



GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES FOR ACADEMIC REVIEW

[University of Cape Town]

Academic Review Guidelines (v19)

Table of Contents

Section 1: Policy framework for the Academic Review System

1.1	Value Assumptions	3
1.2	Levels of the review system	3
1.2.1	Course Monitoring	3
1.2.2	Programme Reviews	3
1.2.3	Department/School/Divisional Review	4
1.2.4	Discretionary (Special) Reviews	4
1.2.5	Interdisciplinary Programmes	4
1.2.6	PASS Reviews	4

Section 2: Procedures for External, Discretionary and Departmental/ School/ Divisional Reviews

2.1	External Accreditation Programme Evaluations	5
2.2	Discretionary Reviews	5
2.3	Departmental/School/Division Review	5
2.4	Exemption from the Academic Review Process	6

Section 3: Departmental Review Process

3.1	Preparing for a departmental/school/divisional review	7
3.2	Constituting a panel	7
3.3	Student Representation on Panels	8
3.4	Compiling the self-review portfolio	9
3.5	Running the review site-visit	11
3.6	Writing the review report	12
3.7	Follow-up on the review	13

Appendices

•	Appendix A: Definitions	14
•	Appendix B: Roles & Responsibilities in UCT's Academic Review System	16
•	Appendix C: Suggested Evaluative Questions for Departmental/ School/ Division Reviews	19
•	Appendix D: Examples of Evidence to be provided for Academic Review at UCT	24
•	Appendix E: Exemplar of Terms of Reference	26
•	Appendix F: Exemplar of Interview Schedule	28
•	Appendix G: Types of data that can be provided by the Institutional Information Unit	30

1. Policy framework for the Academic Review System

1.1 Value Assumptions

Academic review at UCT is understood as a collective activity based on a collegial rationality. UCT's Guidelines for Academic Review are based on the following values:

- UCT is committed to a systematic, planned approach to quality assurance that ensures that evaluation findings are used to effect improvement. This approach aims to ensure comparable treatment across the university, whilst at the same time recognizing that evaluation and improvement are always context specific and that professionals need discretionary space to reflect on and improve their practice.
- Evaluation is understood as a potential form of organizational learning and development, depending on the extent to which there is openness to change and on the extent to which the review recommendations are internalized by the department. Utilization of evaluation results for decision-making is crucial to the effectiveness of a quality assurance system. If this 'quality loop' is not closed the effectiveness of the system is greatly undermined.
- UCT is committed to research and teaching excellence, and the promotion of the academic interests of our students. It is the professional responsibility of each staff member at UCT to work towards achieving and enhancing high quality.
- In keeping with UCT's commitment to institutional transformation, one of the purposes of academic review should be to verify the extent to which transformation at UCT is being addressed.
- In keeping with UCT's commitment to being a 'research-led' university, the review findings should be evidence-based. This commitment to rigour in evaluation research will ensure that the claims we make about the quality of UCT's educational provision are reasonably valid and reliable. It is proposed that academic review at UCT be based on cycles of planning and budgeting, implementing, monitoring or evaluating and improving practice at three levels: the course, the major/ programme and the department.

1.2 Levels of the review system

1.2.1 Course Monitoring

Course monitoring is the responsibility of course convenors reporting to Heads of Departments.

1.2.2 Programme Reviews

There are three types of review: formative routine reviews (managed by the HODs and the Deans), [discretionary reviews](#) (managed by the IPD and the Deans), and [external accreditation review](#) (managed by external bodies).

- *Routine Internal Formative Review of Programmes (led by the HOD)*

Routine internal improvement-orientated reviews of programmes are the responsibility of the Programme Convenors and the Heads of Department.

- *External Accreditation and Programme Review*

This type of programme review is conducted for accreditation by external professional bodies or as part of judgment-orientated evaluations where judgments are made by external panels against externally prescribed criteria. The cycles for accreditation reviews are set by the external bodies and vary in duration from one to six years.

1.2.3 Department/School/Divisional Review

Departmental/school/Division reviews form the third level of UCT's academic review system. Their purpose is developmental and they are conducted in 10-yearly cycles. At this level of review, the focus is on the effectiveness of the department as an academic organization in carrying out its core functions (teaching, research and social responsiveness). These reviews are the responsibility of Deans who together with the IPD should establish the review schedule for a 10-year cycle.

1.2.4 Discretionary (Special) Reviews

A Dean or the Executive can initiate a discretionary review in order to make a summative judgment with important decision-making consequences, for example about the re-conceptualisation or change of direction of a department/unit/programme / major / set of courses.

1.2.5 Interdisciplinary Programmes

To ensure that interdisciplinary programmes that involve more than one department are considered in a review cycle, Deans of the faculties (where the programmes are housed) will be asked to identify interdisciplinary programmes to be reviewed within the 10-year review cycle.

1.2.6 PASS Reviews

The IPD conducts reviews of PASS departments on a 6-year cycle. These reviews are important for assuring the quality of the overall learning environment that UCT provides for students.

2. Procedures for External, Discretionary, and Departmental/School/Divisional Reviews

2.1 External Accreditation Programme Evaluations

This type of programme review is conducted for accreditation by external professional bodies or as part of a national review by the Higher Education Quality committee (HEQC). These are usually summative, judgment-orientated evaluations made by external panels against externally prescribed criteria. The cycles for accreditation reviews are set by the external bodies and vary in duration from one to six years. In order to maintain coherence in the system, wherever an external accreditation review is held, the accreditation review report and departmental response should be sent by the HoD to the Dean. The report should then be forwarded via the Dean to Faculty Board or an appropriate Faculty Committee and, via the IPD, to the SEC. Subsequent improvement plans and progress reports should also be submitted via the IPD to the SEC.

