

# Workshop Activity Report – Day Two, Two Activities



## WORKSHOP ON QUALITY ASSURANCE STANDARDS IN HIGHER EDUCATION AND ACADEMIC ADVISING USING A.D.R.I MODEL

at College of Computer Science and IT

Report on Second Day Group Activities, held on  
Wednesday, March 2, 2011 ( 27/3/1432 H)

**Presented by M. Shahul Hameed,** MBA, M.Sc., CMA, CIA, CGEIT, CISA, CISM, ITIL, PMP, ISO27001LA,  
Advisor to Dean of Information Technology,

(Led the group discussions, recorded and presented the summaries to all members as the group leader for both the activities of day 2 on separate sessions)

# Contents



◆ Title ... ..	slide # 3
◆ Organizers and Facilitator ... ..	3
◆ Introducing My Group (for both the Activities) ...	4
◆ Workshop scenario & task given for Activity 1 of day 2	5
◆ Summary Response Presentation for Activity 1 of day 2	6-8
◆ Workshop scenario & task given for Activity 2 of day 2	9
◆ Summary Response Presentation for Activity 2 of day 2	10-12
◆ Thanks Giving	

# Title , The organizers and Facilitator



## Title (for the day 2)

'Academic Advising (using ADRI Model)'

## Organizers

- ◆ KFU Senior Management & Administration
- ◆ Deanship of Quality Assurance & Academic Accreditation

## Facilitated by

**Dr. Nasir Ahmad Khan**

HOD-Quality Assurance,

Mazoom University College, Muscat, Sultanate of Oman

# Introducing my group (same for both the activities)



Name	Email Id	Deanship/College
M. Shahul Hameed (leader)	shahul@kfu.edu.sa	Deanship of IT
Dr. Abuelhaj Zaid	abuelhajz@yahoo.com	Arts College
Dr. Ashraf Khalil	aakhalil@kfu.edu.sa	College of Clinical Pharmacy
Dr. Sahnoun Faidi	fsannun@kfu.edu.sa	MIS department
Dr. Ayman Abdel-Shafi	aabdelshafi@kfu.edu.sa	College of science
Dr. Jehad Abdallah Afaneh	jafaneh@kfu.edu.sa	College of Management Studies
Dr. Sobhy Sayed Ibrahim	isobhy@kfu.edu.sa	College of Science
Dr. Wael M-El Sayed El Halawany	waelhalawany@hotmail.com	College of Science - Biology
Dr. Khaled Khalil	kkhalil2002@hotmail.com	MIS – Business School

- The participants were divided into 4 groups, including female members.

# Workshop Activity 1 - Scenario & Task given for group discussion and summary presentation



## Scenario 1: Academic Advising

“We pay special attention to academic advising. Plans related to academic advising are constantly revised and modified in the light of the feedback received and problems encountered. The university administration allocates considerable time for discussing academic advising issue in various meetings at the beginning of each semester. All academic departments tackle realistic mechanisms of supervision to achieve the best results. To guarantee the flexibility and accuracy of advising, advisors are encouraged to meet with students on regular basis to discuss students’ academic progress and problems, if there are any.”

### Tasks:

- ◆ As a QA assessment unit member, what do you conclude about the scenario?
- ◆ Does it represent good practice? What improvements you can derive and suggest?
- ◆ If you are an external reviewer, what further information would you require? How would you get it?

Keeping the above scenario and questions in mind, our group discussed in detail and summarized for me to present to all the participants as well as for responding at the feedback questions by other participants. (30 minutes for activity plus 30 minutes for feedback session were

# Activity 1 - Summary Response Presentation: (1 of 3)



The group leader, M. Shahul Hameed, in his speech after Greetings, gave brief analysis of the scenario and the questions with highlights of the key points discussed during our group discussion. Key points are the following:

- ◆ In our group's view on the given scenario, we understood that the intention of use of ADRI model is visible to certain extent as there are statements mentioning about the intention of having a proper approach with policies revised, deployment of having meetings and involvement of all academic departments with realistic mechanisms of supervision and regular meetings.
- ◆ However, as a common response to the rest of the questions, we gave this brief presentation of the complete scenario in light of ADRI model and giving emphasis on the possible additional information that could have been useful to ensure the best practices is adapted adequately:
- ◆ APPROACH
  - Vision/Mission could be defined similar to the following statement:
  - "All the students are given adequate level of academic advises from the beginning till end, and also for taking the next step when exit the university"

# Activity 1 - Summary Response Presentation: (2 of 3)



## ◆ APPROCH (continued)

- Need to check if all mandatory policies and procedures as per best practices are included, depending on the statement of applicability – to be prepared and approved by the top management. This could include:
  - Clearly defined roles and responsibilities
  - Budget for people and other resources for maintaining the advisor/students ratio to the optimum level
  - Add/Drop policy
  - Policy for academic load reducing for under performing student, if required
- Target to be defined with SMARTR specifications with KPIs to be achieved plus ensuring that all faculty participate in the academic advising, updated contact list exists and meeting attendance logs are available for verification.

