



Course Content Evaluation and Assessment Methods of the English Language Proficiency Program at Al-Ahgaff University in Light of Quality Assurance Standards

Mohammed Salim Karamah Al-Bouri^{1,*}, Fazee Khalid Alezi Mohammed¹, Abdullah Rajab Alfalagg²

¹ Department of English Faculty of Education-Sana'a University, Sana'a, Yemen.

² Hadhramout University- Hadhramout -Yemen.

*Corresponding author: m.s.k.alboori@gmail.com

Keywords

- | | |
|-----------------------|---|
| 1. Quality Assurance | 2. English Language Proficiency Program |
| 3. Course Evaluation | 4. Course Content |
| 5. Assessment Methods | 6. Al-Ahgaff University |
-

Abstract:

In recent years, there has been a growing interest in evaluating academic programs based on the availability of Quality Assurance (QA) standards, as these standards entail periodical reviews of a curriculum and ensure that instructional practices are aligned with learners' needs and labor market requirements. This study therefore aimed to evaluate the course content and assessment methods of the English Language Proficiency Program (ELPP) at Al-Ahgaff University in light of QA standards. It specifically investigated the extent to which QA indicators were available in the course content and assessment methods of the ELPP. The study employed a descriptive qualitative research design, collecting qualitative data through a validated evaluation sheet comprising 42 quality assurance indicators. Document analysis was also conducted to critically examine the availability of QA indicators in the course materials and two examination transcripts given to the first year students in the ELPP. The findings revealed that the course content achieved a high availability rate (74%), with 26% of the indicators being absent; which demonstrates a substantial alignment with the program's objectives, relevance, critical thinking, and self-learning. As for the assessment methods, the results showed an 83% availability rate of the QA indicators, whereas 17% of the indicators were unavailable. The study concludes that, although the ELPP's course content and assessment methods considerably comply with QA indicators, some targeted curricular and assessment enhancements are still necessary to augment the program's quality and efficacy.

تقييم محتوى المقررات وأساليب التقويم في برنامج الكفاءة في اللغة الإنجليزية بجامعة الأحقاف في ضوء معايير ضمان الجودة

محمد سالم كرامة البوري^{1*} , فازع خالد العزي المسلمي¹ , عبدالله رجب الفلق²

¹ قسم اللغة الإنجليزية - كلية التربية - جامعة صنعاء، صنعاء، اليمن.

² جامعة حضرموت، حضرموت - اليمن

*المؤلف: m.s.k.alboori@gmail.com

الكلمات المفتاحية

- | | |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1. ضمان الجودة | 2. برنامج الكفاءة في اللغة الإنجليزية |
| 3. تقويم المقررات | 4. محتوى المقررات |
| 5. أساليب التقويم | 6. جامعة الأحقاف |

الملخص:

شهدت السنوات الأخيرة تزايداً ملحوظاً في الاهتمام بتقويم البرامج الأكاديمية في ضوء معايير ضمان الجودة ، لما تتطلبه هذه المعايير من مراجعة مستمرة للمناهج الدراسية. ويسهم ضمان الجودة في التأكد من مواءمة الممارسات التدريسية مع احتياجات المتعلمين ومتطلبات سوق العمل. هدفت هذه الدراسة إلى تقييم محتوى المقررات وأساليب التقويم في برنامج الكفاءة في اللغة الإنجليزية في ضوء معايير ضمان الجودة، وذلك من خلال التحقق من مدى توافر مؤشرات ضمان الجودة في محتوى المقررات وأساليب التقويم المعتمدة في البرنامج.

اعتمدت الدراسة المنهج الوصفي النوعي، حيث جُمعت البيانات النوعية باستخدام أداة تقويم مُحكَّمة تمثلت في استمارة تقييم اشتملت على (42) مؤشراً من مؤشرات ضمان الجودة. كما أُجري تحليل وثائقي لفحص مدى توافر مؤشرات ضمان الجودة في مواد المقررات الدراسية، إضافة إلى ورقتي اختبار من اختبارات السنة الأولى في برنامج الكفاءة في اللغة الإنجليزية. وأظهرت النتائج أن محتوى المقررات حقق نسبة توافر بلغت (74%)، مما يعكس درجة مرتفعة من اتساق البرنامج من حيث وضوح الأهداف وملاءمة المحتوى وتنمية التفكير الناقد والتعلم الذاتي، في حين لم تتوافر (26%) من مؤشرات ضمان الجودة الخاصة بمحتوى المقررات. كما بيّنت النتائج أن أساليب التقويم حققت نسبة توافر بلغت (83%) من مؤشرات ضمان الجودة، مقابل عدم توافر (17%) من هذه المؤشرات.

وخلصت الدراسة إلى أنه على الرغم من التزام محتوى المقررات وأساليب التقويم في برنامج الكفاءة في اللغة الإنجليزية بدرجة كبيرة بمؤشرات ضمان الجودة، فإن هناك حاجة إلى إدخال تحسينات موجهة على المحتوى وأساليب التقويم بما يساهم في تعزيز جودة البرنامج وفاعليته.

Introduction:

In an increasingly globalized world, proficiency in the English language has become an indispensable asset, as English acts as a lingua franca for international communication, academic advancement, and professional success (Crystal, 2003). Quality assurance in education is essential in ensuring the effectiveness of teaching and learning processes, particularly in language programs where assessment methods and pedagogical competence are essential (Harvey & Green, 1993). The success and reliability of a language program depend entirely on the rigorous development and careful application of quality assurance standards (Ijoko & Bagbi, 2024).

The need for high quality assurance in language education is widely recognized, as it promotes transparency, ensures consistent standards, and improves students' learning level (Eaton, 2010). Previous research in regions like Yemen, for instance, consistently highlights the gravity of such issues as the weak or inconsistent application of formal quality assurance mechanisms, resource limitations, and varying stakeholder perceptions regarding the actual implementation of quality standards (Anaam *et al.*, 2009; Jaber, 2021; Muthanna & Karaman, 2010).

A systematic evaluation of language programs is essential for ensuring that instructional practices remain effective, relevant, and aligned with learners' needs. In particular, evaluating course content and assessment methods provides critical insights into the coherence, appropriateness, and pedagogical validity of program components (Graves, 2008). Course content evaluation helps determine whether materials and topics reflect current linguistic, academic, and sociocultural demands, thereby ensuring that learners develop the competencies required for real-world communication and academic success (Nation & Macalister, 2010). Likewise, evaluating assessment methods is crucial for ensuring that tests and measurement tools are valid, reliable, and aligned with intended learning outcomes, as

assessment practices directly influence learners' motivation, instructional decisions, and the overall effectiveness of learning programs (Bachman & Palmer, 2010; Brown & Abeywickrama, 2019). Continual evaluation of learning programs not only strengthens their accountability but also fosters evidence-based decision-making and continuous quality improvement—core principles emphasized in modern quality assurance frameworks in higher education (Newton, 2018). This study aims to evaluate the course content and assessment methods of the English ELPP. It investigates the availability of quality assurance standards within the program. The study contributes to a deeper understanding of the practicalities, successes, and inherent obstacles faced by the ELPP in pursuit of excellence in language education. By examining adherence of the course content and assessment methods to quality assurance standards, this study aims to identify key areas for improvement to inform policymakers and ultimately support ELPP in preparing students effectively for a globally competitive environment.

Problem Statement

Since its establishment, ELPP at Al-Ahgaff University has faced ongoing concerns regarding its overall quality and effectiveness. Feedback from deans, teachers, and students has consistently indicated dissatisfaction with various aspects of the program, particularly the relevance, coherence, and pedagogical suitability of its course content and the appropriateness of its assessment methods. In response to these concerns, Al-Ahgaff University strives to provide high-quality English education and demonstrates commitment toward this end through various workshops in the hope of achieving satisfactory outcomes (Al-Ahgaff University, 2023a, 2023b). Over the years, the ELPP administration has in fact revised the course content multiple times to enhance the quality of instruction and improve the learning outcomes of the program. However, the revisions have not been grounded in a systematic,

evidence-based evaluation of the program, and therefore it remains unclear whether the modifications to the teaching material have reached the intended level of improvement or further work is still required to enhance the program's effectiveness. The lack of a rigorous assessment of the alignment between the course content, teaching practices, assessment methods, and the intended learning outcomes has contributed to the ongoing uncertainty regarding the ELPP's effectiveness.

