



澳門科技大學
**MACAU UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE
AND TECHNOLOGY**

FACULTY REVIEW

NOVEMBER 2009

In this document 'Faculty' is taken to include any academic Faculty, Department, School and Centre in the University.

WHAT IS A FACULTY REVIEW?

A Faculty Review is a rigorous, systematic, objective, impartial, expert-based examination, evaluation and self-evaluation of how effectively a Faculty is working, as part of the ongoing pursuit of higher levels of achievement and quality in the university, and in the service of Faculty improvement. A Faculty Review includes:

- Preparation and submission of a self-evaluation document;
- Review of the self-evaluation document by the Faculty Review Panel;
- Collection and submission of additional documentation to the Faculty Review Panel;
- Scrutiny of the documentation by the Faculty Review Panel;
- A visit by the Faculty Review Panel to the Faculty and its officers;
- The production of a report that comments on judgements about the Faculty, the strengths of the Faculty, areas for improvement, and recommendations for further action.
- Following the receipt of the report, a follow-up action plan for the Faculty's development.

Faculty Review addresses questions such as:

- What are we doing, why, how and how well?
- How high is the quality of the Faculty?
- How do we know?
- How can the Faculty be improved and the improvement sustained?

It addresses major questions such as:

1. What does the Faculty say it is doing and values about its work?

2. What *procedures* does the Faculty have for planning, monitoring, reviewing, developing what it says it does and values about the work of the Faculty?
3. What *processes* does the Faculty have for planning, monitoring, reviewing, developing what it says it does and values about the work of the Faculty?
4. How does the Faculty know and inform itself and stakeholders if these procedures and processes are *working/being used*?
5. Are the procedures and processes in place, operating and *effective* in meeting the Faculty's stated mission, values, purposes, policies, self-evaluation contents and criteria for the effectiveness of the Faculty?
6. How does the Faculty *inform itself and stakeholders* about the procedures and processes for planning, monitoring, reviewing, developing what it says it does and values about the work of the Faculty?
7. How does the Faculty inform itself/stakeholders about how these procedures and processes for the Faculty are effective in terms of *outcomes and quality* (i.e. impact analysis)?
8. How high is the quality of the Faculty and its elements?
9. What benchmarks and benchmarking does the Faculty operate?
10. How has the Faculty *improved* its quality over time, and how do we know?
11. What recommendations can be made for needed *interventions and developments*?
12. *How and where* can the quality of the Faculty be improved and enhanced, *by whom* and in what *time frames*?

The intention is to show that the Faculty has proper procedures and processes for quality assurance, that these are actually operating, that they are making a positive difference, and that they are impacting on the work of the Faculty. Within Faculty Review, self-evaluation has a primary purpose of bringing about improvement, to ensure that a Faculty is meeting its goals, and has procedures for informing itself of this, and that its statements of quality are evidence-based. It is designed to identify and diagnose the strengths and weaknesses of the Faculty in a way that can bring about improvement, i.e. its intention is constructive and formative. The Australian Universities Quality Agency (2008: 5)¹ indicates other several possible intended outcomes of self-evaluation within Faculty Review:

- 'Verifying that processes are in place, and whether these are operating effectively
- Determining whether existing policies and procedures are effective in meeting institutional goals, and identifying any gaps
- Providing information that may not normally be evident (such as localised innovative practices in teaching and learning)
- Enhancing understanding (across staff, student and/or other stakeholders) of organisational processes and outcomes

¹ Adams, R., Strong, J., Mattick, L.E., McManus, M.E., Matthews, K.E. and Foster, J. (2008) *Self-review for Higher Education Institutions*. Melbourne: Australian Universities Quality Agency.

- ‘Reality testing’ achievements toward strategic goals Increasing engagement with change
- Disclosing weaknesses and forcing confrontation
- Promoting honest communication
- Encouraging benchmarking, internally and/or externally
- Providing a base for ongoing comparison and benchmarking
- Identifying activities that are misaligned with organizational goals/objectives
- Providing evidence of quality processes in place
- Promoting empowerment and engagement of participants
- Promoting an evidence-based culture
- Promoting learning
- Enabling self-identification of improvement gaps and development of associated strategies to address these prior to external audit.’

