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs).
- The Panel learned during the interviews with faculty that e-learning is used in the BSID programme and contributes to the achievement of its ILOs. The provided evidence includes AU's Online Delivered Courses Assessment Manual, which was implemented in the first semester of 2020-2021 and the Online Assessment Matrix. The Panel notes that the latter document comprises suitable methods for online assessments. The provided evidence also indicates that the virtual environment had an overall student satisfaction rate of 84%.
- During the interviews with faculty, students, alumni and employers, various examples were cited to demonstrate that AU encourages students' exposure to different learning experiences related to professional practice/application of theory. These examples include having access to the Interior Design Club, industry guest speakers' lectures, field trips to diverse institutions, workshops, career day, Ahlia Youth Connect, studio site visits, shop suppliers' visits, etc... The students further elaborated during interviews that AU learning environment encourages their participation in learning, enhances their lifelong learning skills and motivates them to create and innovate. In all, the Panel is satisfied with the variety of activities provided to BSID students.

Indicator 1.5: Assessment Arrangements

Suitable assessment arrangements, which include policies and procedures for assessing students achievements, are in place and are known to all relevant stakeholders.

Judgment: Addressed

- The SER clarifies that the Assessment Manual, which is available at the AU website, is a general framework with a set of policies and procedures that ensures the transparency of assessment and cover all the related aspects. During interviews, it was explained that the Assessment Manual (fifth revision) was revised in line with the Higher Education Council (HEC) and NQF requirements. Furthermore, the Department Council ensures the proper implementation of the Manual, while the College Council and the Teaching, Learning and Assessment Committee (TLAC) monitors this process.

- The SER refers to a variety of formative and summative assessment methods that are used by the BSID programme in line with Teaching and Learning Excellence Plan and the Assessment Manual. The Assessment Manual states that written feedback has to be delivered within seven working days and up to 14 days in research projects. The students' interviews confirmed that they are given prompt feedback which helps them to improve their performance.
- According to the SER, the BSID programme has in place internal moderation for the pre-assessment stage of major assessments (above 20% weighting) and external moderation for the post-assessment stage. From the submitted evidence and interviews, the Panel concludes that the mechanisms used for grading the students are fair and rigorous.
- The BSID policies and procedures for academic misconduct and grade appeals are described in the Assessment Manual and are disseminated during the student orientation and in the beginning of each course by the instructors. Moreover, there is a Discipline Committee for cases of misconduct and cheating during examinations which assesses the gravity of the infraction. During faculty interviews and based on the submitted evidence, the Panel acknowledges that there are in place provisions for academic misconduct and appeals by the students. The Panel also learned that policies and procedures related to ethical conduct of research are adequately disseminated to students.

Standard 2

Efficiency of the Programme

The programme is efficient in terms of the admitted students, the use of available resources - staffing, infrastructure, and student support.

Indicator 2.1: Admitted Students

There are clear admission requirements, which are appropriate for the level and type of the programme, ensuring equal opportunities for both genders, and the profile of admitted students matches the programme aims and available resources.

Judgment: Addressed

- The college's admission criteria are clearly stated in the SER, the Student Handbook, and the university website. The Panel is of the view that these criteria are adequate and ensure that appropriate students are accepted on an equal basis between females and males. The Panel notes that the admission policy is consistently implemented and includes an aptitude test, or a portfolio followed by an interview. The Panel also notes the Student Handbook does not include these requirements. Therefore, the Panel recommends that the College should revise the Student Handbook to ensure that it clearly describes all the admission criteria and requirements.
- In the interviews, it was clarified that students who satisfy the admission criteria, including a TOEFL score of 500 or an overall grade of more than 85% in their Secondary School Certificate (Tawjihia), or those who pass the English and Math placement tests, are not required to take the orientation programme. However, if their English or Math proficiency levels do not meet the standard, the University provides orientation courses in English and Mathematics. In addition to these requirements, all applicants need to score at least 60% in the BSID aptitude test. Applicants who score between 50%-59.9% in the BSID aptitude test must pass an interview at the department level and submit a portfolio. In addition, the Panel was able to confirm, based on the submitted evidence and the interviews, that remedial support measures for supporting students with special needs are in place.
- As described in the Student Handbook, credit transfer is allowed with maximum credit of 66% of the total number of credits required in the programme. The Panel is satisfied with the procedure followed for credit transfer as explained during interviews and supported by evidence.

- Based on the benchmarking studies and the feedback received from relevant stakeholders, the admission policy was revised in January 2023. This was done with the aim to include programme-specific criteria in line with the College mission and goals. Overall, the Panel is satisfied that the admission requirements are consistent with local and international academic standards, regularly updated and confirmed through benchmarking activities.