Moreover, the ELPP has not been formally evaluated in light of Yemen's National Academic Reference Standards (NARS) or internationally recognized quality assurance frameworks for English language teaching. It is because of the absence of such a comprehensive, systematic evaluation that the ELPP cannot ensure that its curriculum is properly designed to meet the students' specific needs and the institutional quality assurance requirements and that its assessment methods are valid and reliable, despite long-standing dissatisfaction among stakeholders and repeated attempts to develop the curriculum. To address this problem, the present study seeks to systematically and comprehensively evaluate the ELPP's curriculum to identify its strengths, weaknesses, and areas requiring further development in accordance with established quality assurance standards.

Significance of the Study

The significance of the study stems from the fact that it is aimed at evaluating a language program that has not yet been evaluated based on the established quality assurance standards within the Yemeni higher education context. Also, it is hoped that the study will help provide the decision-makers at Al-Ahgaff University with vital data-driven insights for enhancing the effectiveness of its ELPP. The results will also, hopefully, be of value to the other Yemeni universities that offer similar English language proficiency programs, enabling them to evaluate and improve their quality assurance standards for evaluating course content and assessment methods. Although several studies have been

conducted in the Yemeni context about academic program evaluations (Alguhali et al. 2022; Al-Batri 2020; Al-Saba *et al.*, 2010), English language proficiency program evaluation has not been given the due attention (Al-Bouri *et al.*, 2025; Al-Muslimi, 2011; Ateeq 2023; Jaber 2021).

Limitations

The current study was limited to evaluating the course content and assessment methods in the ELPP in light of quality assurance standards. It focused on the availability of quality assurance indicators of the course content and assessment methods in the program. The study was conducted at Al-Ahgaff University in Mukalla during the 2024–2025 academic year.

Research Questions:

The study seeks to answer the following key questions:

1. To what extent are the quality assurance standards available in the course content of the ELPP?
2. To what extent are the quality assurance standards available in the assessment methods of the ELPP?

Literature Review

Merits and Challenges of Embracing Quality Assurance Standards in Higher Education

The notion of QA evolved from industrial sector practices, and over time it has found its way to service sectors, including education (Koslowski, 2006). Its origins can be traced back to medieval university education, but it gained prominence in the 1990s as educational institutions recognized its importance, which led to the establishment of dedicated QA departments and methodologies (Usmani et al., 2012). The industrial revolution spurred the adoption of quality assurance in industry, while the expansion of higher education and knowledge-based economies drove its adoption in academia (Moullin, 2002; Rasool, 2010). Today, QA is crucial for aligning institutions with the demands of the economy, society, and global community (Vlk, 2006). Initially, QA was seen as an internal matter, but

it was redefined as a competitive necessity due to the 1980s shift toward mass higher education (Neave, 1994). Despite debates over its definition, QA has become instrumental in achieving institutional success, ensuring efficiency, reliability, and global competitiveness (Kontio, 2012; Mishra, 2007; Watty, 2006).

Traditional QA methods are increasingly conceived as inadequate, lacking more comprehensive and effective frameworks (Mizikaci, 2006). The designing of such QA frameworks requires the involvement of all stakeholders, including students, faculty, and support services, alongside audits, accreditation, and evaluations (Knight, 2003; Shahid & Wahab, 2015). Effective QA frameworks must be developed in line with national and international standards should educational institutions wish to enhance their institutional credibility and improve learning outcomes (Batoool & Qureshi, 2007; Oyebade et al., 2012). As a mandatory requirement for accreditation, QA drives curricular and pedagogical improvements, playing a pivotal role in sustaining educational excellence (Chong, 2014; Usmani & Khatoon, 2016). In fact, adherence to the application of QA standards can lead to academic accreditation, which is the secret behind the success of most higher education institutions all over the world (Siddiek et al., 2013).

However, implementing QA at the level of higher education encounters a plethora of challenges, ranging from cultural barriers and institutional resistance to leadership commitment (Harvey & Green, 1993; Soomro & Ahmed, 2012). In other words, the effective application of and compliance to some QA standards essential for quality education may be hindered by certain cultural and institutional traditions in some countries. A lack of commitment on the part of the leadership of an institution can also be an obstacle to taking QA measures necessary for improving the education system; such commitment includes the president's vision for the institution (Winter, 1991). Resistance to change is a third challenge for QA in higher

education; both the administrators and the academic staff of the institution may be reluctant to adopt new QA policies and measures, fearing increased workload, loss of autonomy, or unfamiliarity with new processes (Harvey and Green, 1993). It is because of such obstacles that the current QA standards and policies at many higher education institutions are outdated and inadequate. There is of course an increasing acknowledgment of this fact as well as of the urgent need for a fresh and more comprehensive QA framework (Mizikaci, 2006). Efforts to establish formal accreditation systems are routinely hampered by resource limitations, infrastructural damage, and persistent political crises, resulting in a systemic lack of fully developed formal quality mechanisms (Anaam et al., 2009).

Quality Assurance in Higher Education in the Arab Region

In most Arab countries, QA at the level of higher education is overseen by the Ministry of Higher Education, the government body responsible of developing standardized QA frameworks to ensure quality education (UNESCO, 2003). While these frameworks are designed to align with labor market needs and socioeconomic conditions (Alkaabi, 2020), many developing nations are still struggling with declining educational quality due to inadequate attention to QA (Moosa, 2006). Unlike Western systems, where we find higher education institutions-initiated QA, Arab governments have assumed the responsibility of setting up mechanisms for learning programs (Karakhanyan, 2019). As Karakhanyan says, Arab nations are currently refining their QA systems to better integrate institutional priorities at various levels, recognizing QA as crucial for economic growth and technological advancement (Ezeokoli & Ayodele, 2014).

Although Arab countries adopt diverse terms for QA frameworks, the frameworks comprise similar standards. In the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) states, QA is typically mandated and heavily structured. Saudi Arabia, for

example, employs a highly centralized model developed by the National Center for Academic Accreditation and Evaluation (NCAAA). The model utilizes a comprehensive framework detailing standards across eleven core areas ranging from governance and learning quality to research and community contribution (Darandari et al., 2009). Similarly, the UAE uses the federal Commission for Academic Accreditation (CAA), which applies an outcomes-based evaluation framework that scrutinizes key performance indicators like student employment outcomes and industry collaboration, often demanding additional accreditation from international agencies for its competitive private institutions (CAA, 2024). However, nations facing instability, such as Yemen, struggle with the fundamental implementation of QA.

Yemen has made efforts to establish QA in higher education, beginning with the Ministry of Higher Education's initiatives in 1998 following a national conference on education quality (Al-fotih, 2011; Hamzah, 2012). Workshops and programs, including a World Bank-supported project (2003-2006), have aimed to raise awareness among university staffers about the significance of QA standards (Anaam et al., 2009; Hamzah, 2012). Despite such efforts on the part of the government, QA culture remains weak within administrative and academic systems (Al-Sharjabi et al., 2022; Hamzah, 2012).

Frameworks of QA Standards for Evaluating English Language Programs

Several accreditation frameworks and quality assurance standards have been developed globally to evaluate English language programs in higher education. Internationally, the Commission on English Language Program Accreditation (CEA) provides a comprehensive set of 44 standards covering curriculum design, instructional methods, faculty qualifications, student services, assessment practices, and administrative capacity, with an emphasis on continuous improvement and accountability (Commission on English Language Program Accreditation [CEA], 2022). Similarly, the

British Council Accreditation UK framework focuses on teaching quality, program management, learner support, and resource adequacy (British Council, 2023), while the TESOL Standards for Postsecondary Programs address language proficiency outcomes, curriculum alignment, assessment, and professional development (TESOL International Association, 2021). Another widely recognized reference is the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), which defines six language proficiency levels (A1–C2) and offers descriptors for learning, teaching, and assessment (Council of Europe, 2020).

In the Arab region, QA initiatives such as the Arab Network for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (AAFAQ) provide region-specific frameworks that evaluate program design, pedagogy, assessment systems, and institutional quality management (Arab Network for Quality Assurance in Higher Education [ANQAHE], 2015). Adaptations of teacher preparation accreditation standards, such as those from the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), have also been implemented in the Gulf countries to enhance program effectiveness (Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation [CAEP], 2013). Locally, in Yemen, the Council for Academic Accreditation and Quality Assurance has established national standards for higher education programs, including English language programs. These standards encompass program design, teaching and learning, assessment methods, student support, faculty development, and research, aiming to ensure relevance, efficiency, and alignment with both national and international benchmarks (Council for Academic Accreditation and Quality Assurance, 2015).

