



Policy Document on Assessment of Program Educational Objectives and Program Benchmark in Higher Quality Accredited Institutions

Christo Ananth¹

College of Engineering, AMA International University, Bahrain¹

Abstract: This Policy record guarantees that all its program contributions are fit-for reason and that its alumni are suitably utilized and have the learning, aptitudes and abilities expected of their particular program. All program instructive destinations ought to be adjusted to the Institutional Vision and Mission just as to the Colleges' objectives and goals. This arrangement archive and methods give the vital data to the Assessment and Evaluation of the Program Educational Objectives. This strategy and strategies necessitate that appraisal and assessment of Program Educational Objectives are accomplished for all program contributions yearly for alumni of at any rate three (3) years for undergrad and in any event two (2) years for alumni programs. This Policy Document additionally guarantees to direct customary benchmark for the scholastic projects inside the schools so as to guarantee that the offered projects are state-of-the-art, lined up with the market needs and reasonable with the neighborhood, local and global gauges and references. The strategy record covers the guidelines and procedure of both formal and casual benchmark and characterizes real criteria to be seen during a program benchmark. The arrangement report expects to guarantee that all program formal and casual benchmark exercises are directed in cognizant manner with the prescribed procedures. Benchmark exercises are checked and directed by the depicted procedure and watch the general objectives as referred to inside the policy document.

Keywords: Higher Quality Accredited Institutions, Teaching, Learning & Assessment, Program Educational Objectives, Program Benchmark

I. INTRODUCTION

Reliable and productive usage of this strategy and techniques is the duty of the Dean, in a joint effort with the Placement, Co-appointment and Alumni Office. The Head of the Placement, Co-appointment and Alumni Office is entrusted to assemble information from both the alumni and the businesses of the alumni. The College Committee for Program Educational Objectives Assessment and Evaluation is entrusted to unite the reports from these two workplaces and give the assessment results to the Dean. Program Educational Objectives are wide explanations that depict what graduates are relied upon to accomplish inside a couple of long periods of graduation. They depend on the requirements of the program's bodies electorate. Appraisal is at least one procedures that recognize, gather, and set up the information fundamental for assessment. Assessment is at least one procedures for deciphering the information obtained however the evaluation forms so as to decide how

well the program instructive goals and understudy results are being achieved. School Committee on Program Educational Goals Assessment and Evaluation is a board of trustees made out of employees, set up in every College to guarantee that the appraisal and assessment of program instructive destinations are executed as planned. Arrangement, Co-appointment and Alumni Office is a scholastic help unit which is entrusted to monitor the alumni of the University, and fills in as the connection between the University and the alumni, and supervises the College's business connection programs and to liaise with the business for the understudies' practicum and occupation position. Benchmarking is the way toward contrasting ones' practices, methodologies, arrangements and procedures to the best associations in a similar industry Deans, Associate Deans and Department heads are in charge of the direct of benchmarking or required reference guides fundamental toward guarantee accomplishment of value yield on their zones of duty.



II. ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION PROCEDURES

The Assessment of the Program Educational Objectives incorporates the readiness of the study instrument, distinguishing proof of respondents, lead of the study and the assemblage of the study results. The College readies the review instrument to evaluate the fulfillment of the Program Educational Objectives. The study instruments are submitted and imparted to the Head of the Placement, Co-appointment and Alumni Office. The Head of the Placement, Co-appointment and Alumni Office distinguishes the rundown of respondents for the 2 reviews. He oversees the Alumni Survey Questionnaire to the alumni of the program (3 years after graduation for the Bachelor and 2 years after graduation for the Master), and the Employer Survey Questionnaire to the businesses of the said alumni. The Head of the Placement, Co-appointment and Alumni Office groups and outlines the aftereffects of the overview and presents the report, together with the cultivated study instruments to the College. The assessment of the Program Educational Objectives lays on the College Committee for Program Educational Objectives Assessment and Evaluation. The Committee thinks about and breaks down the outcomes and settles on the portion of weights to each studies dependent on the quantity of respondents and the nature of overview turn-outs and finishes up regarding what degree the Program Educational Objectives are accomplished on the built up agreeable criteria. The Committee presents the Program Educational Objectives Evaluation Report to the College Dean and Department Head to close the procedure of the Program Educational Objectives assessment. The report of the Committee spreads point by point investigation of the aftereffects of the Program Educational Objectives assessment, which incorporates among others diagrams, tables, and rounded out study structures. The report incorporates proposals and suggestions, which the Committee feels, are required as a major aspect of the ceaseless quality improvement. All the more critically, the Committee features in the report the level