Indicator 2.2: Academic Staff

There are clear procedures for the recruitment, induction, appraisal, promotion, and professional development of academic staff, which ensure that staff members are fit-for-purpose and that help in staff retention.

Judgment: Partially Addressed

- The Panel notes that AU has adequate policies and processes for advertising, recruiting, and appointing faculty and staff, as well as for their appraisal and promotion. Evidence on annual evaluation of faculty was provided, which shows that it is point based, thus, the Panel suggests including formative feedback in the evaluation. Induction is provided to new faculty and staff by the Human Resource Directorate to inform them about the university rules and regulations and other aspects necessary for settling them into the university's culture and operations.
- AU ensures the quality of scientific research carried out by faculty members through different interrelated policies and procedures including the Research Plan 2021-2025, Rules and Regulations of Research, Postgraduate Studies and Research Bylaws, Funding Policy and Procedures, and Funding Scheme for Publishing Books and Journals. The Panel is of the view that the implemented policies and procedures are appropriate and satisfactorily aligned with the AU's Strategic Plan and the BSID's Operational Plan.
- The workload policy sets out the faculty working loads according to their ranks as per the HEC requirements. However, the Panel was informed during the interviews that the faculty teaching load is high. Moreover, the Panel learned that the reduction of teaching load for administrative positions - Dean, Chairperson of the Department and Programme Coordinator - is the same (one course). Therefore, the Panel recommends that the College should reduce the faculty teaching load to enable them to fulfil the responsibilities of their administrative position and to increase the time spent by the faculty on research and community engagement.
- The Panel was provided with evidence on how AU ensures equal opportunities and supports women's progression and needs. Furthermore, during interviews, the Panel was informed that AU was recently listed on the United Nations Platform for SDG5 related to gender equality considering its initiatives for women's needs.

- As per the SER, the BSID programme has nine faculty members, who are qualified in the field of Interior Design and Architecture. Six of them are full-timers and three are part-timers. Therefore, the Panel recommends that the College should increase the number of full-time faculty who hold a degree in Interior Design or has an extensive experience in Interior Design to enhance the programme delivery.
- The Panel notes that there are suitable and effective arrangements, policies and procedures for identifying and supporting continuing professional development needs. Moreover, the Professional Development Unit, in the Human Resources Directorate, is responsible for organising professional development activities and maintaining accurate records of each activity. These arrangements were satisfactorily discussed in interviews with faculty, administrators, and senior management.
- In the last two years, the retention rate of the faculty members at the College of Arts and Science was high, marking 92% in 2019 and 95% in 2020. Incentives to motivate faculty members include salary increments and research grants for publications and participation in seminars. Overall, the Panel finds that the staff retention in the BSID programme is within the normal rates.

Indicator 2.3: Physical and Material Resources

Physical and material resources are adequate in number, space, style and equipment; these include classrooms, teaching halls, laboratories and other study spaces; Information Technology facilities, library and learning resources.

Judgment: Addressed

- According to the SER, the classrooms are equipped with computers, which are updated and regularly maintained by the Information and Communication Technology Centre (ICTC). The Panel noted, during the site visit tour, that the classes and laboratories are adequate in terms of number and size. The Panel also noted that there are three practical-based studios with drawing tables for students, one workshop, and one material room, which are dedicated to the BSID programme. Moreover, the BSID students have access to a specialised laboratory equipped with a plotter and a 3D printer, in addition to access to specific software for interior design, such as Adobe Photoshop, Autodesk AutoCAD, Autodesk 3Ds Max, and Autodesk Revit. The Panel appreciates the investment in new 3D software packages based on stakeholder feedback to enhance the students' experience and basic 3D CAD skills.
- The ICTC conducts regular checks to ensure that various learning facilities, such as classrooms, laboratories, and offices are adequately maintained. Additionally, Information and Communication Technology (ICT) resources are periodically upgraded

or replaced to ensure their optimal functionality. Overall, the Panel is of the view that the ICT equipment in BSID laboratories is adequate and regularly maintained and upgraded.

- AU has a central library and a digital library as shown on the AU website. As noticed by the Panel during the site visit tour, the library has adequate facilities, which are appropriate in terms of formal and informal study spaces and accessibility. It also has adequate resources with more than 12,000 volumes and offers access to over 2.5 million e-journal reference materials *via* 46 databases that cover a wide range of disciplines, including Interior Design.
- From the SER and the interviews, the Panel confirmed that there is a formal mechanism to ensure the maintenance of library resources and services which includes a follow up with departments and colleges every semester to order new textbooks/references. PC's replacement and upgrades are also reviewed every five to seven years. Regarding the measuring of the adequacy of the facilities, the Panel was provided with the alumni survey results, but these did not cover facilities. The Panel suggests including questions about facilities in the alumni surveys to ensure their adequacy and enable further improvements.
- The Panel was provided with a Health and Safety leaflet and a Safety pocket guide, which are available to students, faculty, staff and visitors. During the site visit tour, the Panel noticed that there is a health clinic in campus with a full-time nurse. In addition, the Panel noticed that first aid kits are available in laboratories and the Studio. Also, the arrangements for fire evacuation were satisfactorily discussed during the tour.

