Centre for Measurement and Evaluation (CME) Manual - Version 2.0

Ref: UC/ P 695/2024

As approved by University Council Decision No. UC/2521/09/2023-24 of meeting No. UC/09/2023-24 held on Wednesday the 24th of April 2024.

This document is to supersede the previous manual for the Centre for Measurement and Evaluation (CME) as contained in the University Council approved document carrying reference number UC/P 263/2017.

Centre for Measurement and Evaluation (CME) Manual - Version 2.0

1. Introduction

The purpose of the Centre for Measurement and Evaluation (CME) Policy and Procedure Manual (V2) is providing a comprehensive guideline for collecting stakeholders feedback that is utilised for evaluating university operations in line with the University Strategic Objectives. The manual is developed to act as a guideline for the academic and administrative units while conducting a different type of evaluations through qualitative or administrative surveys, research-based market studies to assess and evaluate the extent of key performance indicators (KPIs) derived from university strategic plan and to facilitate decision making as part of academic programmes periodic reviews. This document was developed in line with national and international standards including the General Institutional Framework by HEC/BQA as well as United Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) to maintain sustainability of academic standards and United Nations Education Scientific and Cultural Organizations (UNESCO) Principles. The main purpose of the manual is developing clear framework to:

- To set various approaches and mechanisms used to elicit stakeholder feedback and promote clear measurement and evaluation tools used for collecting stakeholder feedback through quantitative and qualitative methodologies.
- To provide stakeholder's-based reports and analysis leading to facilitate decision-making towards quality improvement at different academic and administrative levels.
- To provide a clear structure of survey administration procedures including communicating improvement to stakeholders.
- To promote fair and transparent faculty evaluation through faculty evaluation policy statements and procedures; faculty evaluation criteria; and faculty evaluation appeal procedure.

National Alignment

- Higher Education Council Strategy
- Bahrain Economic Vision 2030
- Institutional Accreditation Standards for Higher Education Council
- Bahrain Education and Training Quality Authority Quality Assurance Standards for Institutional and Academic Programme Reviews
- National Qualification Framework Standards for local and cross-border qualifications

International Alignment

- United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (UNSDGs) – SDG 4 Quality Education
- United Nations Education Scientific and Cultural Organizations (UNESCO)

2. Centre for Measurement and Evaluation (CME) Roles and Responsibilities

CME was established with a main role to support academic and administrative staff by conducting different evaluation tools to assess the extent of stakeholder satisfaction as part of measurement of the effectiveness. CME roles and responsibilities are:

- Supporting academic and administrative units to generate analysis reports based on both quantitative data (i.e., via surveys) and qualitative data (i.e., via focus groups, roundtable consultations or advisory boards) collected from internal and external stakeholders.

- Developing measurement tools used to collect stakeholder feedback are both missions driven, and sustainability driven. Thus, ensuring that the academic and administrative units align the achievement for their KPIs with the university's strategic plan.

- Conducting surveys on cycles-basis or additional requests made by the concerned channels and generating analysis reports that are communicated to the relevant channels for decision-making purposes, utilisation of feedback and loop closure.

- Conducting market needs analysis (MNA) which assesses the relevancy of market needs and employability skills. The MNA is conducted in coordination with the departments and colleges to capture the needs of the market in terms of competency and employability skills requirements.

- Producing reports to support periodic reviews, new proposed programmes, for justification the need of currently offered programme and identification of employability skills and competency.

- Conducting the process of annual overall faculty evaluation process, faculty evaluation is summarised and communicated to faculty and relevant channels for improvements.

3. Identified Stakeholders

AU believes in engagement with all stakeholders and gauging feedback that is utilised towards continuous improvements, the identified stakeholders may include but not limited to:

- AU Students including students studying as part of Cross Border programmes.
- Employers of AU Graduates
- External Advisory Board Members
- Alumni
- Faculty Members (Including Members from all academic ranks, Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors and Lecturers)
- Heads and Directors of Administrative Units
- Senior Management
- Board of Directors and Board of Trustees Members
- Administrative Staff
- Affiliates or collaborating organisations/institutions.

4. Academic and Administrative Measurement Tools

CME is responsible to work closely with Academic & Administrative units to develop and conduct all kinds of quantitative and qualitative tools for the collection of data relevant to the domain covering the core functions of AU. The reports could be generated in different forms including (surveys, consultation forum reports, interview-based reports etc.). The summary of the analysis of the reports are used to support further improvement and decision making by relevant channels that contribute towards institutional effectiveness.