of which the Program Educational Objectives are accomplished. A duplicate of the report is additionally given to the Curriculum Review Committee and the Committee for Continuous Quality and Improvement. Quality Records incorporate Alumni Survey Instrument and Employer Survey Instrument. This Document is dispersed to Deans, Placement, Co-appointment and Alumni Office, Overall

Academic Dean and Head of Quality Assurance and Accreditation Office.

III. BENCHMARKING PROCEDURES

A. Informal Benchmarking

The casual benchmark is prescribed to be directed to synchronize with the program audit and at whatever point fundamental. The casual benchmark considers openly accessible, non-secured information and data accessible on site, diaries, open correspondences and other shared data with no non-divulgence understandings. This will be finished with 3 colleges, 1 global, 1 territorial and 1 neighborhood college. The Department Head in a joint effort with the Curriculum Review Committee (school level) start the activity of the casual benchmark by distinguishing the comparative program to be benchmarked with. The ID procedure closes with the accommodation of a far reaching report defending the decisions for endorsement by the school committee. The accompanying criteria ought to be considered during the distinguishing proof stage: Preference is given to college/schools having over 20 years of presence. Inclination is given to comparable program running since over 05 years. When affirmed, the Department Head can command the Curriculum Review Committee or structure a council to experience in a joint effort with the Curriculum Review Committee. The casual benchmark including the accompanying significant advances:

- 1) Benchmark territory and objectives: contingent upon the key direction and desire for the office the advisory group will obviously distinguished the zone to benchmark with just as the objectives of the benchmark

- 2) Benchmark required information: in view of thing (a), the board of trustees will recognize and gather the accompanying: (1) Internal required information for benchmark, (2) External required information for benchmark

- 3) Benchmark examination: subsequent to gathering the required information the council is entrusted to investigate, think about and assess the accessible data. Immaculate coordination is required with the Department Head, specialization organizers and course facilitators.

- 4) Benchmark Report: Office Head shapes a board on casual benchmarking following the endorsement organize. The board of trustees needs to present the benchmark report for discourse to the concerned office committee just as the school chamber. If there should arise an occurrence of any suggestions and remarks the board is entrusted to modify the benchmark report before returning to the College Council and later for accommodation for conclusive endorsement



B. Formal Benchmarking

The Department head will experience a qualification investigation of the program for formal benchmark. A program may demand for a formal benchmark in the wake of checking the accompanying criteria and presenting a qualification study demonstrating the accompanying: The program has at any rate two bunches of alumni. The formal benchmark can be led with a base recurrence of one formal benchmark at regular intervals. There are accessible input from outer analysts and outside partners. The Department Head presents the qualification prerequisites with a letter of aim for a formal benchmark to the College Council for endorsement. The College Council may request further explanation and may endorse/return the solicitation for formal benchmark. The solicitation is displayed by the Dean to the College Council for endorsement. The solicitation must be given a draft of the mentioned spending plan. The Dean as a team with the Department Head, proposes a Formal Benchmark Committee and submit it for endorsement to the Overall Academic Dean. When affirmed by the Overall Academic Dean, the Formal Benchmark Committee needs to distinguish the focused on program/organization. The Formal Benchmark Committee will present the recognized establishment/program for three degree of endorsement: (1) College Level, (2) Academic Council level, (3) President Level. When endorsed by the President, the Formal Benchmark Committee will begin the formal benchmark as portrayed underneath: With a non-accomplice college, the Formal Benchmark Committee should organize with the Dean and the Overall Academic Dean office the foundation of a general and additionally explicit MOU with the recognized organization.