Indicator 2.4: Management Information Systems

There are functioning management information and tracking systems that support the decision-making processes and evaluate the utilisation of laboratories, e-learning and e-resources, along with policies and procedures that ensure security of learners records and accuracy of results.

Judgment: Addressed

- The Admission and Registration Information System (ADREG) is extensive and supports the University in decision-making. The Panel was given a satisfactory virtual demonstration of the system, which confirmed its utilization to assist decision makers in gathering pertinent facts from unprocessed data to recognise issues, find solutions, and take decisions accordingly. In addition, AU utilizes Moodle learning management system. Overall, the Panel is satisfied that adequate e-learning and e-resources are being effectively utilized to inform decision making.
- From the interviews and the provided evidence, the Panel confirms that the University has a clear procedure for the authentication of certification and to ensure that final

certificates are genuine and protected against fraud. For instance, the ADREG system creates a 29-digit security code that is secure and confidential for every printed graduation certificate.

- The Panel is satisfied with the explanation given during interviews regarding how ADREG graduation module tracks all the graduation stages from the moment the student is flagged for graduation until the certificate is endorsed by the HEC and collected by the student. The Panel confirmed that the awarded certificates and transcripts are accurate in describing the achieved learning by students and are issued in a timely manner. Although during interviews the timeliness of the transcripts was disclosed as being a three weeks' process, the Panel suggests that it should be explicitly specified in the certificate/transcript preparation procedures.

Indicator 2.5: Student Support

There is appropriate student support available in terms of guidance, and care for students including students with special needs, newly admitted and transferred students, and students at risk of academic failure.

Judgment: Addressed

- There is an appropriate student support available in terms of overall facilities, library, laboratories, e-learning and guidance. The responsible entities include the Directorate of Student Counselling, the Deanship of students Affairs, the Directorate of Admission and Registration, the Directorate of Student Activities and the Directorate of Professional Relations, which provides students with care and support for internship placements and career guidance. To further utilise the strong stakeholder support that the programme has developed, the Panel suggests dedicating a career day for the BSID students to ensure more involvement and participation from internship providers and employers.
- The Deanship of Student Affairs hosts an orientation day for new students each semester, which includes a briefing on the academic rules and regulations as well as an introduction to the student support services. A college orientation day is also conducted for BSID students to give them academic information about the programme. During interviews, students confirmed that they received induction by the BSID faculty at the beginning of their study.
- As per the Academic Advising Policy, every student is allocated to an academic advisor, who assists students in clarifying matters related to their academic progress. The Panel noted that the number of advisees per faculty is ranging from 25 to 26, and suggests reducing the number of advisees per faculty. The Panel also suggests increasing the

minimum academic advising contact, as it was stated during interviews that students were only advised once at the beginning of each semester.

- Evidence on how AU supports women's progression and needs were provided to the Panel. AU has also an institution-wide Policy for Admitting and Supporting Students with Special Needs. The SER refers to provisions related to these students that are clearly stated in the Student Handbook, and to a committee that has been created to specifically look after the welfare of the students with special needs. The Panel is of the view that the implemented policies and provisions are appropriate.
- The Policy for Identifying and Supporting 'At Risk' Students and the Academic Probation Policy include a clear process for identifying and supporting students who are at risk of academic failure. 'At-Risk' students are identified through the ADREG system. The percentage of at-risk students has dropped from 52% to 11% in the last three academic years, which reflects the effectiveness of the academic support provided to these students.
- As described in the SER, 'the Deanship of Student Affairs maintains an open-door policy, where students are welcomed at any time if they have questions, concerns, or would like to set up a meeting with a staff member'. However, the Panel examined the student satisfaction survey and found that it does not include any questions for assessing the provided support services. The Panel also noticed that the analysis of course surveys and the annual review report of the programme do not include information about assessing support services. Therefore, the Panel recommends that the University should ensure that the student satisfaction surveys include all the support services provided to students. The Panel also suggests that the University maintains a record of all the enhancements made to student support services based on the feedback received from students.

Standard 3

Academic Standards of Students and Graduates

The students and graduates of the programme meet academic standards that are compatible with equivalent programmes in Bahrain, regionally and internationally.

Indicator 3.1: Efficiency of the Assessment

The assessment is effective and aligned with learning outcomes, to ensure attainment of the graduate attributes and academic standards of the programme.