Quality Assurance of Course Content Evaluation and Assessment Methods

QA of course content and assessment methods has been widely examined in recent literature. Research shows that high-quality course design depends on clearly articulated learning outcomes, coherent sequencing of content, and strong

alignment between instructional activities and assessment tasks (Vlachopoulos, 2016). Marciniak (2018) adds that effective quality assurance models also require continuous curriculum review, relevance of learning materials, and consistency between course objectives and program outcomes. In relation to assessment, several studies emphasize that validity, reliability, transparency, and alignment with learning outcomes are fundamental indicators of assessment quality. Lucander and Christersson (2020) highlight the importance of explicit assessment criteria, stakeholder involvement, and systematic monitoring to ensure fair and reliable evaluation of student learning. More recent approaches, such as curriculum analytics, demonstrate how patterns in grades and assessment performance can serve as diagnostic indicators for improving both assessment methods and course design (Velazquez et al., 2025). Similarly, broader institutional studies link students' performance, satisfaction, and progression directly to the effectiveness of curriculum structure and assessment practices, reinforcing that robust course content and equitable assessment systems are core components of institutional quality assurance (Vykydal et al., 2020).

In Yemen, quality assurance standards for course content and assessment methods are primarily guided by the National Academic Reference Standards (NARS), which outlines expectations for curriculum design, alignment of learning outcomes, instructional materials, and systematic program reviews (Council for Accreditation and Quality Assurance in Higher Education, 2019). NARS also specifies assessment-related indicators, including validity, reliability, transparency of grading criteria, and alignment between assessment tasks and intended learning outcomes. However, empirical studies show that the implementation of this framework remains inconsistent across higher-education institutions due to armed conflict, severe financial constraints, and institutional instability. Research on Yemeni universities indicates that many

learning programs lack structured curriculum review cycles, clear course specifications, and robust assessment policies, leading to misalignment between content, assessment practices, and national QA expectations (Al-Khatib, 2023; Barakat & Algorafi, 2022). Additional analyses of the higher education sector reveal that disruptions in governance and inadequate institutional capacity during the ongoing conflict have weakened the internal QA systems needed to enforce standards for course design and assessment quality (Alawadhi, 2024). Despite these challenges, studies recommend strengthening internal QA units, adopting standardized course templates, and improving assessment moderation procedures to ensure that Yemeni universities consistently meet national QA indicators for course content and evaluation methods (Sana'a Center for Strategic Studies, 2024). These findings collectively demonstrate that while Yemen has articulated formal QA standards, significant work remains to institutionalize them within course content development and assessment practices across universities.

Previous Studies

A growing body of literature has examined QA practices in higher education across Yemen, the Arab region, and worldwide, revealing a complex and often fragmented landscape. In Yemen, Ateeq (2023) evaluated the English language program at the Faculty of Education in Seiyun University based on the national QA framework. The study found that while national standards were moderately met with a quality compliance rate of 69% and indicator availability at 79%, gaps remained in institutional readiness and strategic alignment.

Alguhali et al. (2022) examined the availability and application of key accreditation quality indicators, especially course content and assessment practices, in programs offered by Amran University. The results indicated that the availability and implementation of standards related to course content (e.g., program and course objectives, curriculum coherence, and

alignment with learning outcomes) were generally rated at a “medium” level, reflecting partial fulfillment of accreditation expectations. Regarding assessment methods, the findings suggested that standards tied to QA and continuous improvement were rated “low”.

Jaber (2021) investigated the extent of the availability of the national academic accreditation and quality standards in the English language courses at Women's College, Hadhramout University, in light of Yemen's national academic accreditation standards issued by the Council for Academic Accreditation and Quality Assurance for Higher Education (2017). The results showed that the content of the specifications of the English language program meets most of the academic program analysis form criteria by 81.6%. The descriptions of courses fulfilled less than half of the criteria for the course specification analysis form for the academic program at a rate of 48%.

Al-Batri's (2020) study explored the perceptions of the faculty and administrators at Sa'ada University about the alignment of academic curricula with quality criteria. It examined the extent to which assessment methods adhered to standards that promote valid measurement of student learning and continuous improvement. The results revealed that while many programs nominally included elements of quality standards on paper, actual implementation was undermined by outdated syllabi, weak alignment between course objectives and content, and insufficient curricular review processes. Participants reported that curricula often lacked coherence, relevance to evolving disciplinary knowledge, and integration of modern pedagogical approaches. Regarding assessment methods, the findings indicated that obstacles such as limited assessment literacy among faculty, overreliance on traditional summative exams, and the absence of systematic formative and diversified assessment strategies significantly constrained the realization of comprehensive QA standards. Faculty noted that assessment practices were often poorly aligned with intended learning

outcomes and did not provide adequate feedback for student growth or program improvement.

Regionally, extensive research has addressed the evaluation of academic and language programs across universities, focusing on course content and assessment methods evaluation. Ataman and Adigüzel (2024) explored instructors' perceptions of the importance and implementation of curriculum and assessment quality standards in Intensive English Programs (IEPs) in Turkish higher education. The results showed that instructors considered all standard to be important. The respondents reported that the curriculum-related standard was implemented “to a great extent”, while the continuous improvement area, which included ongoing evaluation and assessment practices, was implemented “moderately.”

Khalaf (2023) evaluated the English for Iraq: Students and Activity Book for the first intermediate grade in Iraqi schools using quality standards as its framework. The research specifically assessed the teachers' perceptions of the textbook's effectiveness across several critical domains, including content and assessment methods. The findings revealed that the textbook met 80% of quality standards overall, though notable gaps emerged.

Al-Maraziq and Bani Ahmad (2022) explored students' perspectives on the clarity, relevance, coherence, and currency of course content and its contribution to developing their academic and professional competencies at the Faculty of Educational Sciences at Jerash University. The results indicated a moderate to high level of quality. The students reported that course objectives were clear and content was generally coherent and supportive of disciplinary knowledge. However, they also highlighted the need to update some course materials and strengthen the link between theoretical content and practical applications relevant to the educational field.

AlHarbi (2021) evaluated EFL teacher preparation programs in Saudi Arabia by comparing their current status with TESOL

standards. The study determined the extent to which program components aligned with internationally recognized standards for preparing effective English language teachers. The results revealed that while the programs generally covered essential linguistic and pedagogical knowledge, there were noticeable gaps in alignment with TESOL standards, especially in areas such as integrating theory with practice, developing intercultural competence, and systematically addressing contemporary ELT methodologies. Regarding assessment methods, the findings indicated that assessment practices were largely traditional and exam-oriented, focusing more on measuring theoretical knowledge than on evaluating practical teaching skills and professional competencies.

Al-Mekhlaf's (2021) study explored the extent to which course content aligned with program objectives, students' academic needs, and contemporary developments in education from students' perceptions at the Faculty of Education, Imam Abdulrahman Bin Faisal University. The study further examined whether assessment methods effectively measured learning outcomes and supported student learning. The results showed that students generally perceived the content as relevant and coherent, contributing to the development of academic knowledge and research skills. However, they also reported a need for updating some courses, reducing repetition, and strengthening the link between theoretical content and practical application.

Al-Saffara et al. (2020) investigated the extent to which QA standards were available and implemented in the curricula of Basic Education Colleges. The results showed that course content partially met QA standards, as curricula generally included clearly stated objectives and covered essential subject matter. However, weaknesses were identified in curriculum coherence, updating of content, and alignment with labor market and learner needs. Regarding assessment methods, the findings revealed that assessment practices were largely traditional and exam-centered, with limited use of diversified and

formative assessment tools that support continuous learning and skill development.

Al-Azmi and Al-Mutairi (2019) explored students' perceptions of the extent to which total QA standards were achieved in teacher preparation programs at the College of Basic Education in Kuwait. The results indicated a moderate to high level of achievement of quality standards. The students perceived the content to be generally coherent, relevant, and supportive of their academic and professional preparation. The findings also revealed a moderate level of quality of assessment methods. The students reported the programs' reliance on traditional examinations and limited use of diverse and formative assessment tools.

Aldradi's (2019) study examined the extent to which course content and assessment practices achieved the recognized QA indicators at Tripoli University. The results showed that although the programs covered core language skills and basic linguistic knowledge, the curriculum suffered from some shortcomings. It had outdated content, weak alignment with learning outcomes, and limited integration of communicative and practical language use, which reduced its relevance to students' real-life and professional contexts. Furthermore, the findings revealed a strong reliance on traditional summative examinations, with limited use of formative, continuous, or performance-based assessment methods.