2.2 Discretionary Reviews

The Executive or a Dean may determine the need for a discretionary review based on various factors e.g. analysis of quantitative data, student feedback, imminent changes in headship etc. As part of the process of initiating a discretionary review, Deans will consult with the IPD and HoD concerned and set out the Terms of Reference for the review. Once the Dean has finalised the Terms of Reference, the HoD (and programme convenor, where applicable) should meet with the IPD to set up the panel and plan the review. The IPD will assist in the running of discretionary reviews where possible given capacity constraints. However, the IPD will not allocate any funding for these reviews.

The methodology for the reviews should be determined in consultation with the Dean or DVC who commissioned the review to ensure that it is aligned to the purpose of the review and the nature of the unit being reviewed.

Where the review is commissioned by a Dean the final report and response should be forwarded to the Dean for presentation at Faculty Board. Where a discretionary review is initiated by a member of the Executive the review report and response should be submitted to the Senate Executive and tabled in OpsMag for noting where appropriate. If the review falls within the ambit of the Council from a governance point of view the reports and responses should be submitted to Council as well.

2.3 Departmental/School/Division Review

The main focus in this category is on departments/ schools/ divisions. However, a special motivation can be made for reviews of units within schools/departments or divisions for strategic reasons. These reviews form the third level of UCT's academic review system. These are comprehensive, improvement-orientated evaluations that include an evaluation of at least one key undergraduate major/programme and one key postgraduate programme offered by the entity. Given their significance (they occur only once every 10 years), they are conducted formally, as rigorously as possible and facilitated by the IPD. These reviews are an essential component of Quality Assurance in the university and all departments are subject to the review process. The Terms of Reference for each review should be determined by the Dean in consultation with the HoD concerned and the IPD.

In determining the focus for the review, the findings of quantitative data provided by the IPD and evaluative questions listed in Appendix C must be considered by the Dean and HoD. Reviews of majors should form part of a departmental review.

These reviews provide an opportunity for the entity to review collectively the previous decade of activities and to plan for the next decade. It is therefore crucial that all permanent academic staff and key administrative staff members in the entity participate in the review and ensure that it is meaningful to their work.

Further detail on the review process is provided in [Section 3 \(Departmental Review process\)](#).

2.4 Exemption from the Academic Review Process

Where a programme undergoes regular external accreditation review, in order to lighten the evaluation load on staff, HoDs may choose to apply to the Quality Assurance Committee to use the findings of the accreditation review rather than undertaking any further programme review. Where a department has undergone a discretionary review in the last two years, an application for exemption may be made. In making an assessment of the application the QAC will solicit the view of the Dean on the extent of the congruence between the external and UCT's review criteria.

The QAC will consider applications for exemption and grant a full or partial exemption where all, or most, of the UCT evaluative questions are addressed by the external review. Where a partial exemption is granted the QAC will request the unit to provide additional information where deemed necessary. The QAC may also decline the application if the degree of congruence between UCT's approach to reviews and that of the external body is minimal.

3. Departmental Review Process

3.1 Preparing for a departmental/school/divisional review

The following process is suggested for preparing for reviews:

- The IPD in consultation with Deans, the SEC and advised by the Quality Assurance Committee, sets out a schedule of reviews for a 10 year cycle. The selected entities should be given a lead time of at least one year to prepare for a review.
- The Dean will set out the [Terms of Reference](#) for the review in consultation with the IPD and the HOD.
- The review of a department will include entities affiliated to the department which are not accredited by the URC.
- The HoD assembles a project team who develop a project plan for the review process. Programme reviews can be delegated to programme convenors where appropriate.
- The IPD provides administrative support and further quantitative data where required. Other specialist expertise, e.g. from CHED or the Research Office, can be drawn on in the preparation process as required.
- The review project team gathers and analyses data (see Appendix G for a full list of [data provided by the Institutional Information Unit](#)) in order to answer the evaluation questions set out in the Terms of Reference.
- [Compiling the self-review portfolio](#) should begin approximately four months prior to the review panel's site-visit. Each section of the review portfolio should conclude with a list of areas for improvement in light of the review findings. One month before the visit 5 hard copies of the portfolio should be submitted to the IPD.

3.2 Constituting a panel

- The DVC for Quality Assurance appoints the Chair of the review panel, usually from amongst the internal membership, and after consulting the Dean. The Chair should not be a Deputy Dean located in the same faculty as the department.
- The panel is appointed by the responsible DVC after consultation with the Dean. Reviews are most beneficial when a strong panel has been selected. As such, departments are encouraged to give careful consideration to the suggested panelists whose names are submitted for nomination to the review panel.
- Where resources permit, nominations should include an international panelist.
- When internal academics are nominated, departments must provide a brief summary of current interactions with such nominees where these relate directly to the core functions of the department.
- Departments are asked to submit a minimum of three suggested names of external panelists and three internal panelists to the QA unit, together with a brief motivation for each nomination and a brief description of the nature of the relationship with the proposed panelists.

- Panelists who participate in the review process should be able to act with full impartiality. Hence care should be taken to avoid possible conflicts of interest. As a guideline, individuals who fall into the following categories would be considered inappropriate:
 - a relative of senior staff in the department being reviewed
 - a person who has a formal affiliation or close familial relationship with any section of the department that is being reviewed
 - a current external examiner, or a person who has been an external examiner in the past 5 years
 - a person who currently is, or has been, a visiting lecturer within the last five years
 - a person in a cognate department within UCT who works very closely with the department being reviewed, for example, teaches on several courses within the department
 - a person who is in a leadership position within the same faculty as the department, for example, a Dean or Deputy Dean.