4.1 Survey Development and Administration Procedures

The main purpose of this procedure is to develop a clear guideline to be followed while developing/conducting a survey related to academic and administrative units. The role of CME is to coordinate work closely with all Academic and Administrative units to customise and develop required methods to collect stakeholder input that serve various needs of the functions of the university that could be used for decision making and improvements by the relevant channels.

The surveys will be conducted based on CME procedures that is focused on the four stages as stated below:

Table 1: Stages of the CME Survey Development and Administration	
Stage	**Expected Deliverables**
Stage 1 Questionnaire Design	• The survey will be designed by the survey owner in consultation with the Director of the CME to agree on the methodology of data collection and verification of measurement. • The owner must ensure that the survey is covering all the required needs and proceed with approvals as per the authorised channels and university council. • Surveys and other qualitative measurement tools are reviewed on cycle basis or as needed by concerned colleges Academic & Administrative Units.
Stage 2 Approval by Relevant Channels	• The relevant channels such as department council, college council, admin directorates and university council will review the content of the submitted survey and provide feedback (if any) in terms of the content.
Stage 3 Data Collection Stage	• The CME is responsible for data collection from the relevant stakeholders using various methods as it deems appropriate. • In case it is based on interviews, CME will arrange for a round table consultation forum in coordination with the survey owner to invite the target audience.
Stage 4 Data and Measurement Evaluation	• The collected data will be measured and analysed by CME. • CME will generate a measurement report that will be forwarded to the concerned academic and admin units to facilitate decision-making at different operational levels. • A copy of the survey will be communicated to the President for reference.

4.2 Criteria for Selecting Survey Participants

CME employs the stratified sampling method to select survey participants. The stratified sampling methods allows for dividing the samples into sub-samples based on their (major, programme, year, etc.). In the process of data collection, the CME usually aims to attain a minimum of 20 % response rate given the size of the population of stakeholders. The selection of participants is made by targeting the right audience as classified below for external stakeholders:

External Stakeholders	Inclusion Criteria for Data Collection
Employers of the Graduates	• Selection is made based on direct employers of the graduates that are in the specialisation of the field of the study. • Data of the employers are generated from AU destination list that is maintained by Directorate of Professional Relations • The data collection is conducted for recent cohorts as agreed with the survey owners (with a consideration of duration last 5 years)
Alumni	• Selection is made based on Alumni that proceeded to employment, further study or business owners. • Data of the alumni are generated from AU destination list that is maintained by Directorate of Professional Relations • The data collection is conducted for recent cohorts as agreed with the survey owners (with a consideration of duration last 5 years)
Internship Site Supervisors	• Selection is made directly through the line managers that supervisors Internship during the internship period (following the internship guideline) • Data is obtained from Directorate of Professional Relations
Other surveys conducted by stakeholders; the target audience area clearly defined such as college external advisory board members as per UC approved decision. Faculty of AU and Students. The surveys ensures that there is institutionalisation across the data collection and a mix of gender to maintain gender equality as well as diversity.	

4.3 Survey Validity and Reliability

The CME develops survey questions in collaboration with the survey owners (both academic and administrative). The surveys are developed considering the university's mission and the units' goals. Following the initial development of the questions, the survey is reviewed by the concerned councils and channels to ensure validity. Additionally, surveys are conducted on a cycle-basis and distributed to the intended sample of stakeholders. This allows the CME to check its clarity, readability, feasibility, and suitability for future cycles. The CME further collects feedback from stakeholders regarding the difficulty and length of the surveys, whereby it considers amendments to future cycles where necessary. The same can be discerned in term of reliability of the responses, whereby to ensure internal consistency, reliability is checked for through statistical tests as well as from previous cycles. If any questions show inconsistency in terms of one cycle to the next, the point is raised to survey owners, and they are encouraged to change the question.

4.4 University wide Surveys in line with AU Strategic Plan 2021-2025

CME will conduct the surveys as per Table (3) in line with Ahlia University strategic plan KPIs. CME director will be coordinating with the owners of the surveys to establish the process as per CME development and administrative procedure (Table 1). Table 3 describes KPI-related surveys and other university-wide surveys. It further illustrates the frequency of survey conduction, the targeted samples, and the purpose for conducting each survey.