Judgment: Addressed

- As per the AU Assessment Manual, the reliability of assessment methods is verified through pre-assessment internal moderation that includes reviewing the assessment type, alignment to appropriate CILOs, complexity of assessment, weight allocation, etc., and post-assessment internal and external moderation. The Panel confirmed from the evidence and the interviews that the assessment framework, policies and procedures are consistently applied across all courses. However, upon closer scrutiny of course portfolios, the Panel notes that there is a high number of assessments for each course, therefore the Panel suggests that the programme considers reducing the number of assessments and redistributing their weight, focusing on their quality and effectiveness.
- With respect to the alignment of the assessments with graduate attributes, the SER states that it is verified by an external evaluator once every two years as per the AU Guidelines for Evaluating Academic Programmes. The Panel was provided with the External Evaluator Report and samples of the course assessment matrix that measured the achievement of the CILOs and PILOs using the assessment scores and concludes that appropriate mechanisms are in place to ensure the alignment of assessments with the ILOs and graduate attributes.
- The SER explains that the process to ensure the attainment of PILOs is conducted every semester for all courses and that its achievement rate must be above 60% to ensure their attainment and thereafter the attainment of graduates' attributes. Furthermore, if the achievement rate falls below 60%, an improvement is considered at department level. This was confirmed by the Panel during interviews and corroborated by the evidence provided.
- There is evidence on the usage of internal and external moderation, to improve the assessment process. Furthermore, the process of internal moderation is regularly assessed

and improved by the TLAC in coordination with Centre for Accreditation and Quality Assurance (CAQA). The minutes of meetings from the TLAC and the College Council, as well as the CAQA review report, are all reflected on the End of Semester Report. Moreover, the minutes of meeting of the BSID External Advisory Board include assigning advisory board members as external jurors for the 'Final Project' (INTD499) course. This allows the External Advisory Board to provide feedback not only to students but also to the programme administration in terms of meeting market needs. Based on the evidence and the interviews with faculty and various stakeholders, the Panel is satisfied with the mechanisms followed for monitoring the implementation of the assessment process and its improvement.

Indicator 3.2: Academic Integrity

Academic integrity is ensured through the consistent implementation of relevant policies and procedures that deter plagiarism and other forms of academic misconduct (e.g. cheating, forging of results, and commissioning others to do the work).

Judgment: Partially Addressed

- The policies and procedures for academic misconduct are described in the Assessment Manual and Student Handbook, which are disseminated during student orientation and in the beginning of each course and available on the AU website. Likewise, the Undergraduate Project Guidelines include a dedicated section on academic misconduct. During faculty interviews and based on the evidence submitted, the Panel acknowledges that policies and procedures relating to academic integrity, ethics and research are well-disseminated and known by the students and staff.
- Turnitin is the plagiarism detection software used to detect similarity in written assessments, final project and dissertation manuscript. Plagiarism is assumed if similarity exceeds 30%; however, the Panel learned during faculty and students' interviews that the maximum percentage of similarity allowed is 15% subject to the instructor's discretion. The Panel received different answers with regard to the number of times that the students are allowed to resubmit their plagiarized work and with respect to penalties of detected plagiarism. Likewise, although the 'process for detecting misconduct of design studio and visual' was included in the Assessment Manual and the SER, the Panel found during the faculty interviews that the process is based on an individual instructor approach. Thus, the Panel finds that this process is inconsistently applied and recommends that the College should review its practices regarding the policies and procedures of academic integrity to match the 15% similarity index accepted, limit the number of allowed resubmissions and clarify the warnings and penalties in related policies.

- The Panel was provided with one example of misconduct cases and was informed during interviews that the cases of academic misconduct are discussed and recorded within the department council.

Indicator 3.3: Internal and External Moderation of Assessment

There are mechanisms in place to measure the effectiveness of the programme's internal and external moderation systems for setting assessment instruments and grading students' achievements.

Judgment: Addressed

- The Panel is of the view that there are formal and appropriate procedures and criteria for the internal and external moderation of the assessment process and the selection of internal and external moderators, which are clearly outlined and translated into a fairly robust system that is consistently adhered to. This aspect was corroborated by the comprehensive AU Assessment Manual, the detailed narrative on the SER and was further confirmed during interviews. The interviewed moderators were well qualified.
- The Panel is of the view that the internal moderation contributes to the review and improvement of both courses and the programme as a whole and ensures consistent assessments and fairness of grading that meet both professional and academic standards. This is evidenced by the provided filled-out forms for Internal Verification of Course Syllabus-Specification, Internal Moderation of Final Examination, and Internal Verification of Final Examination. The criteria addressed on the various forms is reflected in the Manual. The Chairperson of Department oversees the effectiveness of the internal moderation, and the Dean evaluates the process with feedback given to TLAC.
- Based on the evidence and interviews, the Panel confirmed that external moderation contributed to the review and improvement of both courses and the programme. Additionally, the Panel found that there are formal and appropriate mechanisms for the evaluation of the effectiveness of the programme's external moderation. Twenty percent of the courses that are offered are externally moderated per semester; this is tracked by the Chairperson of Department to ensure that every course undergoes this process in a two years' cycle. During the interviews with senior management and with the external moderator, it was noted that only three courses underwent this process in the last semester. Therefore, the Panel recommends that the College should ensure that 20% of the courses are moderated annually and suggests adding a second External Moderator if needed. The Panel also recommends that the College should review the weighted value associated with student work that qualifies for internal and external moderation, as it is observed that a high percentage of assessments are weighted below the value of 20% and would not be assessed; this applies to internal and external moderation.

