

*Full Length Research Paper*

# Self assessment in higher education: An empirical evidence from the Department of Business Administration of Shahjalal University of Science and Technology, Bangladesh

Nazrul Islam\* and Mohmmad Ashraful Ferdous Chowdhury

Department of Business Administration, Shahjalal University of Science and Technology, Sylhet, Bangladesh.

Received 27 May, 2015, Accepted 11 August, 2015

The paper aimed to explore the self assessment practices in higher education in Bangladesh with special reference to Department of Business Administration of Shahjalal University of Science and Technology. For self assessment purpose the researchers have collected opinion from students, alumni, employer and faculty members on eight areas. In collecting data the study used a semi-structured questionnaire on four point scale . To test the internal consistency the researchers have used Cronbach's  $\alpha$  test of coefficient. The study found that the department is in very weak position almost in all aspects from all assessors. The study suggested to the concerned authority of the department to allocate sufficient fund and logistic facilities for the development of higher education of the department.

**Key words:** Self assessment, higher education, development of higher education.

## INTRODUCTION

Education is a form of learning in which the knowledge, skills, values, beliefs and habits of a group of people transformed from one generation to next generation through storytelling, discussion, teaching, training and research (Dewey and John, 1916, 1944). Higher education also called tertiary education started after completion of higher secondary education and it is provided by colleges and universities. It includes teaching, researches and, social activities at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. The goal of higher education is to help students develop into reflective

practitioners who are able to reflect critically upon their own professional practices (Schon, 1987; Falchikov and Boud, 1989; Kwan and Leung, 1995). Assessment in education is a systematic process of gathering, reviewing and using important quantitative and qualitative data and information from multiple and diverse sources about educational program for the purpose of improving teaching learning quality and capacity and evaluating whether academic and learning standard are being maintained through the program. It is a continuous effort like a watch dog. Self assessment (SA) is an appraisal

\*Corresponding author. E-mail: [dnislam69@yahoo.com](mailto:dnislam69@yahoo.com).

conducted by the institution or faculty or department to review whether the offered program(s) achieved the established objectives and meet the quality as demand by the market or users(employers) of the product (graduates). Its aim is to improve quality of the program and the quality and skills of the graduates ultimately. It is a continuous process for development which has no end. Boud (1995) identified two essential components of assessment viz. identification of standards and criteria for judging the quality of the work and the judgment on the extent to which the standards and criteria have been reached.

According to Andrade and Du (2007), "Self assessment is a process of formative assessment during which students reflect on and evaluate the quality of their work and their learning, judge the degree which they reflect explicitly stated goals or criteria, identify strengths and weaknesses in their work, and revise accordingly." The importance of SA to learning is recognized by many professions (Ahern, 2003). It has been highlighted as an essential component for the professional preparation of teachers (Bailey, 1981). Alternatives in assessment have received attention and different forms have been developed in higher education (Birenbaum and Dochy, 1996). The skill of self-, peer- and co-assessment is very important in the development of lifelong learning and the development of autonomous individuals (Sambell and McDowell, 1997).

The present paper is an empirical evidence of self SA of the department of business administration in Shahjalal University of Science and Technology (SUST), Bangladesh. SUST is a public university and the first by its nature in Bangladesh; it is located in Sylhet, a divisional city of the country occupying 130 hectors area; it has 9000 students in 25 departments under 7 schools of studies. Since the establishment in 1998-99 the Department of Business Administration has been offering four- year duration BBA and one- year duration MBA program in different areas of Business Education viz.(i) Accounting and Information Systems; (ii) Finance and Banking; (iii) Marketing; (iv) management; (v) Management Information Systems; and (vi) Human Resource Management. The department has produced around 600 graduates in 11 batches. Now it is offering three-semester long MBA with research, M. Phil and PhD also. There are 10 M. Phil and two PhD fellow in the department. For SA purpose a sub - project was submitted and finally awarded after scrutiny by University Grants Commission (UGC) of Bangladesh under Higher Education Quality Enhancement Project (HEQEP) entitled "Self Assessment for Department of Business Administration" firstly in the department and also in the university. The objectives of the sub-project were to- (i) design and review existing curricula and their contents; (ii) assess the existing teaching learning and assessment methods in the department for ensuring quality; (iii) assess

the quality of students and measuring their skills, progress and achievement in terms of employment needs; (iv) collect the feedback from the students regarding curriculum , teaching -learning and assessment methods; (v) assess the capabilities of imparting post graduate studies through SWOT analysis; (vi) exercise peer observation method for improving the teaching - learning methods;(vii)exercise academic guidance and counseling system for career development of students; (viii) prepare the department for achieving the international accreditation. The project helped in SA of the department and finally the authority has noticed to confiscate the weakness of the department for improving student learning capacity. Further through the sub project the researchers have learned how to make SA in higher education. It helped to improve the quality of teaching learning environment and finally the quality of the graduates will be enhanced.

## METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

For assessment purpose researchers have collected data from the students, faculty members, alumni and employer through separate semi structured questionnaire for each group. The questionnaires were prepared covering all relevant aspects of self assessment developed through different workshops and seminars on SA organized by UGC with faculties of universities of Bangladesh. The number of respondents was 207 in total consisting 147 students, 12 faculty members 29 alumni and 18 employers. Data has been collected through face to face interview by the researchers during three months period of time. Before collecting data four seminars were organized on different aspects of SA with all students, teachers and alumni. As SA is a new concept in Bangladesh we made understand the employers about SA through face to face conversation during data collection. The questionnaires were on four point likert scale where 1 assigned for strongly disagree, 2 for disagree, 3 for agree and 4 for strongly agree. Likert's scale was used in SA (Harrington, 1995). For assessment of reliability of questionnaires we used Cronbach's  $\alpha$ (alpha) test<sup>of</sup> coefficient of internal consistency. We know that if  $\alpha$  value is 0.90 or above then the reliability of assessment is excellent, if  $\alpha$  value is 0.80 to 0.89 then the reliability of assessment is good, and if  $\alpha$  value is 0.70 to 0.79 then reliability of assessment is acceptable.