Globally, extensive literature highlights course content evaluation and assessment methods as central components of quality assurance processes, stressing the importance of curriculum alignment, validity, and reliability of assessment tools. Grab's (2025) study examined the compliance of the English language teaching program with accreditation standards at the tertiary level. It focused on curriculum content, instructional methods, assessment, and learning outcomes. The results showed that the course content of the ELT bachelor's program was generally effective, relevant, and well aligned with pedagogical principles and accreditation

standards. The students reported high satisfaction and noticeable improvement in language skills and pedagogical knowledge. Although some content required updating to reflect emerging trends such as technology integration and culturally responsive teaching, the curriculum articulated learning outcomes and adequately prepared students for teaching roles. In contrast, assessment methods were identified as a weaker area. The students reported lower satisfaction due to an overreliance on summative assessments, particularly final exams, which did not fully reflect communicative competence or practical teaching skills.

Liu and Huang's (2020) study examined the QA mechanisms of a national English writing assessment and to analyze how assessment design and validation processes contribute to quality improvement at the policy and instructional levels. The study focused on whether the writing assessment reflected

Methodology and Procedures

The present study employed a qualitative content analysis. Document analysis was utilized to extract qualitative data about the QA standards in the ELPP course materials and assessment methods. Document analysis is a form of qualitative research in which documents are interpreted by the researcher to give voice and meaning to an assessment topic (Bowen, 2009). Any document containing text is a potential source for qualitative analysis (Patton, 2015). Unlike quantitative research, which relies on numerical measurement and statistical analysis, qualitative research collects rich, descriptive data.

Materials of the Study

The instructional materials prescribed for the ELPP at Al-Ahgaff University encompass several textbooks targeting different language skills (Al-Bouri, et. al., 2025). However, only one of the prescribed core textbooks was evaluated in this study. The course material chosen for the purposes of the study is the fourth edition of *Weaving It Together: Reading and Writing* by Milada Broukal. This textbook is prescribed for

curricular objectives and learning outcomes. The results showed that the assessment was largely aligned with national curriculum goals, as writing tasks were designed to reflect key content areas and competencies emphasized in English writing instruction.

The present study might contribute to previous international, Arab, and Yemeni researches in adopting QA standards to evaluate course content and assessment methods in the ELPP at Al-Ahgaff University, a highly reputable and internationally recognized national university in Hadhramout, Yemen. The study is unique from most of the previous studies in both methodology and depth of analysis. Unlike studies that depended mainly on questionnaires and stakeholder perceptions, the present study adopted a document-analysis approach, examining actual course materials and assessment papers.

level one and serves as the primary coursebook for developing reading and writing skills, the main focus of the ELPP (Al-Bouri, et. al., 2025). This textbook consists of eight instructional modules that integrate reading texts with structured academic writing activities, vocabulary development, and comprehension tasks. The researcher intentionally limited the evaluation to the textbook of *Weaving It Together: Reading and Writing* because it aligns with the core objectives and learning outcomes of the ELPP. Therefore, the textbook provides the most appropriate basis for assessing the availability of QA indicators related to course content and assessment methods. This study is limited to analyzing two basic materials to achieve the objectives of the study: (a) the course content of the ELPP at Al-Ahgaff University, and (b) two examination papers in the same program.

Data Collection Instrument

The researcher developed an evaluation sheet to determine the availability of QA standards in the course content and assessment methods. Creswell and Poth (2018) state that an evaluation sheet is considered a data collection instrument

because it is a structured tool—similar to checklists, rating scales, and rubrics—used to collect data in an organized and consistent manner. When the evaluation sheet includes clearly defined items and standardized response options, it enables evaluative judgments to be systematically recorded and converted into analyzable data aligned with the study's objectives. The evaluation sheet was adapted from the national quality standards and academic accreditation of the Ministry of Higher Education in Yemen (2021) and previous studies in the literature review on QA (Al-Mahrooqi et al., 2015; Al-Marazeeq, 2020; Al-Mekhlafi, 2021; Al Shraie, 2009; Ateeq, 2023; Jaber, 2021; Quach & Nguyen, 2025).

The evaluation sheet consisted of three main parts and a total of 42 QA indicators. These indicators were descriptive qualitative statements related to the course content and assessment methods. The introductory part of the sheet consisted of course information, including course name, level, types of the course, types of content, number of credit hours, total marks of the course, teacher's name, and their qualification. The second part included 19 indicators (1-19) about the QA standards of the course content of the ELPP. The third part included (23) indicators 20-42 about the standards of assessment methods. The indicators were classified into a dichotomy of a) available, and b) unavailable for raters to select.

To validate the items of the evaluation sheet, it was sent to a panel of nine ELT specialists, professors, and quality assurance experts to check the content validity, appropriateness, and clarity of each statement. The evaluation sheet was finetuned based on the referees' suggestions, ending up with a total of (42) items.

Study Procedures and Data Analysis

The evaluation of the course content and assessment methods of the ELPP was conducted

by two evaluators: the researcher and one ELPP instructor with extensive teaching experience in the ELPP. Both evaluators independently completed the evaluation sheet, rating each quality assurance indicator related to course content and assessment methods. Following the independent evaluation, the two sets of responses were systematically compared. Any items that were rated differently were re-evaluated, thoroughly discussed, and a consensus was reached through professional judgment based on the evaluation criteria and evidence drawn from the course materials. This dual-rater and consensus-based procedure is widely used in qualitative program evaluation to enhance the credibility, dependability, and trustworthiness of evaluative judgments (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014). Qualitative descriptive indicators of the evaluation sheet were counted and converted to percentages to derive the findings.

To check the reliability of the evaluation sheet, Holsti's (1969) coefficient was computed. Holsti's (1969) coefficient is a measure of intercoder reliability, which is crucial for establishing the trustworthiness of the data analysis, particularly in studies involving content analysis where multiple researchers or coders are interpreting and categorizing data later.

To calculate Holsti's coefficient, the following formula was used: $\text{Holsti's CR} = (2 \times A) / (N1 + N2)$. 'A' refers to the number of agreements between the two coders, i.e., the count of items where both coders assigned the exact same code/category. 'N1' refers to the total number of coding decisions made by Coder 1 on the reliability sample. 'N2' refers to the total number of coding decisions made by Coder 2 on the reliability sample.

Table 1. Reliability Coefficient of the Evaluation Sheet

No	Standards	First coder	Second coder	No. of agreements	Coefficient of Reliability
1	Course content QA indicators	19	19	17	0.89

2	Examination papers QA indicators	23	23	19	0.83
Total		42	42	36	0.86

The Holsti's reliability coefficient was found to be 0.86. This result, according to Holsti (1969), was very good. It indicates that the evaluation sheet was good enough to be utilized.

Results and Discussion

Quality Assurance Indicators in the Course Content of the ELPP

The first research question explored the extent of the availability of the QA standards in the course content of the ELPP, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2. The Availability of the QA Indicators of the Course Content in the ELPP

The first standard: Course Content Indicators		Available	Unavailable
1.	The course content clearly reflects the program objectives.	✓	
2.	The course content meets the specialized knowledge requirements.	✓	
3.	The course content reflects up-to-date knowledge in the specialization.	✓	
4.	The course content develops problem-solving skills.		✓
5.	The course content achieves a balance between practical and theoretical aspects, and vice-versa.	✓	
6.	The course content stimulates the discovery of abilities and talents.	✓	
7.	The course content reflects knowledge.	✓	
8.	The course aligns with the needs of the student and society.		✓
9.	The course aligns with labor market requirements.	✓	
10.	The course is characterized by clear language.	✓	
11.	The length of the course is proportional to the number of lectures assigned to it.	✓	
12.	The course aligns with technological advancements and changes.		✓
13.	The course considers the logical sequence and interconnectedness of information.	✓	
14.	The course encourages students to ask questions, discuss, and engage in dialogue.	✓	
15.	The course content is consistent with the content of other related subjects within the specialization.		✓
16.	The course motivates students toward self-learning.	✓	
17.	The course includes activities that promote critical thinking, inquiry, and analysis.	✓	
18.	The course is characterized by a variety and comprehensiveness of self-assessment questions.	✓	
19.	The course connects the scientific material with the learner's environment and experience.		✓
Total		14 (74%)	5(26%)

Table 2 presents the results of the availability of the indicators of quality assurance standards in the course content of the ELPP. The results show that the QA indicators of the first standard achieved an availability rate of 74%, while 26% of the indicators were unavailable. This means that 14 QA indicators were available, whereas 5 indicators were not available in the course content. As can be seen from the data in Table 2, QA indicators 4, 8, 12, 15, and 19 are not available in the course content, whereas indicators 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, and 18 are ranked as available in the ELPP, accounting for 74% of the total number of the indicators. One of the most prominent strengths identified is the clear reflection of learning objectives in the course content. This finding aligns with the principle of constructive alignment proposed by Biggs and Tang (2011), who demonstrated that integrating course objectives enhances student learning. Similarly, Khalaf (2023) identified “achieving the general objectives of the material” as a strongly validated indicator, supported by a high mean score of 4.01, reinforcing the importance of objective–content congruence in curriculum design.