Indicator 3.4: Work-based Learning

Where assessed work-based learning takes place, there is a policy and procedures to manage the process and its assessment, to assure that the learning experience is appropriate in terms of content and level for meeting the intended learning outcomes.

Judgment: Addressed

- The Panel is of the view that the policies and procedures related to the BSID programme's three-credit 'Internship' (INTR470) course are appropriate and clearly stated in the Undergraduate Internship Programme Guidelines. The roles and responsibilities of the internship providers, academic supervisors, training supervisors and students are clearly set out and well communicated to all the relevant stakeholders, including all the forms related to assessment. Based on the evidence and the interviews with faculty and external internship supervisors, the Panel confirmed that the work-based learning within the BSID programme has clearly communicated policies and procedures that govern the process and assessment and is appropriate in both content and skills level to support the attainment of its ILOs. Although the Internship Guidelines is comprehensive, the Panel recommends that the College should review the Internship Guidelines to conceal the discrepancy between section 1.1 ('2 credits compulsory internship course') and section 1.4 ('the internship course is 3 credits').
- Based on the provided sample evaluation forms and reports, the Panel confirmed that the work-based learning component contributes effectively to the achievement of the PILOs. The work plan included as part of the internship acceptance demonstrates a commitment from the employer's side to cover specific areas to support the attainment of the ILOs.
- During interviews and from the evidence provided, the Panel confirmed that the assessment of the work-based learning is well-managed, consistently implemented, and is appropriate in terms of content and level. Monitoring and assessment of work-based learning is done through monthly reports and two academic advisor site visits, as well as a final report. During the interviews with external internship supervisors, it was noted that the communication between the programme team and the internship companies happens by written reports and forms as well as conversations during the site visits. The interviewees clarified that the feedback they provided is a point-based format on a clearly outlined criteria. Moreover, the internship is conducted during the spring semester for eight weeks, alongside course work. Students can either be placed in internships or seek on their own as per the specific guidelines and criteria described in the Internship Manual.
- The Panel learned from the external internship supervisors' interviews that their feedback regarding knowledge of specific software and finishes had been implemented in the curriculum and they were of the view that the programme was consistently improving. Moreover, they cited the work ethic, commitment, knowledge, and responsibility of AU

students as being high. In addition, there is evidence that data collected as part of internship was shared amongst faculty and utilized in developing the internship course curriculum. Therefore, the Panel acknowledges that there are sound processes to evaluate the effectiveness of work-based learning course and its contribution to the achievement of the programme aims.

Indicator 3.5: Capstone Project or Thesis/Dissertation Component

Where there is a capstone project or thesis/dissertation component, there are clear policies and procedures for supervision and evaluation which state the responsibilities and duties of both the supervisor and students, and there is a mechanism to monitor the related implementations and improvements.

Judgment: Addressed

- The 'Final Project' (INTD 499) course is the capstone activity, which students take after having completed the Capstone Research course (IDRM 498). Based on the provided sample projects the Panel confirmed that the Final Project contributes effectively to the achievement of the PILOs. Furthermore, AU has comprehensive Guidelines for Undergraduate Project, which are available on the university website. These Guidelines explicitly define the roles and responsibilities of both supervisors and students and are effectively communicated to all relevant stakeholders *via* AU website.
- Regular progress assessments of students are carried out by supervisors, who record and minute the student progress in ADREG. This was also confirmed during interviews. Interviews with students and other relevant stakeholders indicated that there is general satisfaction with the capstone project supervision process and the related support provided during it. From the interviews with faculty and different stakeholders, and the evidence provided, the Panel finds that the assessment of capstone project is well-defined and involves project supervisors, academic supervisors, and an external juror. The Panel is of the view that the work of students is at a similar level to equivalent programmes in general and would suggest more activities on using benchmarking to compare the programme's assessment methods with those of other universities.
- The programme has a monitoring mechanism in place to track the implementation and improvement of the capstone project process. The TLAC periodically reviews the undergraduate project guidelines and collects feedback from the colleges and the CAQA. This feedback helps to identify areas for improvement that have become apparent through the practical experience of faculty involved in capstone projects and allows for necessary adjustments to be made to the process to ensure its continued effectiveness. The Panel is satisfied with the monitoring and improvement process.