A Faculty Review is conducted by internal members of the university and by external reviewers. It comprises a self-evaluation by the Faculty and the Faculty committee(s), together with a review by members of the university who are not from the Faculty, and who include senior officers of the university.

A ‘Faculty’ Review encompasses, amongst other areas:

- (a) The mission, goals, targets and objectives of the Faculty;
- (b) Programs and courses in the Faculty;
- (c) Leadership and management of the Faculty;
- (d) Teaching, learning and supervision;
- (e) Research and publication in the Faculty;
- (f) Staff development in the Faculty;
- (g) Student-related matters;
- (h) Staffing and staff-related matters;
- (i) Internal and external relations with partners, the community and stakeholders;
- (j) The resources in the Faculty;
- (k) Strategic planning and implementation in the Faculty;
- (l) Challenges, opportunities and directions; quality assurance in the Faculty; and
- (m) Improvements and developments for actions planning in the Faculty.

A ‘program’ is defined here as an entire set of courses leading to an award.

A ‘course’ is defined here as a single element of a program to which an identifying code has been assigned.

‘Examination’ is defined here as any formal assessment, examination, and/or evaluation of performance which contributes to the grading of students in a course or Faculty.

'Assessment' here is defined as the process of reaching a decision on the marks/grades to be awarded to students. It also includes the provision of formative feedback to students where appropriate (see also below: releasing marks).

An 'award' here is defined as the degree/certificate/diploma awarded, together with its classification (where appropriate).

A Faculty Review involves: evaluation and self-evaluation; internal peer review; the involvement of external parties with the appropriate disciplinary expertise; and student, alumni, faculty and administrative input.

BENEFITS OF A FACULTY REVIEW

A Faculty Review enables a Faculty and its staff to identify its strengths and weaknesses, and to know where to intervene to make effective and sustainable, continuous improvements. It brings internal benefits to the Faculty and the staff, and external benefits to the students and the reputation of the institution.

A Faculty Review enables leaders and staff involved in the Faculty to formulate, clarify and articulate its mission, vision, goals, objectives and its relation to those of the university, and to review the nature and impact of the academic work in the Faculty. It enables staff to receive feedback on the Faculty and to take action as a consequence of the feedback, setting collective priorities, and disseminating good practice. Faculty Review enables evidence-based decision-making and leadership to be cultivated and implemented. It identifies needs and resources, and it promotes action planning. It develops the staff's abilities to monitor and evaluate themselves, each other, students and the Faculty.

A Faculty Review enables Faculty members to develop a systematic, rigorous mentality/mindset towards, and way of looking at, planning, delivering and evaluating a Faculty and their own and others' work, and to do this methodically, collaboratively and collegially. It develops collaborative and collegial practices and improves morale. It is part of the ongoing professional development of the staff and, indeed, enhances the professionalism of the staff through regulation, self-regulation, and self-organized Faculty development.

Faculty Review leads to continuous improvement of the Faculty, its staff and students. Continuous improvement is both the medium and outcome of Faculty Review.

A Faculty Review is a collaborative exercise, and one of its benefits is a consensus on Faculty goals, objectives and intended outcomes, such that there is a common benchmark set of criteria for planning and evaluating the Faculty. It also enables staff to identify the unique and/or distinctive features of the Faculty, and this can help it to position itself for student and staff recruitment and orientation (which, indeed, is also useful for Human Resource Managers and Personnel Officers), and for publicity, identify what the Faculty stands for and where it is going. Indeed, in working toward the consensus, staff will be involved in examining best practice in its own and other, similar Faculties.

Faculty Review is data-driven, and, amongst the data set, are student outcomes. Faculty Review can help staff to understand the processes that led to the outcomes, so that these can be improved where necessary, i.e. the Faculty Review has a clear formative agenda.

Faculty Review can also be used in the presentation of proposals for research applications and grants, as some grant applications require applicants to provide

information on institutional or organizational capability and capacity; Faculty Reviews can provide a useful source of information here.