- Each review panel will ultimately comprise:
 - a) Two senior academics external to UCT (one should be an international academic* where resources permit)
 - b) Up to two senior academics from another UCT department
 - c) A Dean's representative, e.g. Deputy Dean (optional)
 - d) Where appropriate a member with special expertise e.g. a representative from an employer body (optional)
 - e) A member of CHED who will be an assessor member in the review panel
 - f) Up to two student representatives. Where the number of panelists from categories (a) to (d) is five or less, one postgraduate student representative shall be appointed to the panel. Otherwise, provision should be made for two postgraduate student representatives.

**Note: The IPD will only cover the costs of an average domestic flight. The balance of the travel costs will need to be covered by the Departments.*

3.3 Student Representation on Panels

International benchmarking suggests that student participation on review panels is widely accepted and encouraged. Student panelists play a critical role in providing a student perspective in crafting the review report and in ensuring that student issues are addressed. Every effort should be made to appoint up to two postgraduate student representatives to the panel in consultation with the Student Representative Council. Where a specific request has been made by the department to select students from a faculty other than that in which the department being reviewed is located, this should also be taken into consideration when identifying the student representatives.

The students will participate as full members of the review panel throughout the process, except where sensitive Human Resource related issues are discussed these students will be asked to recuse themselves. They will be asked to sign confidentiality agreements on the review process.

The SRC should identify student nominees through its Postgraduate Activities Subcommittee. The following should be borne in mind:

The student panelists should:

- Be registered UCT postgraduate students.
- Have experience of participating in the University's quality assurance processes, for example as a member of the Students Representative Council or Faculty Council or as a class representative.
- Not be from the department being reviewed.
- Be available to attend a briefing session prior to the review.
- Be able to commit the required amount of time for the duration of the review.
- Be able to commit to reading the review documentation beforehand, assist in formulating of the panel findings and commenting on the final review report.

3.4 Compiling the self-review portfolio

- The self-review portfolio should be as inclusive of different voices in the department as possible, (including PASS staff) and every effort should be made to ensure that it is representative of all staff views.

As such, the draft self-review portfolio should be presented to the entire department for comment and input before it is sent to the Quality Assurance Unit. Efforts should also be made to seek student perspectives on issues needing attention. Staff and students should be informed that they may submit their views to the panel Chair for consideration by the panel.

- It is important that any claims made in the portfolio be supported by [evidence](#) presented in a set of Appendices (specific documents should be referred to by page number). (See [Appendix D](#) for suggested sources of evidence to be provided for review panels).
- The portfolio should include an Executive Summary of about 5 pages in which the Terms of Reference developed for the review and the key findings are presented.
- The portfolio should begin with an Introduction that gives an overview of the department, its history and development, contextual factors impacting on the work of the department, its present reputation and distinctiveness, its current vision and goals and, its envisaged direction for the future. The introduction should also indicate what the department currently considers to be its strengths and challenges and, the environmental opportunities and threats that it faces. Where appropriate, this should take into account comparative benchmarking data. Finally, the introduction should contain a brief description of the processes followed by the entity in preparing for the review.

The portfolio should then include a section on each of the following four areas: teaching, research, social responsiveness and leadership & management with transformation as a cross-cutting issue.

- Each section should consist of a narrative that includes the following elements:
 - the goals of the entity for this area¹
 - the [key evaluation questions](#) the entity set itself for this function and the reasons for their selection
 - the findings of the self-evaluation for each of the areas (these must be backed up by supporting evidence provided in the Appendices)
 - identification of areas for improvement for each area.

3.4.1 Teaching and Learning

In preparing the section of the self-review portfolio on teaching and learning HoDs are required to select at least one undergraduate major/programme/courses and one postgraduate programme for in-depth review but departments are free to identify other courses which may be of concern. The IPD will propose possible programmes or courses to focus on based on analysis of the quantitative data.

Where the recommendation of the IPD is rejected, reasons should be provided. When preparing this section, examples of issues to consider are provided in [Appendix C](#).

3.4.2 Social Responsiveness

In preparing the section of the self-review portfolio on social responsiveness, HoDs are encouraged to reflect on activities that address critical development challenges facing our country and continent, through mutually beneficial partnerships with government, national research councils and advisory bodies, the private sector, civil society and non-governmental and community-based organisations etc. Examples of issues to consider are provided in Appendix C.

3.4.3 Governance and Administration

In preparing the section of the self-review portfolio on the management and leadership of the Department, HoDs should provide:

- An organogram of the department's structure(s) and commentary on decision-making processes in the department.
- An account of how goals and priorities for the department are set and how these align with faculty and university goals and priorities.
- A staffing profile by race, gender, nationality, and level.

¹ For example for teaching, a department could describe the attributes of the graduates and the nature of the graduate profile that it hopes to produce in 10 years' time. For research it could describe the focus and quality of its research outputs in 10 years' time.

In the course of reviews, panels often engage with issues pertaining to staff workloads and working conditions in response to issues raised by the units of review. Panels are requested to note issues that concern them, or that they feel require further interrogation or attention, for the consideration of the Faculty or the Executive Director. Examples of issues to consider are provided in [Appendix C](#).