## Area of self assessment

From the experience in different works and seminars in national and international areas, the researchers have identified the following areas of SA: (i) governance of university and department; (ii) curriculum design and

**Table 1.** Student's assessment on governance.

Questions on governance	No of respondents out of 147 in total				Total point	Average point
	1	2	3	4		
The vision, mission and goals of SUST are clear to me	5	24	88	30	437	2.97
The program objectives are clearly stated and known to all students	6	56	64	21	394	2.68
SUST website is informative and helpful to students	9	34	54	50	439	2.99
Academic environment management system is well organized and satisfactory	14	60	62	11	364	2.48
Academic progress documentation system is satisfactory	31	59	49	8	328	2.23
Average						2.67
Cronbach's $\alpha$ (alpha) test is not acceptable						0.40

Source: Produced from collected data.

content review; (iii) teaching-learning and learning evaluation; (iv) institutional structure and facilities; (v) student support, counseling and development; (vi) research and extension; (vii) process control; and (viii) peer observation .

## DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF COLLECTED DATA ON THE AREAS OF SELF ASSESSMENT

**Governance:** It means the administrative structure and decision making system in the university as well as in the department. Vice-chancellor(VC) is the is the full time chief executive officer in the university who is accountable to the Chancellor (The Honorable President of Bangladesh) while pro-vice-chancellor and the treasurer are his running mate. The syndicate is the top most executive body where VC is the chairman and the registrar is secretary by default in the university. All the financial decision, academic and administrative decision and rules are promulgated and approved by this body. The academic council (AC) is highest academic body of the university for formulating policy and methods/ techniques of teaching learning, research, curriculum, examination system of the university .All schools of studies, institutes, affiliated colleges and disciplines are accountable to this body for teaching learning, research, curriculum, examination and other academic activities where VC is the chair and the registrar is secretary by default. This body can propose for new department, institute, and research support to the syndicate. Board of Advanced Studies (BAS) is an academic body of postgraduate studies under the academic council under the chair of VC. School of Studies is another academic body chaired by dean of school .The school formulates and design curriculum and syllabus for the disciplines and recommend to AC and BAS for approval. Each department/discipline is the lowest but entity under the head of the department who is nominated by VC as per

ordinance of the university. The head of the discipline is responsible to the dean of the school and also the vice chancellor for the all administrative and academic activities. The head with all faculty members will design curriculum, formulate examination committee, graduate study committee following the ordinance. Further it may formulate others committee for running the department. The head should conduct all academic and administrative functions with the assistant of faculty members. The assessments on governance of students and faculty members is given in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1 clarifies that the scale point of governance is 2.67(66.75) on average. It shows that the average satisfactory level of the students on governance ranges between disagree and agree. The Cronbach's  $\alpha$ (alpha) test is not acceptable (0.40). The assessment by teachers on governance is given in Table 2.

Table 2 clarifies that the average scale point is 2.53(63%). Therefore the satisfactory level of organization and management is between agreeing and disagree. The Cronbach's  $\alpha$ (alpha) test is excellent (0.91). Therefore, the assessment on governance of both the students and faculty members lies between agreeing and disagree while the assessment is good or excellent.

**Curriculum design and content and review:** The curriculum design and content and review have been assessed by students, faculty members' alumni and employers. The collected data are depicted in Tables 3 and 4.

Table 3 shows that the average scale point of curriculum design and content analysis is 2.61(65%). The highest satisfaction of the students is on courses of the program. The range of satisfaction has been varied between 1.81 and 3.31. Therefore, students' satisfactory level lies between disagreeing and agree. Data from faculty members on curriculum design and content and review is given in Table 4.

Table 4 clarified that the average scale point on

**Table 2.** Assessment result on governance by faculty members.

Questionnaire	No of respondents total 13				Total point	Average point
	1	2	3	4		
The vision, mission and goals of SUST is clear to me	1	4	5	3	36	2.77
The current faculty selection procedure/recruitment system is satisfactory	6	2	4	1	26	2.00
The graduate catalogue is informative enough and well organized	3	5	2	3	31	2.38
Performance appraisal system of teachers from Dean and Department is good	4	5	3	1	27	2.08
The authority tries to maintain sound environment of teaching-learning	3	0	7	3	36	2.77
The authority always tries to maintain academic fairness and transparency at all level	2	2	7	2	35	2.69
Every newly recruited faculties require foundation training on teaching-learning	4	0	1	8	39	3.00
Every decision is taken through committee meeting	3	3	4	3	33	2.54
Average						2.53
Cronbach's $\alpha$ (alpha) test is excellent						0.91

Source: Produced from collected data.

**Table 3.** Student's assessment on curriculum design and content review.

Particulars	No of respondents out of 147 in total				Total Point	Average Point
	1	2	3	4		
Taken course is related to program	2	4	86	55	488	3.31
Present curriculum enables me to apply theory lessons in practical field area	9	50	69	19	392	2.67
Present curriculum enables to identify future Business needs	8	35	81	23	413	2.81
Present curriculum enables me in leadership skills	9	44	70	24	403	2.74
I am satisfied with the evaluation methods in the present curriculum	18	68	56	5	342	2.32
Students have every opportunity to give feedback on curriculum	27	80	33	7	314	2.14
Current curriculum is always reviewed by discussing with the students	56	60	24	7	276	1.88
Current curriculum content is at suitable level for further study	7	35	89	16	408	2.78
Current curriculum content is at suitable level for employment	8	37	82	20	408	2.61
Average Scale point						2.61
Cronbach's $\alpha$ (alpha) is 0.78						0.78

Source: Produced from collected data.

curriculum design, content and review is 2.61 (65%). Therefore the satisfactory level of work skill and teamwork is between agree and disagree. The Cronbach's  $\alpha$ (alpha) test is excellent (0.91). We have collected data from 29 members of alumni. The average assessment result is given in Table 5.