For accountability purposes, Faculty Review enables the Faculty and university to know and to understand the distinctive strengths, accomplishments, needs, and future plans of the Faculty. In turn, this enables the Faculty to offer support, identify areas of common interest in the Faculty, to link individual members of staff or entire Faculties with relevant resources on- and off-campus, and to meet identified resource needs.

Faculty Review is designed to ensure consistency, reliability and excellence in meeting the demands of fitness *of* purpose and fitness *for* purpose, and in a timely fashion ('right first time'). It ensures that the Faculty is aligned not only to its own aims, objectives and intended learning outcomes, but also that, these, in turn, are aligned to the strategic direction of the Faculty and the university. It indicates where the Faculty in practice is, and is not, matched to its declared intentions. It improves the quality of the Faculty, the work of the staff and students, and their learning and achievement.

A Faculty Review enhances communication and within a Faculty and its members, it improves morale and a sense of working towards a common aim of the best performance and operation of the Faculty, by enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of the Faculty.

Faculty Review also enhances the reputation of the institution as well as the Faculty, and it meets external demands for demonstrating quality, quality assurance and quality enhancement.

Quality enhancement is the act of taking planned steps to bring about continuous improvement in the effectiveness and efficiency of the Faculty.

One of the effects of Faculty Review is to compile thorough and complete documentation of a Faculty, such that new members of staff can understand, and, indeed fit into, a new Faculty with maximum ease and minimum time; this can be useful if staff turnover is an issue.

PURPOSES OF A FACULTY REVIEW

A Faculty Review is designed to contribute to the ongoing processes of assurance and enhancement of quality in the Faculty, its teaching, learning, research, publications and evaluation over and above the other mechanisms and their reporting cycles that the Faculty has for reviewing and improving its work.

Its fundamental purpose is Faculty improvement and development, to ensure that the quality of the Faculty is at the highest level, and to be seen to be constructive and formative (rather than solely judgemental and summative), and that the processes for this exist in the Faculty, are operating effectively, and are impacting on the quality of the Faculty. It is based on the principle that every Faculty can be improved continuously and that evaluation and self-evaluation, both internal and external, are ongoing practices that serve that improvement.

The aims of a Faculty Review are:

- To establish whether there are appropriate and effective procedures and mechanisms, and that these are working, to ensure that the intended features of the Faculty are being achieved, that the research, publication, teaching, supervision and learning opportunities and outcomes are of the highest quality, that intended outcomes are being achieved, that the intended standards of the Faculty, staff and student outcomes are correct and are being achieved, that the Faculty's awards are fair and appropriate to the Faculty, and that the Faculty specifications are being addressed and delivered;
- To establish whether the Faculty continues to be up-to-date, relevant and valid in the light of developments in the environment, the discipline, the curriculum, research, publication, supervision and in teaching and learning;
- To review the quality of the information provided to staff and students and to potential and actual applicants;
- To review how the Faculty is implementing its policies on all matters related to the Faculty, and with what process and outcome success;
- To identify good practice within the Faculty that can be disseminated both within and outside the Faculty.

A Faculty Review is evaluative, and not only descriptive, and is evidence-based and data-driven, with evidence drawn from a wide range of referenced sources.

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR A FACULTY REVIEW PANEL

The Faculty Review Panel is established to review, examine, evaluate, comment and report on the quality of the Faculty, and to make recommendations for its improvement and development. The Faculty Review Panel must conduct scrutiny of relevant documents and materials, and make a formal visit to the Faculty in connection with the Faculty Review, interviewing members of the Faculty, and, provide a formal report on the Faculty, included in which are recommendations for improvement to the Faculty. The Faculty Review Panel must review the quality, scope, focus, direction and coverage of the all the Faculty's activities, including: leadership and management; teaching (undergraduate and postgraduate); learning; staff-related and student-related matters; research activity, training and outcomes; publication; supervision; internal and external relations; quality assurance; development and strategic planning; and internationalization. These are all in respect of:

1. how, and how well, the Faculty meets its own and the university's mission and strategy;
2. how effectively the Faculty meets its stated aims and objectives, and the evidence that the Faculty uses to evaluate its own achievement of these;
3. the quality of the Faculty and its achievement of intended outcomes for staff and students;
4. the quality of the work of the Faculty, and the mechanisms and procedures to assure and enhance these;
5. the quality of the programs, research, teaching, learning, supervision and publication in the Faculty;
6. the quality of the awards gained by students;
7. admission, retention, progression, and achievements of the staff and students in the Faculty, and how these can be improved;
8. the quality of the staffing of the Faculty and their suitability for the programs and courses that they teach;
9. workloads of the staff;
10. the quality of the resources, support and training for teaching, research, publication and learning that are provided by the Faculty;
11. links that the Faculty makes to outside parties, and the public information that is provided on the Faculty;
12. the quality of the leadership and management of the Faculty;
13. the quality of the quality assurance mechanisms and procedures of the Faculty;
14. the standards reached by staff and students and the strategies to review and improve these;
15. the comparability of standards of achievement with those elsewhere;
16. student representation and support in the Faculty;
17. the quality of the Faculty's self-evaluation, review and development;
18. strategic planning and action planning in the Faculty;
19. staff recruitment, retention and development ;

20. gathering, commenting on and acting on students' views and experiences in the Faculty;
21. administrative support in the Faculty;
22. strengths and weaknesses of the Faculty;
23. identifying areas for development and improvement in the Faculty and the terms of an action plan to achieve these.

The Faculty Review Panel reports to the Learning and Teaching Committee and to the Faculty Board.

STAGES IN A FACULTY REVIEW

The Learning and Teaching Committee is responsible for coordinating the Faculty Review. For that part of the Faculty Review that resides within the Faculty, the Dean is responsible. The administrative offices of the university must be involved in Faculty Review. The Faculty must produce a self-evaluation report on the Faculty, and this must include an action plan. Subsequent to the Faculty Review, the Faculty must produce an action plan to indicate how it addresses the findings and recommendations that come from the Faculty Review.

The following are guidelines for a Faculty Review:

Step One: No less than seven months before the Faculty Review Panel visit takes place, the Head of the Learning and Teaching Committee, together with the Head of the Quality Assurance Office, discuss the membership of the Faculty Review Panel with the Learning and Teaching Committee and Quality Assurance Office, and members of the Faculty Review Panel are appointed by the Learning and Teaching Committee. They normally comprise:

- a. two or more senior officers of the university (one of whom may be the Head of the Learning and Teaching Committee or his/her nominee);
- b. a senior academic from another Faculty in the university;
- c. one or more external consultants who have the appropriate academic expertise and experience in the field concerned.

Step Two: No less than seven months before the Faculty Review Panel visit takes place, the Head of the Learning and Teaching Committee, together with the Head of the Quality Assurance Office, informs the Dean of the Faculty of the Faculty Review and consults with the Dean of the Faculty on the scope of the review and membership of the Faculty Review Panel. The Faculty Review Panel is appointed, convenes and makes arrangements for the immediate release of documents that are required for the Faculty Review, to the Dean of the Faculty, and sets the date for the campus visit.

Step Three: No less than seven months before the Faculty Review Panel visit takes place, the Dean of the Faculty convenes a small Working Group to plan and prepare for the Faculty Review. That group normally comprises:

- The Dean and Deputy/Assistant Dean (the latter where appropriate)
- Program Coordinators
- A senior Administrative Officer in the Faculty
- A small number of academic staff from the Faculty
- One or more student members of the Faculty
- Co-opted members of the Faculty if desired

(It may be similar, in part, to the Faculty Board)

The Working Group enlists the cooperation and collaboration of staff on the Faculty and others as necessary, to prepare for the Faculty Review and in the compilation and completion of the self-evaluation document, during the visit of

the Faculty Review Panel, and the subsequent feedback, discussion and action planning

Step Four: No less than six months before the Faculty Review Panel visit takes place, the Head of the Quality Assurance Office briefs the Faculty Working Group on the review procedure and on how to prepare the self-evaluation document and associated documentation. Members of the Quality Assurance Office will also be available for ongoing discussion and consultation.