3.4.4 Research

In preparing the section of the self-review portfolio on **research**, HoDs should provide information on the nature of the research activities and key focus areas in the unit under review (e.g. department or research groupings) as well as a statement on the main objectives and future plans for research over the next ten years:

- A list of related research outputs (quantified) per staff member over the past 10 years;
- An account of the structures that exist to manage research activities in the department or unit.
- Examples of issues to consider are provided in [Appendix C](#).

3.5 Running the review site-visit

The site-visits are conducted over 2-3 days. It is suggested that for a review, one or two panel members be assigned to take responsibility for gathering information on a particular area and for making a submission on that area shortly after the site-visit.

The site-visit process should be planned in such a way that panelists are able to gather data and form opinions on each function listed above. In the interviews the panel should elicit the views of stakeholders such as students, tutors, administrative staff; and if need be, employers and external examiners.

Where individual programmes are to be reviewed in depth, additional days may be required for this. The last day of the site-visit is used for summarising the findings. The IPD provides administrative support for the planning, coordination and recording of the review site-visit. The IPD runs a briefing session for the department six months prior to the review and for the panel not later than 2 weeks before the site-visit (once the Self-Review Portfolio is available).

The IPD and the Chair (in consultation with the HoD) are jointly responsible for drawing up a detailed [schedule for the site-visit](#). This includes determining groups of interviewees and formulating lines of enquiry to pursue. The Chair leads the panel, manages the discussions, sums up the findings and is responsible for writing the first draft of the report and signing off the final version within the agreed time-frame. The IPD produces a summary of the review proceedings to be used by the Chair and panel. (See [Appendix B](#) for a list of responsibilities to be performed by the various role-players involved).

The Chair provides preliminary feedback to the Department at the end of the review. **All staff (both academic and PASS) are encouraged to attend the panel feedback session on the final day of the review, where key findings are reported to departments. HoDs are strongly encouraged to ensure that all academic and PASS staff are invited to these sessions.**

3.6 Writing the review report

The typical structure for a review report is as follows:

- **Executive Summary:** Key findings and commendations and recommendations as related to the Terms of Reference for the review.
- **Overview of the department:** A brief summary of the material provided in the review portfolio, including a summary of the department’s vision and goals, its ethos and its contextual possibilities and constraints.
- **Scope of the Review:** The department’s key evaluation questions or Terms of Reference for the review. The panel’s response to these, other priorities and issues identified by the review panel.
- **The four core areas:** For each of these areas, (teaching, research, social responsiveness and leadership & management) the report should assess the strengths and challenges that it faces and provide commendations and recommendations. The report should also comment on whether the department has been able to respond appropriately to previous evaluations and reviews.

3.6.1 Estimated Timeline for Completion of the Review Report

4 weeks post review	IPD produces summary of site-visit proceedings and circulates this to panel members
4 weeks post review	Panelists submit focus area reports to the IPD who forwards them to the Chair
8 weeks post review	Chair produces Version 1 of the report to IPD who circulates it to panel members for comment
10 weeks post review	Chair considers inputs from panel members and produces Version 2 of report
12 weeks post review	IPD sends Version 2 to HoD for accuracy check
13 weeks post review	IPD makes corrections and Chair signs off final Version 3 of report. IPD forwards Version 3 to HoD and Dean.
19 weeks post review	Final review report and final improvement plan are submitted by HoD to IPD, Dean and DVC
12-18 months post review	Progress report is submitted by HoD to IPD, Dean and DVC

3.7 Follow-up on the review

Once finalised, the department is given the opportunity to respond to recommendations made by the panel in the review report, in the form of an improvement plan. The improvement plan should also specify the intended actions for implementation of recommendations and, where possible, indicate the anticipated timeline for implementation of the action.

The final Review Report and Improvement Plan (together with a copy of the self-review portfolio) are submitted to the responsible DVC and the Dean of the Faculty approximately 18 weeks after the review visit. At the invitation of the entity concerned, a CHED staff member may be called on to assist with the finalisation and implementation of the Improvement Plan. The Report should also be submitted for discussion at Faculty Board. The Dean must engage with the Department around its Improvement Plan and endorse the final version, taking into account any budgeting and resource implications. **This should be submitted to the Quality Assurance Unit for inclusion in the SEC agenda when the Review Report and the entity's Improvement Plan are discussed. Where the panel has made recommendations for consideration by a faculty, or the University Executive a formal response from the faculty and/or University Executive, is required.**

The final Review Report and the Improvement Plan are submitted to the SEC for consideration. The same follow up procedures apply to external reviews.

The IPD is responsible for producing a meta-evaluation of the review process and findings, trends and issues across the institution for inclusion in the annual Teaching and Learning Report. Review Reports and Improvement Plans are available as data for future HEQC institutional audits.

HoDs report to Deans on progress on the implementation of improvement plans by means of written progress reports submitted 12 to 18 months after each review. The progress reports are submitted to the Deans for approval and thereafter they are sent to the IPD, for submission to the SEC.

The SEC will determine whether a department has responded adequately to the review recommendations in its Improvement Plan and Progress Report or whether additional responses are required by the department. The SEC will consider departmental responses to the review recommendations and, where necessary, invite the HoD to attend for the item in order to gain further clarity on particular issues.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Definitions

Monitoring – the regular oversight of the implementation of a course/ programme to monitor change over time. It is usually undertaken by interested internal parties for developmental purposes. It may use formal or informal methods, make use of existing data or generate new data. Action and monitoring usually work together, informing each other, hand-in-hand.