## ◆ DEPLOYMENT

- Ensure allocation of budget and utilization of the same appropriately for arriving at the required advisors/students ration to be maintained constantly
- Frequency of meetings (in the given scenario it exist) with adequate time given to each students.
- Ensure Subject Matter Expert committee available for the advisor and/or the student to refer for more specific technical details relating to career



# Activity 1 - Summary Response Presentation: (3 of 3)



## ◆ RESULTS

- Feedback from staff & students could be considered in additional forms other than questionnaires, such as discussion and analysis reports based on the students performance on subjects of their interest.
- Evidences of the stated facts that problems are handled efficiently need to be verified and Career guidance related activities reports to be looked at

## ◆ IMPROVEMENT

- All evidences must be documented
  - Seminars / course outline presentations could be arranged for students to understand well about the courses before taking a decision
  - Group discussions with regard to career and subject matters to be enabled
  - Relationship of marks obtained from the past papers need to be analysed with that of the newly proposed courses and subjects
  - Provisions for additional tutorials for students to be considered
  - Separation of overall achievers and under achievers into groups for stretching more (for the achievers) and for striving more for the under achievers.
- ◆ The above highlighted best practices, taking as a gap must be integrated in the current system. Thanks & Questions were discussed and answered.



# Workshop Activity 2 - Scenario & Task given for group discussion and summary presentation



## Scenario 2 – Staff Evaluation

As per the academic regulations and faculty handbook guidelines, the college has adopted the staff evaluation policy. The staff evaluation serves the basis for their annual appraisal. According to that policy, all staff participates in annual appraisal meeting with the Dean of college. The meeting provides opportunities to constructively discuss teaching effectiveness which involves many related issues such as instructional design, peer review, student evaluation and staff development needs. Aggregated results are used for annual appraisal system which claimed to be appropriately effective, constructive and fair. The model is consistent with best practices of staff performance evaluation.

### Tasks:

- ◆ As a QA assessment unit member, what do you conclude about the scenario?
- ◆ Does it represent good practice? What improvements you can derive and suggest?
- ◆ If you are an external reviewer, what further information would you require? How would you get it?

Keeping the above scenario and questions in mind, our group discussed in detail and summarized for me to present to all the participants as well as for responding at the feedback questions by other participants. (30 minutes for activity plus 30 minutes for feedback session were given)

# Activity 2 - Summary Response Presentation: (1 of 3)



The group leader, M. Shahul Hameed, in his speech after Greetings, gave brief analysis of the scenario and the questions with highlights of the key points discussed during our group discussion. Key points are the following:

- ◆ In our group's view, though the scenario touched upon certain key process for Staff Evaluation, there is no clear evidence of usage of ADRI like best practice in complete form, though it is strongly mentioned in the given statement that the model was consistent with best practices of staff performance evaluation – no name of the best practices was given.
- ◆ Our key questions would be to see the evidences of processes as per the ADRI model. Was the policy a latest updated one? What was the best practice used?. Was the evaluation a KPI based, 360 review, score card based. Whether the scholar level rating was also considered or not?
- ◆ As the outcome of our detailed analysis and review, including the complete walk through of the process in light of ADRI model, using the ADRI worksheet, we were able to explain the gaps and areas of concern that require attention and finally the improvement. Highlighted points are given below:

# Activity 2 - Summary Response Presentation: (2 of 3)



## ◆ APPROACH:

- Our model vision/mission statement would be highlighted as:  
'Continuous improvement in the teaching process through ongoing process of staff evaluation and follow-up of corrective actions.'
- Policies & procedures to be updated accordingly
- Target to be defined, taking into appropriate consideration of the KPIs required to improve the teaching quality.

## ◆ DEPLOYMENT

- Introducing with templates for students evaluation about staff (missing)
- Faculty's meeting with the dean should have clearly defined agenda and provision for faculty's appeal for any needed changes on the remarks provided
- Linking of students evaluation and deans evaluation of the faculty performance

## ◆ RESULT

- Aggregated results of the above should be compared with the target KPIs for further improvements prior to the performance appraisal is taking place.

# Activity 2 - Summary Response Presentation: (3 of 3)



IMPROVEMENT (the following shall be the outcome of a detailed review)

- Interim Performance Appraisal to be introduced at the middle of the year, i.e. well ahead of the annual performance is taking place. This will help the faculty to consider further striving or stretching to improve their performance prior to the final one.
- Introducing REWARD and RECOGNITION of achievers
- Right to appeal / confront at the beginning (when KPIs are set)
- Confidentiality of the faculty's performance ratings and comments to be maintained
- Balanced and achievable KPIs only to be enforced and may contain the following aspects: Research, Community Services, Administrative works and other demanded special services.
- The faculty's value based on qualification and experience (that helps in accreditation) must be given due weight within the appraisal.

**Thanks**



**We, take this opportunity to thank  
all hands and minds behind  
organizing this much valuable  
workshop, especially the facilitator,  
Dr. Nasir Ahmad Khan.  
Thank You!.**