Indicator 3.6: Achievements of the Graduates

The achievements of the graduates are consonant with those achieved on equivalent programmes as expressed in their assessed work, rates of progression and first destinations.

Judgment: Addressed

- Based on careful scrutiny of course portfolios and a sample of capstone projects, the Panel confirmed that the level of students' achievements is appropriate and reflects their ability to create and innovate. The students demonstrated a high level of creativity in their approach to the capstone project, coming up with unique ideas and solutions that were not necessarily conventional. Further evidence was apparent in the photographs of projects captured during the tour visit, which demonstrated the student's capacity to engage in critical thinking and effectively resolve problems through their work.
- According to the statistics provided in the SER, the Panel found that the number of full-time students registered for the period 2018-2019 to 2022-2023 remained relatively stable; the mean length of study for graduates was 4.4 years in 2017-2018, increased to 5.1 years in 2019-2020, and decreased to 4.1 years in 2021-2022. The data shows that the length of study follows a normal distribution. The Panel recommends that the College should conduct the analysis of the students' progression at the cohort level to better understand if there are any underlying issues with progression and graduation times.
- To ensure that graduate's records are up to date, there is a dedicated officer who reports to the Director of Professional Relations. The graduate's records are also updated with their destinations and personal information during the yearly alumni reunion. The Panel noted from evidence that over 77% of graduates, since 2017, are employed in jobs related to Interior Design.
- The provided Employers Satisfaction Survey has a commendable high satisfaction rate. During the virtual interviews, the employers confirmed their overall satisfaction with the quality of programme delivery.

Standard 4

Effectiveness of Quality Management and Assurance

The arrangements in place for managing the programme, including quality assurance and continuous improvement, contribute to giving confidence in the programme.

Indicator 4.1: Quality Assurance Management

There is a clear quality assurance management system, in relation to the programme that ensures the institution's policies, procedures and regulations are applied effectively and consistently.

Judgment: Addressed

- The Quality Assurance processes are clearly outlined and defined in the Quality Assurance Manual. The Panel is of the view that this document is comprehensive and is frequently reviewed. AU has an internal structure to support, monitor, evaluate and improve overall quality assurance mechanisms, which is consistently implemented, where committees such as TLAC and CAQA are communicating with one another, supervised by the Accreditation and Quality Assurance Committee (AQAC) which reflects a broad segment of the AU community. Information is well-disseminated to stakeholders in a variety of ways, this was confirmed by the submitted evidence and the Panel interviews with the senior management and faculty. The senior management was able to provide an example of changes made to the BSID programme through the related processes during the interview.
- The Panel found that AU ensures that academic staff are involved in the quality assurance processes and their assessment, by increasing their awareness on its related activities through the delivery of workshops. The academic and support staff interviews proved that all members had an understanding of the quality assurance processes and were well-aware of their role in ensuring the effectiveness of its provision. Moreover, the SER explained how the staff workshop effectiveness was measured by participants' survey scoring a 90.91% satisfaction rate. Further evidence was provided showing processes that derive in communal decisions. The Panel discovered during interviews that the students play a role in the quality assurance processes as well, as both the Department Council and University Council have a student representative from the (elected) Student Council in attendance.
- Overall, the Panel is of the view that the systems, mechanisms, policies and procedures are monitored, evaluated and periodically improved. Additionally, AU alignment with the UN Sustainable Development Goal 4, reflects that AU looks to improve its

programmes and processes. The Panel notes with appreciation the comprehensive quality assurance mechanisms and systems that are in place and the sound understanding of these mechanisms and systems on the part of faculty and staff.

Indicator 4.2: Programme Management and Leadership

The programme is managed in a way that demonstrates effective and responsible leadership and there are clear lines of accountability.

Judgment: Addressed

- The Panel confirms that the AU organisational chart is appropriate and clarifies the relationships between different entities, keeping communication and reporting lines understandable for efficiently managing the programme. Furthermore, the existing reporting lines and the terms of reference for different management posts and committees are documented in AU Bylaws and in the University Standing Committees terms of reference and are comprehensive, clear and ensure fruitful communication to inform decision-making, as showcased in several meeting minutes. The roles and responsibilities of the Dean and the Chairperson of Department were clarified to the Panel during the interviews, where the latter holding the overall responsibility for the management and initiating the improvement processes of the programme and coordinating decision-making with a variety of other AU entities. Moreover, the faculty interviews and evidence confirmed that the academic staff are involved in regular meetings and discuss a variety of issues related to the programme functioning.
- Overall, the Panel is of the view that the current BSID programme demonstrates effective and responsible management and leadership, aligned with the AU policies and procedures, and interviews confirmed that issues and decisions are clearly communicated to all those involved. Furthermore, the interviews demonstrated a clear custodianship and understanding of the programme improvements and related implementation on the part of higher management.