Evaluation – the systematic application of social science research procedures to assess the conceptualization, design, implementation or outcomes of social intervention programmes. Evaluation leads to evidence-based judgments about the quality, effectiveness, efficiency, relevance or impact of a programme, service or product. Evaluation can be used as a management tool to judge and improve organizational activities and processes. **Formative evaluation** leads to useful information to guide improvement, usually used to serve needs intrinsic to the process or practice concerned. **Summative evaluation** leads to a summary judgment about a programme or institution's performance, usually used to serve needs extrinsic to the process or practice concerned.

Review – a long-term formal procedure that includes both monitoring and evaluation and both formative and summative purposes. It usually includes an element of self-review by insiders followed by external validation and assessment by external parties.

Quality – a subjective and value-laden concept, associated in everyday usage with what is good, excellent or worthwhile.

Quality assurance – the systematic internal and external management procedures and mechanisms by which an institution assures its stakeholders of the quality of its systems, processes, products and outcomes and of its ability to manage the maintenance and enhancement quality. This term usually subsumes the meanings of quality assessment, quality management and quality enhancement.

Quality assessment or quality control – the systematic and regular evaluation to measure or check a product or service against pre-determined standards leading to summative judgments about the quality of the product or service.

Quality enhancement – a commitment to improvement and development, usually intrinsically motivated in response to personal or professional drivers.

Quality management – the overall management functions, structures and personnel that determine and implement the quality assurance policy of an institution, which in turn aims to safeguard the quality of the institution's services and products.

Quality management system – the system, procedures and processes that an institution establishes to quality assure its services and products. This usually includes management information systems.

Institutional audit – an external scrutiny using systematic evaluation procedures that usually include peer review to guarantee that an institution of higher education has an adequate quality management system in place to assure and enhance its quality. Audit focuses on the processes that are believed to produce quality and normally does not evaluate quality itself. Audit reports are usually made public.

Programme accreditation – an achieved status awarded to a programme by an authorized body on the basis of summative evaluation conducted by external stakeholders to check whether the programme meets pre-determined threshold quality criteria, thus enabling the public certification of the attainment of minimum (educational) standards. Accreditation of higher education programmes usually focuses on the inputs, objectives or learning outcomes of a programme (its design) as well as on its implementation (process).

Improvement – a commitment to ensuring that the quality (of the inputs, processes, outputs, outcomes and impact) of a service or product continues to develop or change for the better.

Accountability – the responsibility to demonstrate publicly to external stakeholders that a service or product is achieving its aims, meeting legitimate expectations and is being provided in an effective and efficient manner.

Validity – the extent to which the criteria and methods of evaluation are appropriate and actually measure what they are intended to measure, and the extent to which the inferences made on the basis of the findings are justified and dependable.

Reliability – the extent to which scores obtained on a measure are reproducible on repeated administrations, that is, the concern that measurements are consistent and generalisable to other performances conducted under the same conditions.

Moderation – a check on the accuracy, consistency and fairness of assessment.

Indicators – the quantitative or qualitative measures of the inputs, processes, outputs and outcomes of activities performed by an evaluand in fulfilment of its purpose. Performance indicators are used to claim the achievement of pre-specified goals. In a monitoring and evaluation system, it is the relationships between a set of indicators that is significant.

Appendix B: Roles & Responsibilities in UCT's Academic Review System

Responsibilities of Deans

- Approves the schedule of reviews
- Initiates discretionary reviews where deemed appropriate
- Ensures that the departments due for review participate in the process
- Consults with the IPD and HoDs of review units and approves the Terms of Reference for discretionary and departmental/school/divisional reviews
- Submits review reports to relevant faculty structures and then to the SEC via the IPD
- Discusses improvement plans and progress reports with HoDs, and signs these off taking into account planning, budgeting and resource implications

Responsibilities of HoDs

- Meets with the IPD to prepare for the review
- Confirms date of the review
- Nominates and motivates for panel members
- Leads process for determining evaluation questions and Terms of Reference
- Implements and leads the process for compiling the self-review portfolio, ensuring that all staff and student faculty councils are consulted
- Writes the SRP and Improvement Plan and ensures that deadlines for submissions to the IPD are met
- Cooperates with the IPD and panel Chair to formulate the site-visit schedule
- Cooperates with IPD and panel Chair to ensure that the site-visit runs smoothly
- Conducts accuracy check on the draft review report
- Responds to review recommendations in the Improvement Plan (in consultation with the Dean) that will accompany the final review report
- Prepares a follow-up progress report 18 months after the review

Responsibilities of Chair

- Liaises with the IPD around the review, analysis of the SRP and the drawing up of the schedule for the site-visit
- Leads the panel in analysing the SRP, confirming lines of enquiry and in allocating focus areas to panelists
- During the site-visit chairs sessions, manages time and panelists
- Leads panel discussion and the verbal report back to the HoD
- Writes the first draft and signs off final review report on the basis of panelists' reports and the IPD summary

Responsibilities of Panelists

- Confirm appointment, travel arrangements and dates of review with the IPD
- Read and analyse the SRP and suggest lines of enquiry
- Take responsibility for a focus area in keeping with own expertise
- Conduct interviews in a collegial manner, share expertise and accept authority of the Chair
- Validate or question claims made in the SRP
- Add value to the areas identified for improvement in the SRP without being prescriptive
- Take notes on focus area during site-visit
- Within three weeks of site-visit submit a written report (maximum of 5 pages) on the focus area to the IPD in which recommendations and commendations are supported by evidence from the SRP and/ or the site-visit
- Support Chair in writing of the review report, comment on Chair's first draft
- Observe confidentiality of the review process and documentation.

Responsibilities of the International Panelist

International panelists are full members of the panel. However, as the involvement of international panelists is designed to facilitate international benchmarking, the international panelists are requested to provide a brief separate report containing a high-level assessment of the department in relation to his/her international experience.