Table 5 portrayed that the assessment of alumni on curriculum and teaching learning is 2.14 (54%). The assessment on role of curricula in developing knowledge is 2.12 (53%). The role of curricula in developing communication skill has been assessed and is 2.64 (66%) and in while the assessments on role of curricula in developing inter personal skill and teamwork is 2.89 (72%). The assessment on role of curricula in developing leadership is 2.61 (65%). The overall assessment on curriculum is 2.48 (62%). It is observed that all the

test are excellent or good in terms of Cronbach's  $\alpha$  test. Therefore, the curriculum and teaching learning of the department is in poor position. We have collected data from the 18 employers of our graduates for overall assessment. The collected data is given in Table 6.

Table 6 clarified that the satisfaction scale of the employer ranged between 1.94 and 3.56 and on average 3.07. Therefore the employer's evaluation lies in agree to our graduates. Therefore the quality of our curriculum and teaching learning is good from employer perspective. Therefore we can say that the assessment of the employers is excellent.

**Assessment of teaching and learning and learning evaluation:** There are two parts in teaching-learning and learning assessment. One is teaching-learning and

**Table 4.** Assessment of teachers on curriculum design and content review.

Particulars	No of respondents out of 13 in total				Total Point	Average point
	1	2	3	4		
Present BBA curriculum is documented in written form	1	0	5	7	44	3.38
Current curriculum is reviewed regularly (5 years interval) by the dept.	1	1	5	6	42	3.23
Students' feedback on curriculum is regularly collected	6	4	2	1	24	1.85
Current curriculum is enough to achieve SUST mission and goal	2	2	7	2	35	2.69
Current curriculum is enough to meet the employers' need	2	1	7	3	37	2.85
Volume of BBA curriculum is suitable for achieving course and research requirement	0	5	7	1	35	2.69
Comment from teachers on curriculum is collected regularly	1	7	4	1	31	2.38
Current curriculum is enough for students' behavioral change	3	6	3	1	28	2.15
Teaching learning strategies are appropriate for curriculum implementation	3	3	6	1	31	2.38
Evaluation strategies are suitable and match to the current curriculum	4	1	6	2	32	2.46
Average						2.61
Cranach's $\alpha$ (alpha) test is excellent						0.91

Source: Produced from collected data.

**Table 5.** Assessment of alumni on curriculum and teaching learning.

Area of assessment	Assessment	Reliability		
	Average point scale (%)	Comments	Cronbach's $\alpha$ test	Comments
Curriculum and teaching learning	2.14(54)	Poor	0.77	Acceptable
Role of Curricula in Developing Knowledge	2.12(53)	Poor	0.88	Good
Role of Curricula in Developing Communication skill	2.64(66)	moderate	0.88	Good
Role of Curricula in Developing Inter personal skill and teamwork	2.89(72)	moderate	0.85	Good
Role of Curricula in Developing Management/ Leadership/ Work Skill	2.61(65)	moderate	0.93	excellent
Total	2.48(62)	Poor		

Source: Produced from collected data.

another is learning assessment. These two is discussed below:

**Teaching-Learning:** Teaching learning was assessed by students, faculties and alumni. Their assessments are given roughly in Tables 7-10.

Table 7 clarified that the satisfaction of students on teaching learning varied between 2.09 and 2.91 and on average 2.61(65%). Therefore the satisfactory level of the students on teaching learning is between disagree and agree not strongly agree or strongly disagree. The assessment by faculty is given in Table 8.

Table 8 clarified that the average assessment of f on teaching is faculty members' 2.45 (61%) which lies between agree and disagree.

Therefore, assessment result on teaching- learning is 2.61 by students and 2.45 by faculties 2.14 (Table 8) by alumni and by employer 3.07(table-2.4) on over all

curricula and teaching learning. Thus the assessment on teaching learning by different stakeholders ranged between 2.45 and 3.07 which are lies between disagree and agree.

**Assessment of learning evaluation:** It means the assessment on policy and procedure of student performance in the department as well as in the university. This system also assessed by students and teachers. The assessment of student is given in Table 9. Table 9 revealed that the average assessment point on learning evaluation is 2.59 (64%). Student's satisfaction ranges between disagree and agree. The assessment result of faculty members is given in Table 10.

Table 10 shows that the average scale point is 2.34 (58%). Therefore the satisfactory level of learning assessment is between agreeing and disagrees. Therefore the assessment of students and faculty members on

**Table 6.** Assessment of employer on curriculum and teaching learning.

Competence	Rating				Total	Average
	A	B	C	D		
Job knowledge	6	9	3	0	24	3.17
Ability to use academic knowledge in real life situation	5	11	2	0	20	3.17
IT knowledge	8	6	3	1	32	3.17
Proficiency in English	5	9	3	1	20	3.00
Communication skills	4	9	5	0	16	2.94
Analytical skills	4	9	5	0	16	2.94
Problem solving & decision making capability	4	5	2	0	16	1.94
Ethical standard / Honesty	11	5	2	0	44	3.50
Commitment to job	9	6	3	0	36	3.33
Punctuality	8	8	2	0	32	3.33
Self Confidence	4	12	2	0	16	3.11
Adaptability	4	12	2	0	16	3.11
Sense of responsibility	4	10	4	0	16	3.00
Math, science and Engineering knowledge	1	10	7	0	4	2.67
Numerical skill	7	8	3	0	28	3.22
Ability to link theory to practice	1	11	6	0	4	2.72
Computer knowledge	8	7	3	0	32	3.28
Ability to work in a team	6	11	1	0	24	3.28
Leadership quality	4	11	3	0	16	3.06
Independent thinking	2	11	3	1	12	2.89
Motivating ability	5	10	1	2	20	3.00
Time management	7	10	1	0	28	3.33
Sincerity	9	8	1	0	36	3.44
Patriotism	11	6	1	0	44	3.56
Innovative skill	2	13	0	3	8	2.78
Average						3.07
Cronbach's $\alpha$ (alpha) which is excellent						0.95

Source: Produced from collected data.

learning evaluation are 2.59 and 2.34 respectively and both lies between agreeing and disagrees while assessment is good and excellent statistically.