Indicator 4.3: Annual and Periodic Review of the Programme

There are arrangements for annual internal evaluation and periodic reviews of the programme that incorporate both internal and external feedback and mechanisms are in place to implement recommendations for improvement.

Judgment: Addressed

- At the end of each semester, a reporting process as outlined by the CAQA is implemented. This arrangement regarding internal evaluation results includes producing a

comprehensive report with recommendations for improvement. It is the responsibility of the Chairperson of the Department to generate this report and send it onto the College Council. During the interviews, several examples of improvement were presented and discussed. Furthermore, the senior management confirmed that the CAQA, in coordination with the TLAC, ensures the implementation of the semester reports by the Department and follow up on the necessary actions, reporting back to the College Council and the Department through the TLAC whenever necessary. The AU's internal verification process of course syllabi/specifications support this process as well and ensures the involvement of all faculty. The Panel is satisfied that annual reviews of the programme follow AU procedures and policies which are clearly outlined. The SER details the process, and virtual interviews verified that the mechanisms are being followed and monitored.

- The Panel is of the view that there is a comprehensive policy for the periodic review of the programme. The three-year review cycle is thorough and includes various components, including stakeholder feedback, PILO reviews, market analysis, and local, regional and international benchmarking, with a focus on CIDA-aligned programmes. This was confirmed during the interviews with senior management and further corroborated by the submitted evidence on benchmarking, market analysis, external evaluation, advisory board feedback, student feedback, alumni feedback, and employers' feedback. All the data is compiled into a report with an action plan. Once enacted, the action plan as a result of this review process is then subjected to the overall cyclical quality assurance processes.
- The annual and periodic reviews of the programme are being carried out in accordance with AU Academic Programme Annual Review Procedure and Report Template. Faculty are involved in various aspects of this process, and the content related to reviews is communicated through committees with representation of every college, in professional development sessions, and is available on AU intranet to ease faculty access. During interviews and from the evidence provided, the Panel confirmed that the reviews incorporate internal and external feedback and that there are appropriate mechanisms to ensure the implementation of recommendations. Moreover, during the Covid pandemic, additional reviews were put in place to deal with the unprecedented nature of the impact on learning. The Panel appreciates the sound implementation, monitoring and improvement of the annual and periodic review processes.

Indicator 4.4: Benchmarking and Surveys

Benchmarking studies and the structured comments collected from stakeholders surveys are analysed and the outcomes are used to inform decisions on programmes and are made available to the stakeholders.

Judgment: *Addressed*

- The Panel is of the view that AU's Benchmarking Policy and Procedures are comprehensive and include local, regional, and international universities and the criteria for selecting institutions to benchmark are clearly defined. Three of the six benchmarked institutions were either accredited or aligned with CIDA. Moreover, from the evidence provided and the interviews discussions, the Panel is satisfied with the analysis provided by the benchmarking study whose results were discussed in the Department Curriculum Committee and used to inform decision making process for programme improvements resulting in a new BSID study plan, reviewed at the College Council and approved by the University Council. As the BSID programme is on a three-year cycle for benchmarking and periodic reviews, the Panel suggests that the programme aligns this cycle with the CIDA accreditation cycle.
- During interviews with different internal and external stakeholders, the Panel confirmed that feedback is sought through formal surveys and informal in-person conversations. For example, the interviewed members of the External Advisory Board indicated that their feedback was implemented, and the changes are communicated to them *via* emails and regular meetings. Moreover, it was noted that AU excels at cultivating relationships with external entities to the benefit of students. Similar feedback was collected from the internship providers and employers who also participated in AU surveys. The alumni interviews indicated that they participate in surveys and are invited to be on project juries and as guest speakers. The students expressed during their interviews that they understood the process of evaluating instructors at the end of each semester and how the data was implemented. An example given was the need for additional software courses taken on board and applied by the programme.
- Overall, the Panel is of the view that the programme's benchmarking activities and the structured comments collected from stakeholders' surveys are well implemented, analysed, and the outcomes are used to inform decisions on programmes and are made available to the stakeholders, who have reported during interviews their satisfaction with the changes based on their feedback. However, the Panel noted that the surveys are only conducted on a Likert scale and recommends that the College should improve its surveys by adding write-in comments and simultaneously formalise the informal/in-person feedback as they are also extremely useful points of data collection.

Indicator 4.5: Relevance to Labour Market and Societal Needs

The programme has a functioning advisory board and there is continuous scoping of the labour market and the national and societal needs, where appropriate for the programme type, to ensure the relevancy and currency of the programme.