Responsibilities of the Institutional Planning Department (IPD)

The IPD is responsible for managing UCT's academic review system. With regard to academic reviews the IPD provides the following services:

- Frames and facilitates departmental/school/divisional and discretionary reviews. Services reviews by assisting HoDs to prepare self-review portfolios; setting up and briefing the panels; recording site-visit proceedings; providing a summary of site-visit proceedings and supporting panel chairs to produce review reports.
- Facilitates the monitoring of improvement and progress reports.
- The IPD's Institutional Information Unit provides the following quantitative data for scrutiny and reflection in review processes at course, programme/ major and department levels
- Contributes to institutional research and quality assurance by conducting:
 - graduate surveys
 - meta-evaluations across the academic review system
 - annual trends collected in the Teaching & Learning Report
 - reviews of PASS departments
 - benchmarking exercises with other universities
 - and by collecting and disseminating examples of good practice.

Responsibilities of Centre for Higher Education Development (CHED)

CHED is an institutional resource that provides expertise on teaching and learning. With regard to the revised system of academic review, CHED could provide the following support:

- A CHED assessor should be appointed to serve on every departmental/school/division review panel to provide educational and curriculum expertise.
- In general, CHED staff can be requested to offer advice on staff, curriculum and student development in the wake of reviews.

Appendix C: Suggested Evaluative Questions for Departmental/ School/ Division Reviews

Teaching and Learning

The review of a department's teaching function will normally include a review of at least two key programmes or majors offered by the department, one at undergraduate level and the other at postgraduate level. The evaluative questions listed below are derived from the HEQC's generic criteria for programme review and can be used to guide the programme evaluation component of the review.

Curriculum Design

- Are the major/programme's purpose, rationale and learning objectives/ outcomes clearly stated?
- Are the courses making up the major/programme coherently planned with respect to levels, credits, purpose, outcomes, content and rules of combination? Are the rules and different learning pathways clearly spelt out for students?
- Are the major/programme's course contents up-to-date, research informed and appropriate to the major/programme's learning objectives/outcomes and student development pathways and the South African context?
- Is there evidence of integration of scholarship from Africa into the curricula?
- Is there evidence of opportunities for students to acquire capacities to analyse and engage with the continuing legacy of apartheid, and other national challenges e.g. poverty and inequality, drawing on different sources of knowledge and disciplines?
- Does the major/ programme meet and balance the needs of all its stakeholders: students, employers, the professions, regional and national needs, institutional and departmental/school/divisional goals? Where relevant, are external stakeholders consulted about its design?
- Are there flexible entry points to cater for diversity of educational preparedness?
- Does the programme promote students' access to and competence in the use of ICTs? To what extent does it provide a technology and organisational infrastructure that enables an electronic learning and teaching environment?
- Does the major/ programme adequately cater for different types of preparedness for higher education? Is there an adequate range of support for students?
- Where relevant, does the major/ programme provide supervised and assessed community or work-based experience, and applied projects, for undergraduate students?

Student Profile and Performance

- How is student recruitment and placement planned to ensure that its selection criteria are clear and transparent?
- How does the current student composition and profile compare with departmental/school/divisional equity targets?
- How does the major/ programme's graduate profile and degree class distribution compare with its intake profile? (Race and gender break-downs of throughput and retention rates should be considered).
- What measures are in place timeously to identify students at risk?
- How do expert peers rate graduate performance and the quality of student learning on the major/ programme?
- How does the major/ programme develop research skills and generic lifelong learning skills in students?
- What does graduate opinion indicate about their satisfaction with the major/ programme and where relevant, about their employability?

Staff Profile and Development

- How does the current staff profile compare with faculty and departmental/school/division equity targets?
- Are there strategies in place for recruiting black academics?
- Are academic staff, including contract, part-time staff and tutors who teach on the major/ programme academically, professionally and educationally qualified to do so?
- How are staff development needs identified?
- What plans are in place to promote career trajectories of staff?
- In which ways does the entity support, encourage and create opportunities for postgraduate students (and Black students in particular) to pursue an academic career trajectory?
- How are new staff inducted into the Department?

Programme/Major Management

- Is the major/ programme managed effectively?
- What mechanisms are used to ensure coherence of the programme or major?
- Is the major/ programme adequately resourced?
- Is the curriculum team satisfied with the management of the major/ programme? Are professional working relations between staff maintained through good communication and cooperation?
- How does the major/ programme monitor student performance and progression and what mechanisms does it have to identify and assist students at risk?
- How does the major/ programme encourage student feedback and participation in the development and running of the major/ programme? How are student grievances, appeals, concessions, etc. managed? How are students given feedback on course evaluations?
- How do planning, evaluation and improvement of the major/ programme occur? How is feedback from graduates, students and external examiners used?

Teaching, Learning and Assessment

- What teaching theories and approaches underpin the teaching on the major/ programme and are these appropriate?
- Does any research into teaching and learning occur?
- How is innovation in methods of teaching and learning encouraged?
- In what ways are students encouraged to become independent learners?
- What tutoring practices are used in the department?
- How does the department support tutors in their role as facilitators of learning?
- What academic development provision is offered to students and how responsive is it to their learning needs?
- What assessment policies govern the assessment of students and how do these ensure the reliability and validity of student assessment?
- Is a range of assessment methods used across the major/ programme and is there an appropriate balance between formative and summative assessment?