No	Survey title	Level	Frequency of survey conduction	Targeted Sample	Purpose	Owner	Design Stage	Data Collection Stage	SDG Alignment
	Table 3: KPI-Related Surveys derived from AU Strategic Plan 2021-2025								
1	Students Satisfaction (three-in-one)	College/ programme level	Every year	AU enrolled students	To measure student satisfaction rate with their learning experience	College/ Department	Department Council/ College Council	CME	SDGs 3, 4, 8, 9, 10
2	Staff Satisfaction: Faculty satisfaction Administrative staff satisfaction	University Wide	Every year	AU academic staff	To measures Ahlia staff satisfaction with their experience at the university.	CME	TLAC for Academic Staff in coordination with CME HR Director for Admin Staff in coordination with CME	CME	SDGs 3, 5, 8, 9, 10, 16
3	Student Satisfaction with facilities: Library ICT Website ADREG	University wide	Every year	AU enrolled students	to measure satisfaction rate of students with campus facilities and Support services	CME	Survey Owner + Deans of Colleges	CME	SDGs 3, 4, 5, 10
4	Staff Satisfaction with facilities: Library ICT Website ADREG	University wide	Every year	AU staff	to get feedback from Ahlia staff on their satisfaction with AU facilities and Support services	CME	Survey Owner + TLAC	CME	SDGs 3, 4, 5, 10
5	Employers Satisfaction	College/ programme level	Every year	Employers of AU graduates	To measure their satisfaction rate with their job performance and graduate attributes (per programme).	Deanship of Student Affairs+ CME	Department Council/ College Council	Professional Relations in coordination with Deans of Colleges	SDG4,10

6	Student Exit Satisfaction	University wide/Programme level	Every year (filled upon graduation) Analysed in the summer semester	AU graduates (taking into consideration other colleges requirements)	To measure the satisfaction of AU graduates with their overall learning experience	Deanship of Student Affairs+ CME	Deans	Deanship of Student Affairs	SDGs 3, 4, 8, 9, 10
7	Student Satisfaction with Internship and career services	College/ programme level	Every year	AU enrolled students	To measure the satisfaction of students with internship and career services	Deanship of Student Affairs+ CME	Department Council/ College Council	Professional Relations in coordination with Deans of Colleges	SDG4, 8, 9, 10
8	External Advisory Board Satisfaction with programmes	College/ programme level	Upon request	AU advisory board members	To measure the satisfaction rate of the college external advisory board per programme	College + CME	Department Council/ College Council	College Administrators	SDG4, 9, 10
9	Internship site supervisor satisfaction survey	College/ programme level	Every year	Internship site supervisors	To measure the satisfaction rate of internship site Supervisors with employability skill and graduates' attributes	CME and Professional relations + CME	Department Council/ College Council	Professional Relations in coordination with Deans of Colleges	SDG4, 9, 10
10	Alumni Follow-up survey.	College/ programme level	Every year)	AU alumni	To measure the satisfaction rate of the alumni with their programme and learning experience per cohort.	Deanship of Student Affairs+ CME	Department Council/ College Council	Professional Relations in coordination with CME	SDG4, 9, 10
11	Special needs students' survey on AU Services	University Wide	Every 2 years	AU special needs students	To measure Ahlia special needs student's satisfaction with the provided services.	Deanship of Student Affairs+ CME	Deanship of student affairs in consultation with the CME	Deanship of student affairs	SDG4, 5, 10
12	Study abroad exit survey	Study abroad students	Every year Summer	AU exchange students	to measure the satisfaction of Ahlia exchange students with their learning experience at Ahlia.	International Relations + CME	Directorate of International Relations	Directorate of International Relations	SDG4, 5, 17

Other surveys/evaluation reports can be conducted upon request include periodic review-related surveys, new programme surveys (i.e. justification of needs with stakeholders), and any other qualitative-based analysis.

4.5 Procedure for Utilisation of Stakeholder Feedback and Communication of Improvements

- CME in coordination with CAQA and Strategic Planning Directorate develops and shares with the President regular reports detailing surveys conducted including the recommendable actions for improvement to facilitate the President decision making.
- In this regard the President's office forwards a memo with recommendable actions, provided by CME, and approved by the President, for discussion at the department/college/ relevant units and the integration of the actions within the annual operational plans.
- The Director of Strategic Planning will ensure that the recommendations are integrated within the operational plan and regular monitoring will be conducted as part of the operational plan progress reporting.
- Regular monitoring by CAQA and Strategic Planning Directorate will be conducted in terms of implementation of the actions and reported to University Strategic Planning Committee (USPC) in terms of effective for utilisation of actions and quality loop closure.
- The concerned academic and administrative units are responsible for communicating any improvements made to the internal and external stakeholders. Activities for communicating improvements are to be integrated in the operational plan.