#### **Assessment of institutional structure and facilities:**

There are three class rooms and one computer lab with 10 computers in the department. The area of the class rooms are- (i) 182 square meter, (ii) 102 square meter, (iii) 102 square meter respectively and the total area is 386 square meter. The area of the computer lab is 52 square meter. There is no seminar library and no common room for men and female students. WiFi of internet is available. Institutional structure and facilities are analyzed from students as well faculty members through Tables 11- 16. Table 11 showed that the scale point of students satisfaction varies between 1.46 and 2.78 and on average 2.08 (50%) Therefore the institutional structure and facilities is poor and it is near about disagree. There are 18 faculties in the department and out of them one

professor and 5 associate and 12 assistant professors. Again out of 18 teachers 13 are in the station and 5 on study leave. The past experience shows that on average there were 7-10 teachers remains at the station since the establishment of the department. There is two non academic staff one is office assistant and another is office peon. Student's assessment on number academic and non academic staffs is given in Table 12.

Table 12 depicted that the average scale point on quality of staff is 2.26 (45%). It implies that the satisfactory levels of the students on quality of staff are between disagreeing and strongly disagree. It means the assessment is poor in quality. Teachers' evaluation on institutional structure and facilities is given in Table 13.

Table 13 portrays that the average scale point is 1.73(43%). It implies that the satisfactory level of institutional structure is between strongly disagreeing and disagree. The assessment on institutional facilities is given in Table 14.

**Table 7.** Teaching learning assessment by students.

Questions/Scale point	No of respondents out of 147 in total				Total Point	Average Point
	1	2	3	4		
The teachers are prepared for each class	14	49	65	19	383	2.61
The teachers demonstrate knowledge of the subject	6	30	94	17	416	2.83
The teachers always complete the whole course	28	59	52	8	334	2.27
The teachers provide additional material apart from the textbook	14	39	71	23	397	2.70
The teachers communicate the subject matter effectively	10	48	75	14	387	2.63
My teacher respect me as a student	10	19	82	36	438	2.98
The teachers arrive and leave on time	37	65	40	5	307	2.09
The teachers were available during the specified office hours and after class consultations	27	59	52	9	341	2.32
There was sufficient variation in teaching activities.	15	56	63	13	368	2.50
The teaching and study activities facilitated my learning process	5	41	82	19	409	2.78
The teaching activities promoted student interaction	7	54	67	19	392	2.67
My teachers inspire me to become life long learner	3	45	61	38	428	2.91
Average scale point						2.61
<b>Cronbach's <math>\alpha</math>(alpha) is good</b>						<b>0.88</b>

Source: Produced from collected data.

**Table 8.** Assessment of faculty members on teaching – learning.

Questionnaire	No of respondents out of 13 in total				Total Point	Average Point
	1	2	3	4		
Teaching and learning at the program level addresses all of the aims and objectives of each subject	3	3	6	1	31	2.38
Teaching and learning builds on what students know and can do	2	3	7	1	33	2.54
Dean office always monitor and document different issues of teaching learning	5	2	5	1	28	2.15
Teaching and learning supports students to become actively responsible for their own learning	4	3	6	0	28	2.15
Teaching and learning addresses the diversity of student language needs (English), including those for students learning in a language(s) other than mother tongue	3	1	8	1	33	2.54
Teaching and learning demonstrates that all teachers are responsible for language (English) proficiency of students	2	3	7	1	33	2.54
Teaching and learning uses a range and variety of strategies	3	2	8	0	31	2.38
Students workload is balanced and reasonable	2	0	10	1	36	2.77
Teaching and learning incorporates a range of resources, including information technologies	3	1	8	1	33	2.54
Teaching and learning engages students in reflecting on how, what and why they are learning	2	3	7	1	33	2.54
Teaching and learning encourages students to demonstrate their learning in a variety of way	2	4	7	0	31	2.38
Average						2.45
<b>Cronbach's <math>\alpha</math>(alpha) test is excellent</b>						<b>0.96</b>

Source: Produced from collected data.

Table 14 implies that the average scale point of facilities available in the department is 1.78 (44%). Therefore the satisfactory level of facilities available in the department

is between strongly disagreeing and disagrees. The faculty members have given their judgment on recruitment, promotion and development in Table 15.

**Table 9.** Assessment of learning evaluation by students.

Questions /scale point	No of respondents out of 147 in total				Total Point	Average Point
	1	2	3	4		
Assessment strategy are clearly stated at the beginning of term	7	53	74	13	387	2.63
The teachers are fair in examination	9	22	69	46	444	3.02
The teachers return the graded scripts etc. in a reasonable amount of time	49	60	33	5	288	1.96
The content of examinations was representative of the course material	2	20	110	15	432	2.94
I received sufficient feedback on the assignments I completed and on my test results	10	55	64	18	384	2.61
The B.B.A program provides students with feedback to inform and improve their learning	4	31	85	27	429	2.92
The B.B.A program has systems for recording students' progress aligned with the assessment philosophy of the program(s)	14	57	62	15	371	2.54
Overall assessment process of students is satisfactory	12	69	59	7	355	2.41
The feedback on assessment is given timely and is helpful	24	70	44	9	332	2.26
Average scale point						2.59
Cronbach's $\alpha$ (alpha) is good						0.80

Source: Produced from collected data.