Learning Environment

- Are the library services and workspace options that cater for differentiated spaces to meet teaching, learning and research adequate to meet the needs for postgraduate and undergraduate students?
- Are rich library and study resources including access to electronic knowledge resources available to all students, both on and off campus?
- Is the major/ programme adequately resourced in terms of IT infrastructure, support, hardware and software?
- Is the on-line learning environment coherently integrated with the face-to-face teaching environment?
- Are there adequate social spaces for students?
- To what extent does the major/ programme create a rich learning environment for students?

Research

- What self-defined goals and criteria have been established for the research activities of this unit of review including any entities affiliated to the department that are not accredited by the URC? How does the department's output fare in terms of these goals, criteria and measures?
- Is there a departmental/school/divisional research strategy which identifies developmental goals for future research projects or directions?
- Is there evidence of a strategic approach to partnerships?
- What counts as 'research output' in the context of this unit of review? (Books, journals, patents, reports, materials, images, devices, performances, etc.)
- What measures of quality are applicable in this context (and what debates typically attend these measures?)

- What initiatives are underway, or are planned, to further strengthen the quality of the research output in terms of these measures?
- What is the current profile of researchers in the department
- What goals does the department have in terms of this profile (e.g. succession planning, capacity gaps, equity issues etc.), and how are these related to broader institutional or national goals?
- Is there a strategy for motivating staff and students to engage in innovation and research uptake and/or engaged scholarship and recognising it as a mainstream activity in the university?
- What initiatives are underway, or are planned, to address the capacity developmental goals of the department?
- What conditions currently support or frustrate the rollout of capacity development initiatives?
- Are staff happy with forms of support provided for researchers?

Post-graduate Provision

- What strategies are in place to recruit more black postgraduate students?
- How does the department identify and motivate students at undergraduate level who are potentially eligible for postgraduate study?
- What procedures are in place for monitoring the supervision process and student progress?
- How does the programme offer research skills training and create a rich research environment for its postgraduate students?
- How does postgraduate teaching contribute to the research profile and outputs of the department?

Social Responsiveness

- What is the department's profile of research forms of engaged scholarship? (strategic research, applied/ action research, social innovation, knowledge application/transfer e.g. the development of products or patents, systems development, expert advice, policy development)
- What is the department's profile of teaching forms of engaged scholarship? (organisation of service learning/community based education, provision of continuing education courses, production of popular learning materials)
- Information on public service forms of engaged scholarship? (public commentary, public lectures, organisation of conferences involving non-academics, involvement in external non-academic structures, clinical service)
- How do you assess the quality of your ES activities?
- How do you assess the impact of the ES activities?

Management and Leadership

- **Structure, Staffing and Organisational Roles**
 - What is the management and administrative structure of the department?
 - How are redress and equity issues receiving attention in the recruitment, selection, appointment and development of academic and support staff?

Governance and Management of the Department/ School/ Division

- How are decisions taken in the entity?
- Are there dedicated structures and conveners who have responsibility for the quality management of academic programmes, research and social responsiveness?
- Are there clear channels through which students and staff express their views about practices which are experienced as exclusionary and prejudiced
- Are there clearly defined procedures, time-frames, reporting and communication arrangements for the administration and monitoring of programmes, research and social responsiveness?

Departmental/School/Divisional Planning

- How effective are the systems for prioritization and target-setting at all critical decision making levels?

Appendix D: Examples of Evidence to be provided for Academic Review at UCT

Departmental/School/Divisional Management

- Department mission and goals
- Summary of SWOT analysis
- Organogram showing management structures and lines of responsibility in the department
- Organogram showing programmes and courses offered by the department
- Material on academic offerings
- Staffing profile and list of full-time and part-time academic and PASS staff members, plus abbreviated CVs
- List of all units and research centres or any other entity associated with the department
- Departmental/school/division budget

Teaching and Learning

- Programme Level
 - Relevant pages of the faculty handbook, programme and course outlines and reading lists, assessment tasks and weightings
 - List of staff who teach on programmes, plus their abbreviated CVs and where applicable, an indication of how staff research activities contribute to the programme
 - Numbers and profiles of students enrolled for each level/ year/ qualification on the programmes
 - Examples of assessment tasks, especially at exit points
 - Samples of recently assessed student work that shows the feedback given by markers, including by tutors.
 - Graduation and retention data for each programme/ major as a whole by race and gender (provided by the IPD)
 - Analysed results of student opinion surveys
 - Past programme review reports
 - Samples of external examiners' reports
 - Samples of course evaluations and follow up activities
 - Evidence of educational research and development (including publications)

Social Responsiveness

- Qualitative
 - Feedback from external constituencies
 - Formal evaluations
 - Student evaluations of community engagement and/or service learning, and student feedback in the form of critical reflection
- Impact assessments (where appropriate).

- Quantitative
 - Number and size of grants obtained
 - Number of contracts awarded
 - Number of awards won
 - Number and range of partnerships
 - Number of invitations from social movements, industry and government to give talks, facilitate workshops or seminars, chair panels, commissions or task teams
 - Involvement in continuing education programmes
 - Number of reports, popular articles, monographs, policy documents etc

Research

Data on:

- Contract research reports
- Peer-reviewed publications in accredited journals
- Peer reviewed publications in non-accredited journals
- Peer reviewed publications in conference proceedings
- Book chapters
- Creative outputs
- CVs related to research work

Appendix E: Exemplar of Terms of Reference

Adapted Terms of Reference

Psychology Review: Terms of Reference

The Department of Psychology has chosen the following as the specific foci of the review:

1. In the **undergraduate** programme, to focus the review through the following two questions:
 - a. We are re-curriculating our undergraduate offering. We will be moving from offering a variety of semester-long courses at each of 2nd and 3rd year, to an offering of only two courses (one in each semester) for those years. We would like the review panel to comment on our newly redesigned curriculum, as to its fitness as a Psychology major globally as well as locally.
 - b. Transformation is a key focus in the department. We would like the review panel to comment specifically on how our curriculum is appropriate to the South African context and relevant for students in the classroom.
2. Of our **postgraduate** programmes, we would like a review of our neuropsychology programme. As soon as the new neuropsychology regulations are promulgated, we anticipate that this programme will undergo review by the Health Professions Council of South Africa. Feedback from review panel would be enormously helpful in preparing for that.