4.6 Stakeholder Engagement and Communications:

CME in coordination with Strategic Planning Directorate and Centre for Accreditation and Quality Assurance will work in collaboration to capture stakeholders' feedback through multiple means including surveys, consultation forums etc. During the mid-cycle and periodic review cycle strategic planning directorate will communicate to stakeholders' major achievement of the strategic and obtain feedback for future planning.

In terms of academic programmes, the improvements are communicated by the colleges through various means including website content, fact sheet and other relevant materials defining QA loop closure and improvements.

5. **Procedure for conducting Market Needs Analysis (MNA)**

CME will be conducting Market Needs Analyses (MNA) which assess the relevancy of market needs and employability skills. There are two types of market needs analysis (1) university-wide conducted on annual basis (2) programme level conducted as per the periodic cycle. In addition, CME could support any additional requests by the colleges related to (1) development of new proposed programmes (2) for justification the need of the programme and continuation for currently operated programme.

The scope of the MNA goes beyond a need's justification study. It includes identifying the target markets, analysing competitive environment, undertaking secondary research (reports, journal articles, news), conducting primary research (quantitative or qualitative) involving stakeholders, recognising the latest trends and employability skills in the labour market, examining news in areas related to the programme as well as determining job vacancies and defining key skills competency. This helps to identify gaps in the market by investigating the local market needs in line with the latest global trends.

Upon conduction of the MNA, the CME communicates the report to the relevant units for discussion at the department/college/ and the integration of their actions within their quality improvement plans.

6. Annual Overall Faculty Evaluation Policy and Procedures:

6.1 Purpose

The purpose of this section is to state AU's policy and procedure followed in implementing the annual overall faculty evaluation by CME based on the centre's operations derived from the strategic plan 2021-2025.

6.2 Policy Statements

Providing annual overall faculty evaluation results will assist in staff development. CME is responsible for conducting and monitoring annual overall faculty evaluations and the online student evaluation according to the Table 4:

No.	Evaluation	Level	Time Frame	Owner	Review
1	Online Instructor and Course Evaluation	University wide	First and second semester (4 weeks before the end of the semester)	ADREG Team + CME	Every 5 years or when applicable
2	Annual overall faculty Evaluation	University wide	Every year	CME	Every 5 years or when applicable

6.3 Annual Overall faculty evaluation Procedures – Annual Basis

CME facilitate the conduction of Annual Overall Faculty Evaluation process which are usually distributed at the outset of the calendar year and completed by the end of the semester. The below table demonstrates the flow of the annual overall faculty evaluation process:

Table 5: Process Flow of the Annual Overall Faculty Evaluation		
No.	Process Flow	Schedule
1	Distribution of Annexure 1 (Self-Evaluation Report) to full-time faculty members of AU through the ADREG system.	Distributed annually through ADREG.
2	Instructor to complete their Self-Evaluation Form (Annexure 1)	Instructors have 4 weeks to complete the SEF report. The evaluators will be notified once each instructor completes the SEF.
3	Chairperson to fill Annexure 2 and Chairperson's part in Annexure 8 for all instructors in the Department. *This process should go in parallel with all other annexures and evaluators.*	The Chairperson will be able to start evaluating once notified and has 4 weeks to complete evaluation.
4	Dean of the College to fill Annexure 4 and Dean's part in Annexure 8 for all instructors in the College. *This process should go in parallel with all other annexures and evaluators.*	The Dean of the College will be able to start evaluating once notified and has 4 weeks to complete evaluation.

5	Dean of Graduate Studies and Research to fill Annexure 4 and his/her part in Annexure 8 for all instructors in all Colleges. *This process should go in parallel with all other annexures and evaluators.*	The Dean of Graduate Studies and Research will be able to start evaluating once notified and has 4 weeks to complete evaluation.
6	Executive Director of CAQA to fill Annexure 6A for all instructors of all Colleges (Also Annexure 6B should be filled in addition to Annexure 6A in case the instructor happens to be a chairperson). In addition, the Executive Director of CAQA also fills his/her part in Annexure 8 for all instructors of all Colleges. *This process should go in parallel with all other annexures and evaluators.*	The Executive Director of CAQA will be able to start evaluating once notified and have 4 weeks to complete evaluation.
7	VP for Academic Affairs to fill Annexure 7 and his/her part in Annexure 8 for all instructors in all Colleges. *This process should go in parallel with all other annexures and evaluators.*	The VP for Academic Affairs will be able to start evaluating once notified and has 4 weeks to complete evaluation.
8	The President to approve the annual overall-faculty and his/her part in Annexure 8 evaluation for all instructors in all Colleges.	The President will be able to approve the overall-faculty evaluation forms once notified.