Step Five: No less than six months before the visit of the Faculty Review Panel, the formal request is sent to the Dean of the Faculty for documents from the Faculty to be prepared and sent by the Dean to the Head of the Faculty Review Panel. The Faculty Review Panel must receive these no less than one month before the visit of the Faculty Review Panel.

Step Six: The Working Group identifies, plans and reviews the required data and their collection for the provision of documentation and the self-evaluation report. It circulates its suggestions to appropriate staff for feedback and advice. The Working Group analyzes the data collected and prepares a draft of the self-evaluation report, circulating its drafts to appropriate staff for feedback and advice.

Step Seven: The Working Group ensures that the self-evaluation document includes, *inter alia*, the Faculty's goals, leadership and management, curriculum analysis, research and publication matters, plans for development and improvement, staffing, student admission, supervision, learning and teaching, resources, staff development, ongoing assessment of student achievement, student support, records, Faculty evaluation, quality assurance. These can be done in conjunction with the template for Faculty Goals. It circulates its suggestions to appropriate staff for feedback and advice.

Step Eight: The draft of the final self-evaluation report is produced. The Working Group circulates its suggestions to appropriate staff for feedback and advice.

Step Nine: No less than two months before the visit of the Faculty Review Panel, The final version of the self-evaluation report is completed and approved by the Dean of the Faculty.

Step Ten: No less than two months before the visit of the Faculty Review Panel, the self-evaluation report and documentation are submitted to the Learning and Teaching Committee and the Quality Assurance Office prior to, and for, the meeting of the Faculty Review Panel. The Faculty Review Panel must receive the self-evaluation document no less than six weeks before the Faculty Review panel visit.

Step Eleven: No less than five weeks before the visit of the Faculty Review Panel, the panel meets to discuss the self-evaluation report and to consider the Faculty and the Faculty Review.

Step Twelve: No less than four weeks before the visit of the Faculty Review Panel, the Panel agrees with the Dean of the Faculty the meetings, agenda, persons and documentation to be present for the review meeting(s) with staff and students on the Faculty. The Dean arranges for staff and students to be present as required.

Step Thirteen: The Faculty Review Panel meets with staff and students on the Faculty, to conduct the review. The meetings are normally completed within one day, but, in the case of a very large Faculty, they may run over to a second day only.

Step Fourteen: Initial feedback is given to the Faculty at the end of the last day of the meeting(s) with the Faculty.

Step Fifteen: The Faculty Review Panel produces a draft Faculty Review report within 30 working days of the final meeting(s) with the Faculty and submits this to the Dean of the Faculty.

Step Sixteen: Within one week of the receipt of the draft report, feedback on the report is given by the Dean to the Faculty Review Panel. The draft report may be changed by the Faculty Review Panel in respect of factual errors, but there is no obligation on the Faculty Review Panel to change its evaluation or judgements.

Step Seventeen: No more than one week after receiving the feedback from the Faculty Board, the final report is issued by the Faculty Review Panel to the Learning and Teaching Committee and to the Dean of the Faculty in question.

Step Eighteen: Within 30 working days of receipt of the final Faculty Review Panel's report, the Faculty produces an action plan to address points raised in the Faculty Review Panel's report. This may be written in consultation with the Learning and Teaching Committee and the Quality Assurance Office.

Step Nineteen: The action plan is sent by the Dean to the Faculty Review Panel and to the Learning and Teaching Committee, and the Learning and Teaching Committee monitors its implementation and effects in a time scale that it (the Learning and Teaching Committee) determines.

Step Twenty: The Faculty Review Panel is dissolved once the action plan has been received from the Dean by the Learning and Teaching Committee and the Quality Assurance Office.

DOCUMENTS TO BE PROVIDED TO THE FACULTY REVIEW PANEL BY THE DEAN OF THE FACULTY

The Faculty Review Panel must receive documentation as follows, no less than one month before the visit of the Faculty Review Panel.