In contrast, Al-Saba et al. (2010) found that course content in a language teacher preparation program did not adequately connect with program objectives due to insufficient course development. Likewise, Al Shraie (2009) reported low mean scores for objective alignment (2.2) and meeting specialized knowledge requirements (2.1). Against this backdrop, the ELPP demonstrates a clear advantage in terms of foundational clarity and alignment of course content with the program objectives.

The findings also indicate that ELPP course content reflects up-to-date knowledge in the field of English language studies. This contrasts with Al-Mahrooqi et al. (2015), who reported a low mean score (2.30) for the currency of textbook topics, suggesting delays in curriculum revision. Conversely, Khalaf (2023) reported a very high mean score (4.75) for course content characterized by modernity and alignment with scientific developments, a finding consistent with the present study.

Another positive outcome is the alignment of the ELPP course content with labor market requirements. This result is consistent with Alkaabi (2020) and Alowaydhi (2016), who emphasized the importance of aligning curricula with labor market needs in the UAE and Saudi Arabia. Al-Maraziq and Bani Ahmed (2022) further supported this finding, reporting a high mean score (3.88) for the course content alignment with the labor market.

Moreover, the ELPP demonstrates a strong emphasis on promoting critical thinking and analytical skills. Research shows that pedagogical approaches such as problem-based learning, outcome-based learning, collaborative projects, and experiential learning effectively enhance critical thinking and practical skills (Driscoll & Wood, 2007; Ho & Ha, 2025; Prince, 2004). This finding aligns with Al-Maraziq and Bani Ahmed (2022), who reported a high mean score (3.86) for courses incorporating activities that foster critical thinking, inquiry, and analysis. While Al-Mahrooqi et al. (2015) reported only moderate levels of critical thinking and analytical skills ($M = 2.57$), the results of the present study indicate the availability of critical thinking and analytical skills in the ELPP.

Finally, the results reveal that ELPP course content motivates students toward self-learning, an approach shown to be particularly effective for tertiary learners (Balabag & Cadilas, 2024; Johnson et al., 2020). This emphasis on self-learning may partially compensate for identified weaknesses, such as limited explicit focus on problem-solving and talent development, by encouraging students to independently seek resources and develop their skills. This finding is consistent with previous studies (Al-Maraziq & Bani Ahmed, 2022; Alowaydhi, 2016; Khalaf, 2023; Quach & Nguyen, 2025).

In contrast, as shown in Table 2, 27% of the quality assurance indicators—specifically, indicators 4, 8, 12, 15, and 19—are ranked as not available in the ELPP. A key deficiency identified is the absence of course content explicitly designed to develop problem-solving skills, which contrasts with the findings of Al-Mahrooqi et al. (2015), who reported that the

general foundation program supported problem-solving skills at a moderate level ($M = 2.51$). In addition, the unavailability of indicator 8, which concerns alignment of course content with students' and societal needs, points to a gap in contextual and contemporary relevance. This result is supported by Al-Mahrooqi et al. (2015), who reported low student perceptions of textbook relevance to their needs ($M = 2.42$), indicating a persistent disconnect between curriculum content and learners' real-life and socio-professional contexts.

Khalaf (2023) identified consideration of individual and societal needs in course content as a notable area for improvement, reporting a low mean score of 2.47. This finding suggests that respondents perceived the course content as insufficiently addressing real-world needs at both the individual and societal levels. Such a shortcoming is significant, as effective curriculum design depends on the relevance of conceptual and informational content, its suitability to learners' proficiency levels, alignment with societal demands, and its ability to connect learning to students' immediate contexts.

Although the primary course material has undergone multiple revisions, the results indicate a poor alignment of the ELPP course content with technological advancements. As stated in the study materials section, the ELPP prescribes the fourth edition of *Weaving it Together: Reading and Writing 1*. The incongruence between the course content and the technological advancements might be interpreted based on the nature of the emphasized language skills in the evaluated materials. Since the textbook focuses predominantly on reading and writing skills, the instructional delivery of these skills traditionally relies heavily on text-based activities, guided practice, and written feedback, the tasks that do not inherently require extensive technological tools.

Quality Assurance Indicators in the Assessment Methods of the ELPP

The second research question addressed the extent to which the QA indicators were available in the assessment methods of the ELPP.

Table 3. The Availability of QA Indicators of the Assessment Methods in the ELPP.

The Second Standard: Assessment Methods' Indicators		Available	Unavailable
20.	Assessment methods achieve the program objectives.	✓	
21.	Diverse methods are used in exams (quizzes, midterms, finals).	✓	
22.	Assessment methods measure understanding and knowledge outcomes.	✓	
23.	Assessment methods differentiate between varying student abilities.		✓
24.	Assessment methods measure cognitive skills (analysis, inference, etc.).	✓	
25.	Assessment methods provide students with continuous feedback.	✓	
26.	Assessment methods cover all course topics.		✓
27.	Assessment methods include objective questions.	✓	
28.	Assessment methods include essay questions.	✓	
29.	Assessment methods are characterized by precision and clear wording.	✓	
Indicators Related to Exam Paper Format			
30.	The university logo is written/printed on the exam paper.	✓	
31.	The university name is written on the exam paper.	✓	
32.	The program name/title is written on the exam paper.		✓
33.	The academic year is written on the exam paper.	✓	
34.	The exam paper is printed (not handwritten).	✓	
35.	The exam questions are clear and specific.	✓	
36.	The exam paper is free of typographical errors.	✓	
37.	Each question has a clear and specified score.	✓	
Indicators Related to Exam Paper Content			
38.	The course exam questions cover most parts of the course.		✓

39.	The course exam questions measure the affective domain of the course.	✓	
40.	The course exam paper is free of repeated questions.	✓	
41.	The course exam questions are appropriate for the exam duration.	✓	
42.	The course exam paper is free of leading questions that guide the student to the answer.	✓	
Total		19(83%)	4(17%)

Table 3 shows the results related to the second research question about the extent to which the QA indicators of assessment methods were available in the ELPP. The results show that the second standard achieved a high availability rate (83%), with 17 % of the indicators being unavailable. In other words, the results show that 19 QA indicators of the assessment methods of the ELPP were available, whereas four (i.e. 23, 26, 32, and 38) were absent.

Based on the results in Table 3, 83% of the assessment-related QA indicators (20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, and 42) are available in the ELPP. This high level of availability aligns with Khalaf (2023), who found that assessment methods within course content are closely related to the teaching objectives, reflecting strong curriculum alignment. Similarly, Quach and Nguyen (2025) emphasized the diversity of assessment methods as a key strength in higher education institutions, while Al Shraie (2009) reported the availability of multiple assessment tools—such as quizzes, midterms, and final exams—with a relatively high mean score (2.40). Consistent findings by Al-Mahrooqi et al. (2015), Al-Azmi et al. (2019), and Quach and Nguyen (2025) further confirm the use of varied assessment methods with high mean scores (2.67). The high proportion of the available indicators in Table 3 suggests that the ELPP actively employs a range of assessment tools and strikes a balance between subjective and objective test items, avoiding reliance on a single assessment format. Moreover, the program's emphasis on continuous feedback aligns with Quach and Nguyen (2025), who noted that lecturers use assessment feedback to examine students' learning and engagement. This indicates that assessment in the ELPP is not limited merely to grading, but it also utilizes an ongoing mechanism to enhance students'

performance and monitor their learning progress.

As shown in Table 3, 17% of the assessment-related indicators – specifically, indicators 23, 26, 32, and 38 – were ranked as not available in the ELPP, highlighting weaknesses in the program's assessment procedures. These gaps raise concerns about the reliability and fairness of student evaluation. Notably, indicator (38) shows that ELPP assessments do not cover all the taught subject concepts, which contrasts with the findings of Khalaf (2023) and Al Shraie (2009), who reported comprehensive coverage of core content in assessments. In addition, while Al Shraie (2009) found that assessment methods moderately differentiated between varying student abilities ($M = 2.1$), the present study indicates a complete absence of this indicator in the ELPP. This lack of differentiation suggests that current assessment practices might not adequately accommodate differences in students' abilities, learning styles, prior knowledge, or proficiency levels, which underscores a pressing need for prompt improvement in a critical area.