6.4 Distribution of Faculty Evaluation Scores and Criteria:

The overall faculty evaluation is based on multiple components including the online student evaluation (30%), research (20%), vice president's evaluation (5%), dean's evaluation (15%), chairperson's evaluation (20%), and Centre of Accreditation and Quality Assurance evaluation (10%). A description of the calculation for each score is provided in the following table:

Table 6: Distribution of Faculty Evaluation Scores and Criteria			
Annexure	**Evaluator**	**Points**	**Score Calculation**
Annexure 2	**Department Chairperson**	**20**	The evaluation of the faculty by the Chairperson is worth 20 points and is divided into four parts: 1. Teaching and Learning (7 points) 2. Contribution to University Service (department/college/university) (5 Points) 3. Contribution to Research and Intellectuality (4 points) 4. Contribution to the Community Engagement (4 points)
Annexure 3	**Students**	**30**	The online instructor and score are worth 30 points and is the average of the instructor's overall online evaluation score for semester 1and semester 2 of the academic year of evaluation.
Annexure 4	**Dean of the College**	**15**	The evaluation of the faculty by the Dean is worth 15 points and is divided into two parts: 1. College Committees and Activities (3 points)

			2. Other contributions (12 points)
Annexure 5	**Dean of Graduate Studies & Research**	**20**	The evaluation of the faculty by the Dean of Graduate research is worth 20 points and is based on: 1. Published in the last 5 years (excluding in the current year) (12 points) * 2. Published/accepted in the year of evaluation (8 points) * * Criteria for evaluation include citation and H index growth for published papers. This is detailed in the Appendix to the Annual Overall Faculty Evaluation Forms
Annexure 6	**Executive Director of CAQA**	**10**	**For Faculty members:** The evaluation of the faculty by the Executive Director of CAQA is worth 10 points and will depend on a review of one or more course file and the documented instructor file and CAQA's criteria. The score will be allocated based on compliance with the QA adapted standards as part of AUQMS. **For Chairpersons:** The evaluation of the faculty by the Executive Director of CAQA is worth 10 points. The score will be allocated based on compliance with the QA adapted standards as part of AUQMS for the CAQA's criteria.
Annexure 7	**VP for academic affairs**	**5**	The evaluation of the faculty by the VP for Academic Affairs is worth 5 points divided into two parts: 1. The effectiveness of the faculty members in the University Committees and the university activates at large. This is worth 1 point. 2. The efforts of the faculty in self-development worth 4 points divided equally among the three areas below: a) Teaching skills (1.5 points) b) Research skills (1.5 points) c) Technical skills (1 points) Faculty members are required to write the training taken or the self-acquired training they had in each of the three areas.
Overall		**100**	This score is the sum of the above scores.
A part of AU transparency, a detailed summary reports to individual faculty members and to the President of AU which will assist in staff development.			

6.5 Overall Faculty Evaluation Appeal Procedure

A faculty member may appeal their Annual Overall Faculty Evaluation where it is believed that the overall rating does not represent a true evaluation of the faculty's work performance during the evaluation period. To initiate an appeal, the faculty must give a formal appeal to the President of the University. The President shall call for and chair the university appeal's committee to review the case. The committee focuses on investigating and verifying complaints, reviewing evaluation forms and appeals made by the concerned faculty member.

The primary mandate of the committee is to look into the appeals and take the necessary actions needed to issue a way forward. The committee will issue its decision in a recommendation template that will be sent to the concerned faculty member. The formal appeal should state the faculty's intent to appeal and listing the specific parts of the evaluation summary report with which the faculty disagrees and explaining the nature and extent of the disagreement. Relevant supporting documentation and evidence should be submitted to the appeal's committee upon request.

7. **Review of the document and version control:**

This document is subjected for a review once every 5 years or whenever it is required.

Version	UC Reference	Approval Date
Version 1	UC/P 263/2017	30/10/2017
Version 2	UC/P 695/2024	24/04/2024