Handbooks and Public Information

- Staff handbook
- Faculty handbook
- Student handbook
- Quality assurance handbook
- Public information documents and materials
- Faculty handbook
- Prospectus
- Website screen prints

Regulations, Policies and Codes of Practice

- Regulations and instructions to examiners for the programs in the Faculty
- Regulations on attendance and discipline
- Admission requirements
- Policy, procedure and codes of practice documents on:
 - (i) External advisory consultation and boards
 - (ii) Teaching loads
 - (iii) Study leave/research leave
 - (iv) Staff development
 - (v) Attendance
 - (vi) Academic appeals
 - (vii) Disciplinary matters
 - (viii) Scholarly activity
 - (ix) Research and publication
 - (x) Supervision of research students
 - (xi) Supervision training for staff
 - (xii) Research training for staff and students
 - (xiii) Admissions
 - (xiv) Staff engagement in scholarly and professional activity
 - (xv) External and internal benchmarking
 - (xvi) Admission, retention, assessment of students and staff
 - (xvii) Leadership and management of the Faculty
 - (xviii) Equity and equal opportunities
 - (xix) Admitting students with disabilities
 - (xx) Evaluation of the Faculty, staff and students
 - (xxi) Language requirements for the staff and students
 - (xxii) Non-standard entry of students to the Faculty

- (xxiii) Learning and Teaching
- (xxiv) Assessment, marking and examinations
- (xxv) Student support
- (xxvi) Plagiarism and cheating
- (xxvii) Quality assurance
- (xxviii) Credit accumulation, transfer and exemption
- (xxix) Transfer, deferral and suspension
- (xxx) Remedial and support work
- (xxxi) Awarding of credit
- (xxxii) Public service

Reports and Plans

- Annual Faculty Reviews for the last three years for the Faculty under review
- Annual Faculty Review data
- The Faculty's Strategic plan for the next three years, together with projections of resources required, student and staff numbers, sources of income, developments on the Faculty
- External Examiners reports for the last three years
- Action plans for Faculty improvement and enhancement
- Reports and documents from external advisors
- Outside evaluation or accreditation reports that may relate to the Faculty

Faculty Documentation and Data

- Indication of the program
- Faculty mission statement, aims and objectives
- Faculty documentation
- Program documentation, including credit weightings of courses
- Minutes of meetings of the Faculty Board
- Minutes of meetings of curriculum development bodies and advisory groups
- Study plans, program by program, for the whole Faculty, to indicate the sequence with, and structure of, each program
- Materials and pro-formas used in the academic development and reviewing process
- Statement to show how the Faculty meets evidence-based needs for its work
- Instruments and procedures used to measure Faculty effectiveness
- Fees, including break-even costs and numbers per program
- Documentation in the approval of the Faculty's programs
- Remedial or bridging courses in the Faculty
- Admission scores of the applicants and admitted students for the current academic year and preceding two years

- Application rates, offer rates, selectivity rates and outcome rates for the current academic year and preceding two years for the programs in the Faculty
- English language requirements and levels
- Other specific entry requirements (e.g. mathematics requirements, other language requirements)
- Numbers and dropouts, transfer in and transfer out of the Faculty, and throughput, for the current academic year and the preceding two years, for each program
- Supervision arrangements and allocations
- Research facilities and resources for staff and students
- Research activities by staff and students
- Publication record of staff and students
- Time taken to complete by students, for each program
- Completion rates for the current academic years and preceding two years
- Attendance requirements
- Attendance data for each course for the current academic year and preceding two years
- Links with external parties/institutions
- Awards made for the preceding three years, by program together with summaries of grade/GPA distributions for these
- Indicators used in reviewing the Faculty
- Budgets and estimates for the preceding two years, current year, and the next three years
- Unit costs per student per program

Leadership and Management

- Organizational chart, including student representation on/membership of committees/Faculty Board and administrative support
- Membership of the Faculty Board and its terms of reference
- Duties and responsibilities of the Faculty leader(s)
- Structures/personnel with responsibility for staff development
- Membership of the Program Committees, Boards of Examiners, External Examiners, their terms of reference and policies/procedures
- Student records: student data, attendance, academic reports and monitoring
- Record of staff development for the current academic year and the preceding two academic years