**Table 10.** Assessment of learning evaluation by faculty members.

Questionnaire	No of respondents out of 13 in total				Total Point	Average Point
	1	2	3	4		
An assessment criteria for papers, assignments and exams were clearly communicated in advance	3	1	8	1	33	2.54
The ass Assessment criteria for papers, assignments and exams were unequivocal	3	4	5	1	30	2.31
Assessment of student learning is based on the objectives and assessment criteria specific to each subject	2	2	8	1	34	2.62
The BBA program uses a range of strategies and tools to assess student Learning	3	2	8	0	31	2.38
The BBA program has systems for reporting student progress before the next Term	3	7	3	0	26	2.00
The BBA program analyses assessment data to inform teaching and learning	2	9	2	0	26	2.00
Assessment strategies of each course is communicated to the students' earlier	2	3	7	1	33	2.54
The students get sufficient feedback on each assessment before the next one	1	6	6	0	31	2.38
The BBA program provides opportunities for students to participate in, and reflect on, the assessment of their work	3	3	7	0	30	2.31
Average						2.34
Cronbach's $\alpha$ (alpha) is excellent						0.95

Source: Produced from collected data.

Table 15 clarified that the average scale point of recruitment, promotion and development of faculties is 1.88 (47%) indicating the satisfactory level of recruitment, promotion and development of faculty members is between strongly disagreeing and disagrees. The evaluation of faculty members on institutional support is given in Table 16.

Table 16 clarified that the average assessment scale

point of staff support is 2.25(56%) which is close to disagree.

Therefore the assessment of students, alumni, faculty on institutional structure and facilities ranges between 1.73 to 2.25 lying between disagree and agree.

**Assessment of students' support, counseling and development:** There is a central student adviser and



**Table 11.** Assessment of students on institutional structure and facilities.

Questions /scale point	No of respondents out of 147 in total				Total Point	Average point
	1	2	3	4		
No. of classrooms are satisfactory and enough	88	43	14	2	224	1.52
Books, journal and services in the library is enough	90	48	7	2	215	1.46
Computer laboratory has enough no. of computers	107	30	6	4	201	1.37
Students have good internet facility both in campus and hostels	19	33	65	30	400	2.72
No. and amount of scholarships for students is good enough and attractive	37	78	30	2	291	1.98
Computer Laboratory is equipped	78	51	13	5	239	1.63
Research fields are adequate for students requirement	44	64	35	4	293	1.99
Supporting staffs in lab and fields are adequate and supportive	59	63	24	1	261	1.78
Transport facilities are good	15	43	75	14	382	2.60
Health center and ambulance facility is good	20	40	75	12	373	2.54
Hostel facility is satisfactory	30	61	51	5	325	2.21
Enough services and support are obtained from different level of administrators	10	65	67	5	361	2.46
Sports facility is satisfactory	10	34	82	21	408	2.78
Average scale point						2.08
Cronbach's $\alpha$ (alpha) test is good						0.84

Source: Produced from collected data

**Table 12.** Student's assessment on number academic and non academic staff.

Questions /scale point	No of respondents out of 147 in total				Total Point	Average Point
	1	2	3	4		
The teachers are well qualified	6	38	72	31	422	2.87
Number of teachers to operate the program is satisfactory	23	66	46	12	341	2.32
Computer Laboratory technician is well qualified	53	69	20	5	271	1.84
Faculties are available for consultation after office hours	41	66	35	5	298	2.03
Total points(Total answers *scale point)	123	478	519	212	1332	2.26
Average						2.26
Cronbach's $\alpha$ (alpha) is poor						0.64

Source: produced from collected data.

**Table 13.** Assessment of faculties on institutional structure.

Questionnaire	No of respondents				Total Point	Average Point
	1	2	3	4		
Faculties have infrastructure to support new trends of learning process	3	5	5	0	28	2.15
Cooperation receives from higher authority (VC / Dean /Directors) and colleague	4	0	9	0	31	2.38
Research fund is always available	7	4	2	0	21	1.62
The journal section of the library has rich collection of technical journals	6	7	0	0	20	1.54
Individual room/office facility is satisfactory	8	5	0	0	18	1.38
Laboratories are well equipped and adequate	9	4	0	0	17	1.31
Average point						1.73
Cronbach's $\alpha$ (alpha) test is excellent						0.90

Source: produced from collected data.

**Table 14.** Assessment of faculties on institutional facilities.

Questionnaire	No of respondents out of 13 in total				Total Point	Average point
	1	2	3	4		
Office room facility is adequate	4	6	3	0	25	1.92
IT and computer facility is enough	5	7	1	0	22	1.69
Individual research facility is being enhanced and encouraged	4	8	1	0	23	1.77
Satisfied with promotion system	6	2	5	0	25	1.92
Satisfied with salary, honorarium, allowances and other facilities	4	7	2	0	24	1.85
Research fund is always available to conduct research	7	5	1	0	20	1.54
Average						1.78
Cronbach's $\alpha$ (alpha) is good						0.80

Source: produced from collected data.

**Table 14.** Assessment of faculties on institutional facilities.

Questionnaire	No of respondents out of 13 in total				Total Point	Average point
	1	2	3	4		
Office room facility is adequate	4	6	3	0	25	1.92
IT and computer facility is enough	5	7	1	0	22	1.69
Individual research facility is being enhanced and encouraged	4	8	1	0	23	1.77
Satisfied with promotion system	6	2	5	0	25	1.92
Satisfied with salary, honorarium, allowances and other facilities	4	7	2	0	24	1.85
Research fund is always available to conduct research	7	5	1	0	20	1.54
Average						1.78
Cronbach's $\alpha$ (alpha) is good						0.80

Source: produced from collected data.