Conclusion and Implications

The findings of this study carry significant implications for the quality, relevance, and credibility of the ELPP at Al-Ahgaff University. The program should consider making thoughtful refinements to its current practices to further enhance its effectiveness and impact. Although the results indicate a few deficiencies in the availability of QA indicators in both the course content as well as the assessment methods, they substantially align with the ELPP outcomes. The *Weaving it Together* textbook achieves QA indicators in the ELPP.

However, the observed misalignment with students' needs, societal demands, and technological developments fairly limits the ELPP's responsiveness to the local context and

to global trends in English use, including digital literacy and workplace communication. Inconsistencies between the course content and related subjects within the specialization further point to weak curricular coordination. The limited connection between the course content and learners' environment reduces the meaningfulness of instruction. It may be beneficial to enrich the course content by incorporating key competencies such as problem-solving, digital literacy, and talent development, thereby ensuring the alignment of the content with both academic progression and labor market expectations, particularly in an era witnessing an AI boom.

Equally important, the absence of some key QA indicators in the assessment methods suggests that the current assessment practices do not adequately capture the students' exact language competence. When assessment methods do not differentiate between varying student abilities, high-achieving and struggling learners are assessed using the same instruments, which risks misrepresenting learning outcomes and undermining fairness. Also, the limited coverage of the course topics and the uneven alignment between the exam questions and the course content indicate a potential mismatch between teaching and assessment. The omission of the program title on the exam sheets reflects a minor shortcoming in academic standardization and documentation practices expected under QA frameworks. Diversifying assessment methods and promoting greater inclusivity could offer a more comprehensive means of evaluating the diverse strengths of learners, as a recommended remedy for the unavailability of the QA indicators. Collectively, the ELPP above-stated shortcomings imply a dire need for systematic curriculum review, the building of instructors' capabilities in the QA-aligned assessment design, and the integration of contextual, technological, and skills-based approaches.

Limitations and suggestions for future studies

The study focused primarily on a single institutional context, which might restrict the generalizability of findings to other universities

in Yemen or similar regions. Additionally, the study incorporated neither longitudinal data nor the perspectives of students and faculty, which could provide richer insights into the QA indicators of the course content and assessment methods. Therefore, future studies could consider expanding the scope to include multiple institutions for comparative purposes, utilizing mixed-methods approaches that integrate interviews, questionnaires, and focus groups. Further research may also explore the institutional and policy-level barriers to the full implementation of QA standards, especially in relation to digital integration and talent development.

References

- [1] [1] Academic Accreditation Council. (2021). *Assurance of quality in higher education: Guide for self-assessment study for program accreditation*. Ministry of higher education and scientific research. Retrieved from <https://www.caqa-yemen.org/alasdarat/23>
- [2] [2] Ahmed, H., Ahmed, M., & Siddiek, A. G. (2013). Application of quality assurance and accreditation in the institutes of higher education in the Arab world (descriptive and analytical survey). *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 3(4). <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3181723>
- [3] [3] Al Mahrooqi, R., Denman, C., & Al Issa, A. (2015). Student perspectives of quality assurance mechanisms in an EFL program in the Sultanate of Oman. *International Journal of Arts & Sciences*, 8(5), 81–106. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/289674482_student_perspectives_of_quality_assurance_mechanisms_in_an_efl_program_in_the_sultanate_of_oman
- [4] [4] Al Saffara, A. A., Ismail, Q., & Falih, H. H. (2020). The availability of quality assurance standards in the curricula of basic education colleges. *International Journal of Innovation*, 13(6), 1067–1080. https://www.ijicc.net/images/vol_13/Iss_6/13665_Saffar_2020_E_R.pdf
- [5] [5] Al Shraie, B. Q. (2009). An evaluative study for preparing the teacher program at the College of Education, Sultan Qaboos University, according to academic accreditation standards requirements. *Arab Journal for Quality Assurance in Higher Education*, 9(4), 1–50. <https://doi.org/10.20428/ajqahe.v2i0.616>
- [6] [6] Al-Ahgaff University. (2023a, December 9). The English language unit at Al-Ahgaff university holds a workshop entitled "Building achievement tests for English language courses." Al-Ahgaff

- University. <https://en.ahgaff.edu/university-news/2023/12/the-english-language-unit-at-al-ahgaff-university-holds-a-workshop.aspx>
- [7] [7] Al-Ahgaff University. (2023b, December 20). The English language unit holds a workshop entitled "Strategies for teaching reading and writing." *Al-Ahgaff University*. <https://en.ahgaff.edu/university-news/2023/12/the-english-language-unit-holds-a-workshop-entitled-%E2%80%9Cstrategies-for-teaching-reading-and-writing-%E2%80%9D.aspx>
- [8] [8] Alawadhi, H. (2024). The effects of war on the quality of higher education in Yemen: Scholars' perspectives. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 108, 103058. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2024.103058>
- [9] [9] Al-Azmi, B. H., & Al-Mutairi, F. M. (2019). The degree of achievement of total quality standards in teacher preparation programs at the College of Basic Education in the State of Kuwait from the students' point of view. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, (38), 589–638. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/348827348_drjt_thqq_mayyr_aljwdt_alshaml fy_bramj_a_dad_almlm_fy_klyt_altrbyt_alasasyt_fy_dwlt_alk_wyt_mn_wjht_nzr_altlbt
- [10] [10] Al-Batri, M. (2020). Obstacles to applying comprehensive quality standards at Saada University. *Journal of the Arabian Peninsula Center for Educational and Human Research*, 1(4), 1–25. <https://apcra.com/56793/pcra221341.pdf>
- [11] [11] Al-Bouri, M. S. K., Almuslimi, F. K. A. M., & Alfalagg, A. (2025). Evaluating the teaching performance in the English language proficiency program at Al-Ahgaff University in the light of quality assurance standards from students' perspectives. *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies*, 7(6), 266–287. <https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v7i6.2412>
- [12] [12] Aldradi, I. I. (2019). *Quality assessment of English language programmes in Libyan universities: With reference to Tripoli University* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Liverpool John Moores University, UK. <https://www.proquest.com/openview/487fa03eca2ae1e03dd67fe984345070/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=51922>
- [13] [13] Al-Fotih, T. A. (2011). Quality assurance in German and Yemeni higher education: A comparison. *International Journal on New Trends in Education and Their Implications*, 2(2), 22–28. <https://ijonte.elapublishing.net/files/108/MAN/2-2/2-2-3.pdf>
- [14] [14] Alguhali, M. A., Al-Jarban, N. S., & Al-Banna, K. D. (2022). Availability of programmatic academic accreditation standards in academic programs at Amran University. *Amran University Journal*, 20, 217–246. <https://mail.auy.edu.ye/index.php/jaust/article/view/33>
- [15] [15] AlHarbi, A. A. M. (2021). EFL teacher preparation programs in Saudi Arabia: An evaluation comparing status with TESOL standards. *Pegem Journal of Education and Instruction*, 11(4), 237–248. <https://doi.org/10.47750/pegegog.11.04.23>
- [16] [16] Alkaabi, N. (2020). *An assessment of the effectiveness of the current higher education quality assurance systems for raising higher education standards in the UAE* [Master's thesis, The British University in Dubai]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing. <https://www.proquest.com/openview/8436f816a9955761b84bed04efa3a241/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=2026366&diss=y>
- [17] [17] Al-Khatib, K. M. (2023). Researchers' attitudes towards higher education issues in the Republic of Yemen. *The Arab Journal for Quality Assurance in Higher Education*, 15(51), 53–78. <https://doi.org/10.20428/ajqahe.v15i51.2027>
- [18] [18] Al-Maraziq, I. A. M., & Bani Ahmed, O. M. A. (2022). Taqyīm jawdat al-barāmij al-akādīmīyah fī Kullīyat al-'ulūm al-tarbawīyah bi-Jāmi'at Jarash min waḡhat nazar aṭ-ṭalabah [Assessing the quality of academic programs in the College of Educational Sciences at Jerash University from the students' point of view]. *Humanitarian & Natural Sciences Journal*, 3(1), 662–678. <https://doi.org/10.53796/hnsj3140>
- [19] [19] Al-Mekhlafi, M. S. (2021). *Quality evaluation of postgraduate programs from the perspective of students (Faculty of Education, Imam Abdulrahman Bin Faisal University (IAU), KSA)*. *Journal of Education in Black Sea Region*, 5(2), 76–95. <https://doi.org/10.31578/jebbs.v5i2.201>
- [20] [20] Al-Muslimi, F. Kh. (2011). *Evaluating the English language teacher professional preparation program in the Faculty of Education, Sana'a University in the light of quality assurance standards* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Sana'a University.
- [21] [21] Alowaydhi, W. H. (2016). Evaluation of Arabic language learning program for non-native speakers in Saudi Electronic University according to total quality standards. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(32), 74–90. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1122493.pdf>
- [22] [22] Al-Saba, S. S., Ghalib, A. H., & Abdo, S. A. (2010). Evaluating the Arabic language teacher preparation program in the College of Education at Sana'a University in the light of comprehensive quality standards. *Arab Journal of Quality Assurance of University Education*, 5, 96–130. <https://search.shamaa.org/fullrecord?ID=37310>
- [23] [23] Al-Sharjabi, A., & Elmateri, S. (2020). Impediments to the implementation of quality assurance and academic accreditation. *Al-Nasser*