Faculty

- Summary CVs of all staff teaching on the Faculty
- Summary data on all staff teaching on the Faculty, including, for each person, and in tabular form: sex; ethnicity; nationality/home; qualifications

- (percentages with doctorates, Master's etc); selected publications; areas of expertise and experience; number of years teaching; level of appointment (e.g. Assistant Professor, Associate Professor); programs courses and supervisions on which each is working on the Faculty; teaching loads; administrative work; community/service work; research undertaken; research grants awarded
- Number and ratio of full-time and part-time academic and administrative staff
 - Remuneration and conditions of service for staff at each rank
 - Data on teaching assistants in the Faculty, including, for each person, and in tabular form: sex; age; ethnicity; nationality/home; qualifications; selected publications; areas of expertise and experience; area(s) in which working; teaching assistant loads
 - Numbers of new faculty and faculty who have left each year over the preceding three years and the present year
 - Number and nature of funded research programs
 - Number of supervisions per staff (member by member)
 - Faculty to graduate ratio
 - Faculty to student ratio

Students

- Copies of the Faculty's student evaluation form and a summary of students' evaluations of faculty and programs for the current year and preceding two years
- Description of learning support services
- Description of student support services

Resources

- Description of dedicated resources available to the Faculty
- Planned increases to the resources and upgrading of resources
- Policy and procedures for staff and student input into resource acquisition and usage (e.g. books)

Quality Assurance

- Quality assurance procedures, mechanisms and processes in the Faculty
- Responsibilities for QA on the Faculty, and who is responsible for what
- Involvement of staff and students in quality assurance
- Documentation on quality assurance

DOCUMENTS TO BE PROVIDED BY THE FACULTY REVIEW PANEL TO THE DEAN

The Faculty Review Panel is convened, it must provide the following documents to the Dean of the Faculty which is going to be reviewed:

- Principles, purposes and intended outcomes of Faculty Review
- Membership and terms of reference of the Faculty Review and the Faculty Review Panel
- Procedures for the Faculty Review
- Responsibilities and tasks of all parties involved in the Faculty Review
- Schedule, dates and times of submissions, events and requirements for the Faculty Review
- Key events before, during and after the visit of the Faculty Review Panel
- Follow-up requirements from the Faculty Review
- Agendas and arrangements for meetings and the visit of the Faculty Review
- List of documents required by the Faculty Review Panel
- Templates and pro-formas for submission of data
- Code of conduct for the Faculty Review and the Faculty Review Panel
- Request for a suitable and secure room for the Faculty Review Panel and documentation

PREPARING THE SELF-EVALUATION REPORT

The following are guidelines for preparing for a self-evaluation report:

THE EVIDENCE BASE

The self-evaluation document should be factual, explicit and should indicate its data sources. It should include evidence from, and make reference to, the following:

- Faculty handbooks
- Annual Faculty Reviews
- External Examiners' reports
- Student recruitment, admission, progression and completion data
- Reports and documents (if any) from accrediting or other bodies
- Feedback from former students and their employers;
- Data on the first destination of graduates;
- Comparability with other higher education institutions or other external benchmarks
- Internal policy and review documents, as appropriate

The following documents, *inter alia*, should be referred to/included in the document pack to accompany the report:

- Overview of the work of the Faculty
- Staff handbook
- Faculty handbook
- Student handbook
- Program handbooks
- Quality assurance handbook
- Annual Faculty Reviews for the last three years for the Faculty under review
- Annual Faculty Review data
- External Examiners reports for the last three years
- Prospectuses and Faculty documentation
- Admission requirements
- Organizational chart
- Website screen prints
- Faculty strategic plan
- Record of staff development for the current academic year and the preceding two academic years
- Faculty policy documents and codes of practice on curricula, equal opportunities, learning, teaching, assessment, student support, marking and examinations, plagiarism and cheating, Boards of Examiners,

External Examiners, appeals, disciplinary action, quality assurance, strategy and action plans.