**Table 15.** Assessment of faculty on recruitment, promotion and development.

Questionnaire	No of respondents out of 13 in total				Total Point	Average Point
	1	2	3	4		
The recruitment system is satisfactory	7	2	4	0	23	1.77
Basic entry qualification of teachers is satisfactory	4	1	8	0	30	2.31
Teacher – student ratio in respective department is justified	4	8	1	0	23	1.77
Teachers work load in teaching – research is manageable	3	7	3	0	26	2.00
Promotion system is satisfactory	5	3	5	0	26	2.00
Faculties have enough opportunity to take part in different training program for skill development	5	6	2	0	23	1.77
The BBA faculty organizes Foundation training to newly recruited teachers	8	5	0	0	18	1.38
Number of teachers in your dept. is enough to run the program effectively	3	6	4	0	27	2.08
Average						1.88
Cronbach's $\alpha$ (alpha) test is good						0.85

Source: produced from collected data.

guidance in the university as a whole. In the department there is no student adviser and guidance. This area has

been evaluated by students as well as faculties. The assessment result is of student is given through Tables

**Table 16.** Assessment of faculty members on institutional support.

Questionnaire	No of respondents				Total Point	Average point
	1	2	3	4		
The department has a procedure for observing teaching	8	4	1	0	19	1.46
Quality of teaching can be improved by practicing peer observation technique	3	2	7	1	32	2.46
I always consult with my higher colleagues and take their suggestion on teaching-learning	2	0	9	2	37	2.85
Everybody of my dept. think positively about peer observation	4	3	5	1	29	2.23
Average						2.25
Cronbach's $\alpha$ (alpha) is good						0.85

Source: produced from collected data.

**Table 17.** Assessment by students on student's support.

Questions for answer	No of respondents out of 147 in total				Total Point	Average Point
	1	2	3	4		
The current graduate catalogue is well organized and informative	12	46	80	9	380	2.59
Students academic progress documentation system is satisfactory	21	75	46	5	329	2.24
The department has enough faculties to run B.B.A program effectively	35	69	30	13	315	2.14
Admission procedure is good and fair	9	8	52	78	493	3.35
Communication of the university with the employers of its graduates is satisfactory	25	52	66	4	343	2.33
University preparation of students for employment and career development after graduation is satisfactory	40	53	46	8	316	2.15
Students' B.B.A catalogue is informative and supportive	11	39	84	13	393	2.67
University website for students' admission is enough informative and supportive	7	33	82	25	419	2.85
Students' application and registration is done using university website	11	46	63	27	400	2.72
Average scale point						2.56
Cronbach's $\alpha$ (alpha) test is acceptable						0.73

Source: produced from collected data.

**Table 18.** Assessment by student on student's counseling.

Questions /scale point	No of respondents out of 147 in total				Total Point	Average Point
	1	2	3	4		
Feedback procedure on teaching - learning and teaching quality is good	18	57	62	10	358	2.44
Academic guidance and counseling system is satisfactory	21	78	43	5	326	2.22
My teachers maintain open door policy for students	16	38	78	15	386	2.63
Total points(Total answers *scale point)	45	346	549	120	1070	2.43
Average						2.43
Cronbach's $\alpha$ (alpha) is good						0.87

Source: produced from collected data.

17-19.

Table 17 clarifies that average student's assessment is 2.56(64%) on student support and it falls between disagree and agree of consent while the assessment is acceptable.

Average student's assessment is 2.43(60%) on students counseling and it falls between disagree and agree while the assessment is good.

Table 18 described that the average scale point development of skills is 2.69(67%). It told that the

**Table 19.** Student's evaluation on development of skills.

Questions /scale point	No of respondents out of 147 in total				Total Point	Average Point
	1	2	3	4		
Extra-curricular and co curricular activities of the university is satisfactory	8	42	74	23	406	2.76
Present learning experiences improve my problem-solving skills	11	48	80	8	379	2.58
Present learning experiences help me in good decision making	7	46	84	10	391	2.66
Present learning experiences help me in independent thinking	5	41	86	15	405	2.76
Present learning experiences help me in critical thinking	7	56	71	13	384	2.61
The program is effective to develop presentation skill	11	52	63	21	388	2.64
The program is effective to develop planning ability	9	49	75	14	388	2.64
The program is effective to develop team working ability	7	33	82	25	419	2.85
The program is effective to develop time management ability	11	46	63	27	400	2.72
Average point						2.69
Cronbach's $\alpha$ test is good						0.87

Source: Source: produced from collected data.

**Table 20.** Students' support, counseling and development.

Questionnaire	No of respondents out of 13 in total				Total Point	Average Point
	1	2	3	4		
The admission procedure at BBA program is satisfactory	6	1	4	2	28	2.15
The student academic progress documentation system is good	5	2	5	1	28	2.15
Students counseling system is satisfactory	4	5	4	0	26	2.00
Extra-curricular and co curricular activities of the university is satisfactory	3	4	5	1	30	2.31
The program is effective to develop presentation skill	2	4	7	0	31	2.38
The program is effective to develop team working ability	3	6	4	0	27	2.08
Average						2.18
Cronbach's $\alpha$ test is excellent						0.90

Source: produced from collected data.

satisfactory level of the students on development of skills is between disagree and agree and the assessment is good. Teacher's assessment on student support, counseling and development Table 19

Table 20 clarified that the average scale point of student support, counseling and development is 2.18(54%). It indicates that the satisfactory level of student support, counseling and development is close to disagree while the Cronbach's  $\alpha$  test is excellent. Therefore we can conclude that the facilities for students, counseling and development in the department are poor.

**Assessment on research and extension:** This area includes research facilities and extension facilities in the department both in terms of fund and faculty. There is no research fund for the students in the university as well as in the department. The department has only five Ph. D

holder teachers having no fund for research. The assessment of students and faculties is given in Tables 21-22 in this area.