Teaching and learning

1. Curriculum design:
 - a. Are the courses in the major, and the material within those courses, up-to-date, research informed and appropriate to the major's learning objectives, student development pathways, and the South African context?
Is there evidence of integration of scholarship from Africa into the curricula?
2. Student profile and performance:
 - a. Does our undergraduate courses adequately cater for different types of preparedness for higher education? Is there an adequate range of support for students across the different courses and within the major?
 - b. How the courses in the undergraduate major monitor student performance and progression, and what mechanisms does it have to identify and assist students at risk?

Research

1. How do our research achievements compare, broadly speaking, to the Faculty of Humanities at UCT, to universities in South Africa, and in the rest of the world?
2. What is our ability to raise grant money?
3. Staffing around research:
 - a. What proportion of our department is research active?
 - b. What is the demographic profile of our active researchers?
 - c. Do we make any special efforts to enable junior researchers?
4. Do we have research collaborations in the dept?

Postgraduate provision

1. What are postgraduate numbers in the department, and what is our throughput rate (by race and gender)?
2. What have been the postgraduate supervision loads (Masters and PhDs) of each staff member (current and completed)?
3. What strategies are in place to recruit more black postgraduate students at all levels?
4. What procedures are in place for monitoring the supervision process and student progress?

5. How does the department mentor postgraduate students into the academy (e.g., through roles as tutors, markers, lecturers)?

Social responsiveness

1. What is the department's profile of research forms of engaged scholarship? (strategic research, applied/action research, social innovation, knowledge application/transfer e.g. the development of products or patents, systems development, expert advice, policy development).

Management and leadership of the department

1. Structure, staffing and organisational Roles
 - a. What is the management and administrative structure of the department?
 - b. How are redress and equity issues receiving attention in the recruitment, selection, appointment and development of academic and support staff?
2. Governance and management of the department
 - a. How are decisions taken in the department?
 - b. Are there dedicated structures and conveners who have responsibility for the quality management of academic programmes?
 - c. Are there clear channels through which students and staff may express any grievances, including practices that they may feel are exclusionary or prejudiced?

Appendix F: Exemplar of Interview Schedule

A Typical Schedule for a 3- day Departmental/ School/ Divisional Review Site-visit (where the site visit is planned for 5 days the schedule will need to be reviewed)

DAY ONE

Time slot	Activity
08h30-08h45	Briefing Session Introduction of panel members Input from the Director of Institutional Planning on the University's expectations regarding the Review Process Summary of interviewees
08h45-09h15	Panel planning Confirmation of panelists' focus areas and responsibilities Finalisation of lines of inquiry for each of the 4 core areas
09h15-09h30	Tea
09h30-10h30	Meeting with the HoD HoD introduces the department and key issues and findings in the review portfolio
10h30-11h30	Interview with Dean/ Deputy Deans
11h30-13h00	Academic Staff Interviews
13h00-13h30	Lunch
13h30-15h00	Professional and administrative staff interviews
15h00-15h15	Tea
15:00-16h30	Interviews continued
16h30-17h00	Panel reflection on day's findings Summing up the day's findings, and initial formulation of recommendations and commendations

DAY TWO

Time slot	Activity
9h00-10h00	Panel preparation Panel reviews the interview schedule for the day and prepares the lines of enquiry for the different interview sessions.
10h00-10h30	Tea
10h30-13h00	Interviews

	A sample of interviewees is scheduled. Examples include undergraduate/postgraduate students, tutors, alumni, post-doc researchers, course convenors for service courses, PASS staff.
13h00-13h30	Lunch
13h30-15h00	Interviews contd.
15h00-15h15	Tea
15h15-16h30	Interviews contd.
16h30-17h00	Panel reflection on day's findings Summing up the day's findings, and initial formulation of recommendations and commendations

DAY THREE

Time slot	Activity
09h00-10h00	Follow up interview with HoD (if necessary)
10h00-12h00	Panel planning Chair and panel determine how the report write-up will be distributed amongst one another. The panel finalises commendations & recommendations for each of the four focus areas. Prepare for verbal feedback to department on key findings of the review.
12h00-12h30	Verbal Report-back to HoD Chair shares key findings (commendations and recommendations)
12h30-13h30	Lunch

Appendix G: Types of data that can be provided by the Institutional Information Unit

The IPD's Institutional Information Unit provides the following quantitative data for scrutiny and reflection in review processes at course, programme/ major and department levels:

- headcount undergraduate and postgraduate enrolments aggregated to departmental and major/ programme levels
- FTE enrolment and success rate data
- student equity enrolment profiles aggregated to departmental and major/ programme levels
- course performance data, disaggregated by race and gender, inside and outside of majors and programmes
- cohort retention analyses
- graduate equity profiles aggregated to major/ programme/ qualification type
- departmental data on staff qualifications relative to institutional norms
- departmental data on staff research outputs relative to institutional norms
- staff equity profiles aggregated to departmental level
- glossary of planning terms.