Judgment: Addressed

- The BSID programme has a functioning External Advisory Board, which comprises current design professionals. They are evenly split between genders and at least one is also an alumnus, a practice that adds value to the perspectives present on the board [SM195]. The purpose and functions of the Board are clearly laid out by AU and in the interview the members indicated that they were aware of their roles. The Board members hold meetings once per semester, and apart from other engagements, they give feedback to the programme, provide workshops to students, are invited as guest jurors, especially to review the capstone project, and might join the 'pool' of companies offering internships to BSID students.
- Contributions to the programme by the External Advisory Board were confirmed during interviews and discussed in the minutes of meeting of June 2022, where the topics debated reflected the robust engagement of the Board in various ways within the programme review; the input on an upcoming survey; proposals for new programmes and seminars; and jury participation in final design projects. Through the SER and in interviews, examples of external feedback informing the curriculum involve aligning software courses with professional certification, changing elective courses to required courses (interviewees cited a course on sustainability and on project management), and approaching Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning systems in a more holistic manner.
- The Panel finds that the interaction with stakeholders through various mechanisms ensures that the programme meets the labour market, and the national and societal needs. This includes surveys and site visits with internship supervisors, surveys and interactions with Alumni, and actions taken to understand the current market through a BSID Market Needs Analysis. As per the SER, the Market Needs Analysis is a comprehensive mechanism to obtain data regarding the market needs, including the regional market in both residential and commercial sectors, and was part of a periodic programme review, which resulted in several changes within the programme.
- During the faculty and students' interviews, the Panel found that the BSID programme had several real-world projects in different courses, such as working with IKEA and Salmaniya Hospital. The Panel is of the view that involving students with actual clients is another mechanism for understanding societal needs and ensure that the programme is relevant and up to date. Additionally, societal needs were approached from the perspective of the topics chosen for an AU developed research conference, 'Reimagining the Future of Design and Architecture: Creating a Sustainable Ecosystem, in collaboration with Worsen University, India, as noted in the SER. Moreover, during faculty interviews, the Panel asked if the programme had any Memorandum of Understanding or other formalised agreements with external entities who could contribute to programme enhancement in a more formalised way and was told that a few are in process, however, the regulatory framework in Bahrain is different and these Memorandums need approval from the HEC. The Panel appreciates the programme's solid process of seeking relevance

to both market and societal needs and the resulting benefit to improving the programme based on analysis.

- Overall, the Panel is of the view that the programme engages in various mechanisms to understand the current and future labour market and national and societal needs, all of which ensure that the programme remains relevant. By engaging in these processes, analysing the results, implementing changes based on them, and conducting regular assessment and periodic review as part of quality assurance processes, the programme is monitoring and reviewing the applied mechanisms.

IV. Conclusion

Taking into account the institution's own self-evaluation report, the evidence gathered from the interviews and documentation made available during the virtual site visit, the Panel draws the following conclusion in accordance with the DHR/BQA Academic Programme Reviews (Cycle 2) Handbook, 2020:

There is Confidence in the Bachelor's Degree in Interior Design of College of Arts and Science offered by the Ahlia University.

In coming to its conclusion regarding the four Standards, the Panel notes, with appreciation, the following:

1. The investment in new 3D software packages based on stakeholder feedback to enhance the students' experience and basic 3D CAD skills.
2. The comprehensive quality assurance mechanisms and systems that are in place and the sound understanding of these mechanisms and systems on the part of faculty and staff.
3. The sound implementation, monitoring and improving the annual and periodic review of activities.
4. The programme's solid process of seeking relevance to both market and societal needs and the resulting benefit to improving the programme based on analysis.

In terms of improvement, the Panel recommends that the Ahlia University should:

1. Revise the Student Handbook to ensure that it clearly describes all the admission criteria and requirements.
2. Reduce the faculty teaching load to enable them to fulfil the responsibilities of their administrative position and to increase the time spent by the faculty on research and community engagement
3. Increase the number of full-time faculty who hold a degree in Interior Design or has a major experience in Interior Design to enhance the programme delivery.
4. Ensure that the student satisfaction surveys include all the support services provided to students.
5. Review its practices regarding the policies and procedures of academic integrity to match the 15% similarity index accepted, limit the number of allowed resubmissions and clarify the warnings and penalties in related policies.

6. Ensure that 20% of the courses are moderated annually, and review the weighted value associated with student work that qualifies for internal and external moderation.
7. Review the Internship Guidelines to conceal the discrepancy between section 1.1 ('2 credits compulsory internship course') and section 1.4 ('the internship course is 3 credits').
8. Conduct the analysis of the students' progression at the cohort level to better understand if there are any underlying issues with progression and graduation times.
9. Improve its surveys by adding write-in comments and simultaneously formalise the informal/in-person feedback as they are also extremely useful points of data collection.