Table 21 clarified that average point of students' assessment is 1.99(50%) on research and extension. It shows that students are disagreeing and strongly disagree on this aspect while the assessment is good.

Table 22 clarified that the average faculty's assessment is 1.92(54%) on research and extension. It means that faculties are disagreeing and strongly disagree on this aspect while the assessment is excellent.

**Assessment of process control:** Process control means the process of education. There is an average of 1 year session jam, that means at least one year is required excess while 4 year is standard time period for completion of degree. A student has to wait 1-2 year more to

**Table 21.** Student's assessment on research and extension.

Area of question	No of respondents out of 147 in total				Total Point	Average point
	1	2	3	4		
Research fund is enough	99	40	7	1	204	1.39
Research linkage with external organization is good	62	73	11	1	245	1.67
My department has adequate number of research supervisor	36	59	47	5	315	2.14
My departmental research facility and fund is adequate	74	60	10	3	236	1.61
System of research presentation is good and of high quality	30	74	36	7	314	2.14
Students' are encouraged to be involved in community development activities	21	53	62	11	357	2.43
Students' involve in out campus activities is satisfactory	18	41	71	17	381	2.59
Average scale point						1.99
Cronbach's $\alpha$ (alpha) is good						0.82

Source: Produced from collected data

**Table 22.** Faculty's assessment on research and extension.

Questionnaire	No of respondents out of 13 in total				Total Point	Average Point
	1	2	3	4		
The university's research policy is clear to me	5	4	4	0	25	1.92
The entity and department always encouraged and supportive to conduct research	4	6	3	0	25	1.92
Research findings documentation system is satisfactory	5	6	2	0	23	1.77
Research output from each department is satisfactory	4	4	4	1	28	2.15
Community development engagement of faculty members is satisfactory	5	2	5	1	28	2.15
Engagement of students in community services is encouraged by the teachers	4	6	3	0	25	1.92
Total publication of my department is satisfactory	6	5	2	0	22	1.69
Fund hunting facilities by the faculties is satisfactory	6	6	1	0	21	1.62
We have facilities for organizing seminar/workshop in our department	5	2	6	0	27	2.08
We have facilities for participating seminar/workshop/training program	6	1	6	0	26	2.00
Average						1.92
Cronbach's $\alpha$ (alpha) is excellent						0.90

Source: Produced from collected data.

complete his graduation. Both the students and faculties have given their assessment on this area as given in Tables 23 and 24. Table 23 clarified that the average student's assessment on process control is 2.36(59%). It lies between disagree and agree or poor or good while the assessment is acceptable.

Table 24 clarified that the average faculty's assessment on process control is 2.46(62%). It lies between disagree and agree or poor or good while the assessment is excellent. Therefore, the process control of the university and the department is not satisfactory to the students as well as faculties.

**Peer observation:** Peer observation in teaching is a

collegial process where one teacher observe another in the process of his professional duties and then he provides supportive and constructive feedback that enables the observed to reflect upon and improve how he or she performs these duties. In another word it is a third party observation of teaching to observe the relationship between the teacher and the participants. It helps increasing teachers' confidence, greater collegiality, encourages debate and dissemination of best practice and improves teacher interactions with students (Marshall et al., 2008)

There is no provision of peer observation in the department of business administration and SUST also and even in the country. As a result the assessment

**Table 23.** Student's assessment on process control.

Questions /scale point	No of respondents out of 147 in total				Total Point	Average Point
	1	2	3	4		
The academic calendar is always followed without interruption	35	39	50	23	355	2.41
Students' feedback on teaching – learning is always collected	38	71	34	4	298	2.03
Feedback result is always communicated to students	40	77	28	2	286	1.95
University linking system with corporate world is satisfactory	62	54	29	2	265	1.80
Quality culture is maintained and encouraged in the university	11	38	82	16	397	2.70
Quality should come first and then quantity	7	11	62	67	483	3.29
Average scale point						2.36
Cronbach's $\alpha$ (alpha) test is acceptable.						0.71

Source: Produced from collected data.

**Table 24.** Faculty's assessment on process control .

Questionnaire	No of respondents out of 13 in total				Total Point	Average point
	1	2	3	4		
Course management system is always maintained	2	4	6	1	32	2.46
Academic calendar is always maintained	2	4	6	1	32	2.46
Course management system is good to quality management	2	4	6	1	25	1.92
Teacher evaluation system by the BBA faculty /department is satisfactory	4	7	1	1	28	2.15
Teacher evaluation system by the students and its documentation system is satisfactory	6	2	2	3	46	3.54
Self Assessment should be practiced in the faculty	1	0	3	9	46	3.54
Quality culture should be developed in the university	1	0	3	9	31	2.38
We always practice autonomy at all levels	2	6	3	2	32	2.46
BBA faculty take its own decision without external interference	2	5	4	2	40	3.08
BBA faculty involve external evaluator for thesis	2	0	6	5	38	2.92
BBA faculty involve external evaluator for course development	2	1	6	4	26	2.00
Teaching performance indicators are clearly stated, circulated to all	4	6	2	1	26	2.00
Research performance indicators are clearly stated, circulated to all	3	8	1	1	46	3.54
Quality should come first and then quantity	1	1	1	10	32	2.46
Average						2.46
Cronbach's $\alpha$ (alpha) test is excellent						0.95

Source: Produced from collected data.

value in this respect is 0 (zero) on four point scale by the teachers.

From the forgoing discussion, SA from students and teachers of the department can be summarized in Table 25.