- University Journal, 1(16), 39–68. <https://search.mandumah.com/Record/1160215>
- [24] [24] Al-Sharjabi, A., & Elmateri, S. (2021). Obstacles challenging Yemeni universities to attain academic accreditation from the perspectives of accreditation and quality experts. *Journal of Educational and Humanitarian Studies*, 13(4), 20–54. https://jehs.journals.ekb.eg/article_194315.html?lang=en
- [25] [25] Al-Sharjabi, A., Al-Matari, S., & Al-Shibani, M. (2022). Developing a system of quality assurance and academic accreditation system. *Journal of Educational*, 6(16), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.26389/AJSRP.R251221>
- [26] [26] Anaam, M. A., Alhammadi, A. O., & Kwairan, A. A. (2009). The status of quality assurance and accreditation systems within higher education institutions in the Republic of Yemen. *Quality in Higher Education*, 15(1), 51–60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13538320902734397>
- [27] [27] Arab Network for Quality Assurance in Higher Education. (2015). AAFAQ quality assurance framework. ANQAHE. <http://www.anqahe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/AAFAQ-Quality-Assurance-Framework-English.pdf>
- [28] [28] Ataman, O., & Adigüzel, A. (2024). Instructors' views regarding the level of importance and implementation of quality standards in intensive English programs. *TESOL Journal*, 15(2), Article e765. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.765>
- [29] [29] Ateeq, E. (2023). *Evaluating the academic program of the English language department at College of Women, Seiyun University in the light of quality standards and national academic accreditation* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Seiyun University.
- [30] [30] Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (2010). *Language assessment in practice: Developing language assessments and justifying their use in the real world*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [31] [31] Balabag, V. C., & Candilas, K. S. (2024). Improving college students' metacognition through self-paced learning and direct instruction in a remote learning modality. *BRU ELT Journal*, 2(2), 142–157. <https://doi.org/10.14456/bej.2024.11>
- [32] [32] Barakat, T. A. H., & Algorafi, M. A. (2022). Student perceptions of quality education in the faculty of engineering at Sana'a University. *The Journal of Quality in Education*, 12(19), 201–227. <https://doi.org/10.37870/joqie.v12i19.320>
- [33] [33] Başaran, O. (2012). Examining perceptions and processes of quality assurance in preparatory English language programs in Turkish higher education institutions. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Middle east technical university.
- [34] [34] Batool, Z., & Qureshi, R. H. (2007). *Quality assurance manual for higher education in Pakistan*. Higher Education Commission, Pakistan. <https://www.pieas.edu.pk/qec/Quality-Assurance-Manual-for-Higher-Education-Pakistan.pdf>
- [35] [35] Biggs, J. B., & Tang, C. (2011). *Teaching for quality learning at university* (4th ed.). Maidenhead: Society for Research into Higher Education/Open University Press.
- [36] [36] Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>
- [37] [37] British Council. (2013). *The English effect: The impact of English on global careers*. <https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/english-effect-report-v2.pdf>
- [38] [38] British Council. (2023). Accreditation UK handbook. <https://www.britishcouncil.org/education/accreditation>
- [39] [39] Brown, H. D., & Abeywickrama, P. (2019). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices* (3rd ed.). White Plains: Pearson Education.
- [40] [40] Chong, S. (2014). Academic quality management in teacher education: A Singapore perspective. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 22(1), 53–64. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QAE-05-2012-0023>
- [41] [41] Commission on English Language Program Accreditation. (2024). *CEA standards for English language programs and institutions*. https://cea-accredit.org/images/2022_docs_and_handbooks/2022_CEA_Standards.pdf
- [42] [42] Cooper, J. O., Heron, T. E., & Heward, W. L. (2007). *Applied behavior analysis* (2nd ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Education.
- [43] [43] Council for Academic Accreditation and Quality Assurance. (2015). National standards for higher education programs in Yemen. Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research.
- [44] [44] Council for Accreditation and Quality Assurance in Higher Education. (2019). *National academic reference standards (NARS)*. Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research, Yemen.
- [45] [45] Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation. (2013). CAEP standards. Retrieved from <https://caepnet.org/standards>
- [46] [46] Council of Europe. (2020). Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment – Companion volume. Council of Europe Publishing. Retrieved from <https://www.coe.int/en/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages>
- [47] [47] Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing*

- among five approaches (4th ed.). Los Angeles & Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- [48] [48] Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486999>
- [49] [49] Darandari, E. Z., Al-Qahtani, S. A., Allen, I. D., Al-Yafi, W. A., Al-Sudairi, A. A., & Catapang, J. (2009). *The quality assurance system for post-secondary education in Saudi Arabia: A comprehensive, developmental and unified approach*. *Quality in Higher Education*, 15(1), 39–50. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13538320902741806>
- [50] [50] Driscoll, A., & Wood, S. (2007). *Developing Outcomes-Based Assessment for Learner-Centered Education: A Faculty Introduction* (1st ed.). New York: Stylus Publishing.
- [51] [51] Eaton, J. S. (2015). *An overview of U.S. accreditation*. Washington: Council for Higher Education Accreditation.
<https://www.chea.org/sites/default/files/other-content/Overview%20of%20US%20Accreditation%202015.pdf>
- [52] [52] Ezeokoli, R. N., & Ayodele, K. O. (2014). Dimensions of service quality encountered by students on sustainability of higher education in Nigeria. *Developing Country Studies*, 4(6), 147–156.
<https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/234681601.pdf>
- [53] [53] Garrison, D. R., & Vaughan, N. D. (2008). *Blended learning in higher education: Framework, principles, and guidelines*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118269558>
- [54] [54] Grab, M. Ö. (2025). *Evaluating the quality of an ELT program in higher education*. *Journal of Education, Society & Multiculturalism*, 6(1), 123–154. <https://doi.org/10.2478/jesm-2025-000>
- [55] [55] Graves, K. (2008). The language curriculum: A social contextual perspective. *Language Teaching*, 41(2), 147–181.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444807004867>
- [56] [56] Hamzh, A. A. (2012). The experience of higher education in the Republic of Yemen in quality assurance and academic accreditation. *Arab Journal for Quality Assurance in Higher Education*, 5(10), 43–60.
<https://search.shamaa.org/PDF/Articles/YEAjqah/10AjqahVol5No10Y2012/3AjqahVol5No10Y2012.pdf>
- [57] [57] Harvey, L., & Green, D. (1993). Defining quality. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 18(1), 9–34.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0260293930180102>
- [58] [58] Ho, N. P., & Ha, Y. N. (2025). Evaluation of the effectiveness of learning outcomes from students' perspectives towards research writing course: A case study. *International Journal of Language Instruction*, 4(1), 33–49.
<https://doi.org/10.54855/ijli.25413>
- [59] [59] Holsti, O. R. (1969). *Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities*. Reading: Addison-Wesley.
- [60] [60] Ijoko, G. A., & Bagbi, L. (2024). Quality assurance in English language education for sustainable national development in Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Research and Production*, 26(1), 1–13.
<https://acjol.org/index.php/nijorep/article/view/4883>
- [61] [61] International Education Accreditation Council. (2025). *5 advantages of accreditation for academic institutions*. <https://www.ieac.org.uk/37-5-Advantages-of-Accreditation-for-Academic-Institutions-blog.php>
- [62] [62] Jaber, S. S. (2021). *Evaluating the academic program of the English Language Department at Women's College, Hadhramout University*. [Doctoral dissertation]. Hadhramout University.
- [63] [63] Johnson, R., Brown, A., & Smith, J. (2020). Impact of self-paced learning on metacognition in college students: A comparative study. *Educational Psychology Review*, 38(3), 567–582.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-020-09558-2>
- [64] [64] Karakhanyan, S. (2019). Quality assurance in the Arab region in the era of customization: Where do we stand in terms of relevance? In A. Badran, E. Baydoun, & J. R. Hillman (Eds.), *Major challenges facing higher education in the Arab world: Quality assurance and relevance* (pp. 211–223). Springer.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-03774-1_10
- [65] [65] Knight, J. (2003). *GATS, trade and higher education: Perspectives 2003 – Where are we?* London: Observatory on Borderless Higher Education.
- [66] [66] Kontio, J. (2012). Quality assurance at higher education institutes: The role of educational initiatives. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Engineering Education* (pp. 27–31). https://www.ineer.org/Events/ICEE2008/full_papers/full_paper336.pdf
- [67] [67] Koslowski, F. A. (2006). Quality and assessment in context: A brief review. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 14(3), 277–288.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/09684880610678586>
- [68] [68] Liu, Y., & Huang, J. (2020). The quality assurance of a national English writing assessment: Policy implications for quality improvement. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 67, Article 100941.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2020.100941>
- [69] [69] Lucander, H., & Christersson, C. (2020). Engagement for quality development in higher education: A process for quality assurance of assessment. *Quality in Higher Education*, 26(2), 135–155.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13538322.2020.1761008>
- [70] [70] Marciniak, R. (2018). Quality assurance for online higher education programmes: Design and validation of an integrative assessment model