Secrecy and non-exposure understandings between the two organizations ought to be drafted, endorsed (College level, Academic Council level and President Level). When the MOU and the privacy understandings are marked, the Formal Benchmark Committee begins following a similar benchmark ventures as the one portrayed for the casual benchmark guaranteeing that any traded information with the accomplice establishment is secured by a formal non-divulgence secrecy trade process. The formal benchmark investigation result must be submitted to the school, scholastic board, president endorsement before any scattering correspondence or use. The accomplice may request to approach the benchmark result once affirmed by the President.

C. Benchmarking Area

In the program level, the accompanying information and yield measures for benchmarking might be considered, the Department Head with the planned board may think about extra/unique region: Program Description, Program Outcome(s)/Student Outcome(s), Mode of Study, Teaching Learning Approach, Intended Learning Outcomes, Program Infrastructure, Curriculum Structure, Faculty Credentials, Assessment Methods, Evaluation Methods, Extension Programs, Student-Faculty Ratio, Faculty Research Outputs, Student Research Outputs, Various study results, Other significant measure(s) essential in the accomplishment of the program results. Formal benchmark report must be submitted to the school to fill in as contribution to the program audit. It must be submitted to the Academic Council to fill in as contribution for the Curriculum Oversight Committee. Spread of the data on the aftereffect of benchmarking report must be endorsed by the President. Quality Records incorporate Program Specifications, Faculty Profile, Program Review Report, Survey Results, Benchmark Report. These archives are circulated to Head of Administration, Overall Academic Dean and Head of Quality Assurance and Accreditation

IV. CONCLUSION

This Policy report infers that all its program contributions are fit-for reason and that its alumni are fittingly utilized and have the information, abilities and capabilities expected of their particular program. All program instructive destinations ought to be adjusted to the Institutional Vision and Mission just as to the Colleges' objectives and targets. This approach report and methods give the vital data to the Assessment and Evaluation of the Program Educational Objectives. This arrangement and methods necessitate that appraisal and assessment of Program Educational Objectives are accomplished for all program contributions yearly for alumni of in any event three (3) years for undergrad and in any event two (2) years for alumni programs. This Policy Document likewise guarantees to lead customary benchmark for the scholarly programs inside the schools so as to guarantee that the offered projects are cutting-edge, lined up with the market needs and cognizant with the nearby, local and worldwide norms and references. The strategy record covers the guidelines and procedure of both formal and casual benchmark and characterizes significant criteria to be seen during a program benchmark. The strategy record expects to guarantee that all program formal and casual benchmark exercises are led in reasonable manner with the



accepted procedures. Benchmark exercises are checked and directed by the depicted procedure and watch the general objectives as referred to inside the arrangement record.

REFERENCES

- [1] Hall, K., Webber, B., Varley, S., Young, V., & Dorman, P. (1997). A study of teacher assessment at key stage 1. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 27(1), 107-122.
- [2] Hargreaves, A., Moore, S., & James-Wilson, S. (1997). *How teachers deal with secondary school change*. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto.
- [3] Harrison, C., Black, P.J., Hodgen, J., & Serret, N. (2007). *Strengthening Teacher Assessment Practices*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois, April 9-13 2007
- [4] Hattie, J., & Jaeger, R. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning: A deductive approach. *Assessment in Education: principles, policy & practice*, 5(1), 111-122.
- [5] Hofkins, D. (2004). Is SAT-free the answer? *Times Educational Supplement* (4584), 22.
- [6] James, M., Black, P., McCormick, R., Pedder, D., & Wiliam, D. (2006). Learning how to learn, in classrooms, schools and networks: Aims, design and analysis. *Research Papers in Education*, 21(2), 101-118.
- [7] King, D. (2005). Position paper: Consistency of teacher judgement for years 1 to 10 in Lutheran schools: Sharing understandings - developing professionalism: Lutheran Education Queensland.
- [8] Linn, R. L. (1993). Linking results of distinct assessments. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 6(1), 83-102.
- [9] Linn, R. L., & Baker, E. L. (1993). Comparing results from disparate assessments. *The CRESST Line*, Winter, 1-2.
- [10] Lowery, V. (2006). Consistency of teacher judgement - it's a bit tricky in a small school: NSW Department of Education and Training.