**The validation of Self Assessment:** To validate the SA report an external peer committee of four members was employed consisting two business professor from the country and two foreign professor where one is expert in statistics from India and another is expert in education management from Malaysia. The team made a three day

long visits in the department and validated the SA report through communicating to all stakeholders and their observation. It is mentioned that the SA report was sent one month ago to all members before their visit. After the physical verification they recommended as follows:

(i) There is need to review the program's aim for making more specific the meet stakeholders' demands and map these to the vision, mission and objectives of the institution and the department. The curriculum should be reviewed to ensure skill mapping and relevance to industry and society. The curriculum committee should

**Table 25.** Summary of SA from students and teachers of the department.

Assessment Area	Average point on 4 point scale		Validity of assessment	
	Student	Faculty	Student	faculty
Governance	2.67	2.53	accepted	excellent
Curriculum design and content review	2.61	2.61	accepted	excellent
Teaching learning	2.61	2.45	good	excellent
Learning Evaluation	2.59	2.34	good	excellent
Institutional Facilities	2.08	1.54	good	good
Institutional structure	2.26	1.73	poor	excellent
Recruitment promotion and development		1.88		good
Institutional Support		2.25		good
Student Support	2.56	2.18	accepted	excellent
Student counseling	2.43	2.18	good	excellent
Development of skill	2.69	2.18	good	excellent
Research and extension	1.99	1.92	good	excellent
Process control	2.36	2.46	accepted	excellent

consult stakeholders and external experts more efficiently. All courses within the program should have learning outcomes which should be used to assess student learning. Extra-curricular activities should be encouraged.

(ii) The use of lesson plan should be consistent throughout the department. Standardization in format and coverage is required. A student handbook containing academic calendar, course content, learning outcomes, breakdown of assessments and reading list should be provided to support teaching and learning. The student admission procedure should be reviewed to make programs specific. The department should establish a quality assurance cell to support and coordinate all quality assurance activities and key performance indicators should be developed and implement to measure achievement of annual targets.

(iii) The university must review and improve on existing facilities such as: (a) furnished classrooms to meet current demands; (b) multimedia to support delivery; (c) common/washroom for female students; (d) computer labs; (e) seminar rooms and staff rooms.

(iv) An environment should be developed for culture of quality and development through motivation the academic faculties and students. A teacher-mentor should be appointed to support student activities in the department. Faculty must be available for student guidance and academic counseling outside lectures. A review of the central system for processing and release of examination results according to the academic calendar is urgently needed to avoid 'session jams'.

(v) Allocation of courses to lecturers should be on the basis of their experience and capacity. Teaching staff workload should be reviewed to improve performance. More academic staff with suitable qualification and

experience should be appointed. The provision of 'Temporary Appointment against Leave Vacancy' should be implemented to take over the duties of the teaching staff who are on study leave. To this end a review of the current recruitment policy and process may be required. Recruitment process should be reviewed to incorporate 'demonstration' as part of the qualifying criteria for appointment. New staff training and support (orientation) must be introduced, clearly documented and implemented. Pedagogical training for staff should be mandatory to support better classroom management and to enhance teaching capacity.

(vi) Department should consider the employment of graduate students as teaching assistants to support teaching and learning particularly in the first and second years of the undergraduate program.

(vii) There is a need to track and minimize class cancellations by faculties. Where class cancellations are inevitable due to emergencies, classes must be rescheduled. Teacher evaluation by the student must be implemented throughout the department and the university. Peer observation culture should be introduced for teaching development. Scheduled academic and career guidance activities with the support of alumni and industry must be incorporated.

(vii) Research and development to be encouraged through allocating sufficient fund.

There are identifiable pockets of excellence within the department, largely led by individuals. Department is required to focus on team building. Interpersonal relationship among the teachers is very important to develop team spirit which is important to ensure quality of teaching and learning. The achievement of the recommendations provided above can only be possible

with emphasis on a team sharing the same vision and mission viz. quality of teaching and learning and consequently quality graduate. Department must build on its existing goodwill among its stakeholders particularly industry to further strengthen the quality of program and graduates.

## Conclusion

The foregoing discussion and analysis demonstrated that self assessment in tertiary education is essential for ensuring quality graduate. The department of business administration of SUST has some weaknesses with some strength. The concerned authority should take necessary steps to improve the weakness areas for producing quality graduate in business administration.

## Conflict of Interests

The authors have not declared any conflicts of interest.

## REFERENCES

- Ahern G (2003). Designing and implementing coaching/mentoring competencies: a case study. *Counseling Psychol. Q.* 16(4):373-383.
- Andrade H, Du Y (2007). Student responses to criteria –referenced self –Assessment. *Assess. Eval. Higher Educ.* 32(2):159-181.
- Bailey GD (1981). *Teacher self assessment: a means for improving classroom instruction* (Washington, D.C., National Education Association).
- Birenbaum M, Dochy F (1996). *Alternatives in Assessment of Achievement, Learning Process and prior Knowledge* . Boston: Kluwer Academic.
- Boud D (Edu) (1995). *Enhancing learning through self assessment* . London, Kogan Page Limited.
- Dewey John (1916/1944). *Democracy and Education*. The Free Press. pp.1-4. ISBN 0-684-83631-9(www.google.com, dated 25:1.2015).
- Falchikov N, Boud D (1989). Student Self Assessment in Higher in Higher Education: A Meta Analysis. *Rev. Educ. Res.* 59(4):395-430.
- Harrington TF (1995). *Assessment of Abilities*. U.S.: North Carolina.
- Kwan K, Leung R (1996). Tutor versus Peer Group Assessment of Student Performance in a Simulation Training Exercise. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Educ.* 21(3):128-150.
- Marshall B (2004) *Learning from the Academy: From Peer Observation of Teaching to Peer Enhancement of Learning and Teaching*. *J. Adult Theol. Educ.* 1(2):185-204
- Sambell K, McDowell L (1997). *The Value of Self and Peer Assessment to the Developing Lifelong Learner*. ISL Symposium 1997.
- Schon DA (1987). *Education the Reflective Practitioner: Towards a New Design for Teaching and Learning in the Professions*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.