- applicable to Spanish universities. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 19(2), 127–154.
<https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v19i2.3443>
- [71] [71] Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.
- [72] [72] Mishra, S. (2007). *Quality assurance in higher education: An introduction*. Bangalore: National Assessment & Accreditation Council.
- [73] [73] Mizikaci, F. (2006). A systems approach to program evaluation model for quality in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 14(1), 37–53.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/09684880610643601>
- [74] [74] Moosa, K. (2006). *Quality assurance in higher education: Successful approaches for improving quality in colleges and universities* [Conference presentation]. ICAQHE 2006.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/350942217_Quality_Assurance_in_Higher_Education_Successful_Approaches_for_Improving_Quality_in_colleges_and_universities
- [75] [75] Moullin, M. (2002). *Delivering excellence in health and social care: Quality, excellence and performance measurement*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- [76] [76] Muthanna, A. A. N., & Karaman, A. C. (2010). *Exploring the beliefs of teacher educators, students, and administrators: A case study of the English Language Teacher Education Program in Yemen* [Master's thesis, Middle East Technical University, Turkey].
<http://etd.lib.metu.edu.tr/upload/12612859/index.pdf>
- [77] [77] Muthanna, A., & Karaman, A. C. (2011). The need for change in teacher education in Yemen: The beliefs of prospective language teachers. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 12, 224–232.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.02.030>
- [78] [78] Nation, I. S. P., & Macalister, J. (2010). *Language curriculum design*. New York: Routledge.
- [79] [79] Neave, G. (1994). The politics of quality: Developments in higher education in Western Europe 1992–1994. *European Journal of Education*, 29(2), 115–134.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/1561636>
- [80] [80] Newton, P. (2018). *Teaching, assessment and quality assurance in higher education*. London: Routledge.
- [81] [81] Oyeade, S. A., Oladipo, S. A., & Adetoro, J. A. (2012). *Determinants and strategies for quality assurance in Nigerian university education*.
[https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1](https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=461404d3e214f2ee1569e58151de5a071edecd5f)
- [82] [82] Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- [83] [83] Prince, M. (2004). Does active learning work? A review of the research. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 93(3), 223–231.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2004.tb00809>
- [84] [84] Quach, T. T. N., & Nguyen, L. (2025). Lecturers' perceptions of the quality assurance system for general English teaching programs in Vietnamese higher education. *International Journal of TESOL & Education*, 5(2), 1–28.
<https://doi.org/10.54855/ijte.25521>
- [85] [85] Quach, T. T. N., Le, V. C., Pham, T. X. T., Pham, P. P., & Nguyen, T. T. X. (2024). Integrating TPACK to enhance quality assurance in general English teaching: A case study in higher education. *Proceedings of the Asia CALL International Conference*, 6, 250–267.
<https://doi.org/10.54855/paic.24618>
- [86] [86] Rasool, S. (2010). *A comparative study of the quality assurance practices in public and private universities* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Institute of Education and Research, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan.
<https://pr.hec.gov.pk/jspui/handle/123456789/1021?mode=simple>
- [87] [87] Sana'a Center for Strategic Studies. (2024). *A war of attrition: Higher education in Yemen*. Sana'a Center for Strategic Studies.
- [88] [88] Shahid, H., & Wahab, Z. (2015). Quality assurance mechanism in higher education institutions: A thematic analysis of experts' perspectives. *Ma'arif Research Journal*, 10(1), 61–70.
<https://mrjpk.com/index.php/mrjpk/article/view/194>
- [89] [89] Soomro, T. R., & Ahmad, R. (2012). Quality in higher education: United Arab Emirates perspective. *Higher Education Studies*, 2(4), 148–152. <https://doi.org/10.5539/hes.v2n4p148>
- [90] [90] TESOL International Association. (2021). *TESOL standards for postsecondary programs*. TESOL Press.
<https://www.tesol.org/Store/Detail.aspx?id=1593>
- [91] [91] UNESCO. (2003). *Higher education in the Arab region 1998–2003: Meeting of higher education partners*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0013/001303/130341e.pdf>
- [92] [92] Usmani, M. A. W., & Khatoon, S. (2016). Impact of quality assurance initiative on Pakistani universities. *International Journal of Research*

- Studies in Education*, 5(4), 83–90. https://consortiacademia.org/wp-content/uploads/IJRSE/IJRSE_v5i4/1326-4696-1-PB.pdf
- [93] [93] Usmani, M. A. W., Khatoon, S., Shammot, M. M., & Zamil, A. M. (2012). Towards a network of quality assurance in higher education: A Pakistani model. *Archives des Sciences*, 65(7), 224–229. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/332142657_towards_a_network_of_quality_assurance_in_higher_education_a_pakistani_model
- [94] [94] Uzun, L. (2016). Evaluation of the latest English language teacher training program in Turkey: Teacher trainees' perspective. *Cogent Education*, 3(1), Article 1147115. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2016.1147115>
- [95] [95] Velazquez, L., Atenas, B., Cruz Hernández, N., Castro Palacio, J. C., & Monsoriu, J. A. (2025). Diagnosing grade inflation: A curriculum analytics approach to quality assurance in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2025.2572513>
- [96] [96] Vlachopoulos, D. (2016). Assuring quality in e-learning course design: The roadmap. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 17(6), 183–205. <https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v17i6.2784>
- [97] [97] Vlăsceanu, L., Grünberg, L., & Pârlea, D. (2007). *Quality assurance and accreditation: A glossary of basic terms and definitions*. Bucharest: UNESCO.
- [98] [98] Vlk, A. (2006). *Higher education and GATS: Regulatory consequences and stakeholders' responses*. Enschede: Centre for Higher Education Policy Studies University of Twente.
- [99] [99] Vykydal, D., Folta, M., & Nenadál, J. (2020). A study of quality assessment in higher education within the context of sustainable development: A case study from Czech Republic. *Sustainability*, 12(11), 4769. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12114769>
- [100] [100] Watty, K. (2006). Addressing the basics: Academics' view of the purpose of higher education. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 33(1), 23–39. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03246279>
- [101] [101] Winter, R. S. (1991). *Overcoming barriers to total quality management in colleges and universities*. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 18(3), 53–62. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ433121>
- [102] [99] Vykydal, D., Folta, M., & Nenadál, J. (2020). A study of quality assessment in higher education within the context of sustainable development: A case study from Czech Republic. *Sustainability*, 12(11), 4769. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12114769>
- [103] [100] Watty, K. (2006). Addressing the basics: Academics' view of the purpose of higher education. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 33(1), 23–39. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03246279>
- [104] [101] Winter, R. S. (1991). *Overcoming barriers to total quality management in colleges and universities*. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 18(3), 53–62. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ433121>