- Summaries of studies regarding: (a) the effectiveness of the degree programs, and (b) the effectiveness of graduates
- Evidence that annual goals are set and that assessment of success occurs
- Summaries of studies of alumni and former students' satisfaction with their studies at the university
- Findings from surveys of student satisfaction
- Minutes of meetings of curriculum development bodies and advisory groups
- Instruments and procedures used to measure Faculty effectiveness
- Documentation of students' success in achieving Faculty outcomes
- Examples of assessment tools used to assess student achievements, attainments and competencies, and the 'value added' provided by the Faculty
- Any outside evaluation or accreditation reports that may relate to the Faculty
- Copies of the Faculty's student evaluation form and a summary of students' evaluations of faculty and courses
- Materials and pro-formas used in the academic development and reviewing process
- Summaries of grade/GPA distribution studies
- Copies of policies regarding admission and retention of students, remedial and support work, awarding of credit, and policies governing public service
- Evidence that the general education outcomes are integrated into the degree(s) requirements
- Reports and documents from external advisors and External Examiners
- Documentation of students' success towards achieving intended Faculty outcomes
- Faculty CVs

WHAT SHOULD A FACULTY SELF-EVALUATION DOCUMENT CONTAIN?

This is a suggested framework for a Faculty self-evaluation document. For each area it is important to provide both data and a commentary. It is important to comment on the quality and the evidence for the statements of quality.

A self-evaluation report addresses eight main areas and appendices, as follows. It may also include an Executive Summary at the start. It should include a Table of Contents, cross-referencing to documents, and appendices/annexes of data.

SECTION ONE: PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

1. Title of the Faculty
2. Brief history of the Faculty
3. Mission, vision and values of the Faculty
4. Size and scope of the Faculty
5. Main academic activities of the faculty
6. Description of the self-evaluation process that was undertaken for the Faculty Review, and the evidence that was considered
7. Faculty culture
8. Regulatory environment (e.g. accreditation requirements, territory requirements, government requirements)
9. Organizational structure of the Faculty
10. Reporting relationships/arrangements of the Faculty to different committees of the university and externally for the implementation of the university and Faculty policy
11. Introduction to the Faculty:
 - a. background to the Faculty;
 - b. intended student recruitment and market
 - c. external consultation on Faculty development
 - d. number of students in each year and by program
 - e. the demand for graduates of the Faculty
 - f. key features and characteristics of the Faculty
 - g. committee structure for the Faculty
12. Major market(s) of the Faculty
13. Indication of the programs in, and levels of the Faculty's programs (undergraduate/Master's/doctorate)
14. Indication of the research teams, research activities, research areas, research topics, for both funded and non-funded research
15. What research training is provided in and for the Faculty
16. Indication of the main publication areas by Faculty members (referring to an Annex in which the details are provided)
17. Key service providers, partners and collaborators, and the roles they play in the work of the Faculty
18. Key communication mechanisms with service providers, partners, staff, students and stakeholders

19. Strategies to ensure that the best possible staff and students are recruited
20. Student and stakeholder evaluation and satisfaction
21. Quality of admitted students (what it is, how it is reviewed, monitored and evaluated, whether admission requirements are 'delivering' the suitable quality and calibre of students, and the evidence of this)
22. Quality of staff (what it is, how it is reviewed, monitored and evaluated, whether current requirements are 'delivering' the suitable quality and calibre of staff, and the evidence of this)
23. Recruitment strategies and practices for staff and students, and their impact
24. Strategies for staff and student retention, and their impact
25. Quality of students admitted to the Faculty; comments on:
 - a. academic quality
 - b. equity
 - c. numbers and dropout, transfer in and transfer out of the Faculty, and throughput
 - d. time taken to complete by students
 - e. completion rates
26. Quality of staff admitted to the Faculty; commenting on:
 - a. academic quality
 - b. equity
 - c. staff turnover (how many new staff each year and how many staff leave each year, for the current year and preceding two years)
27. Staff/student ratios for programs/supervision
28. Indicators used in review
29. Current strengths and weaknesses
30. Knowledge of stakeholders
31. Stakeholder, advisory and committee input into the Faculty
32. Career development of staff
33. Stakeholder evaluation and satisfaction
34. External relations: industry; consultants; community; public agencies; graduate employers; professional bodies
35. Public information, which is accurate and up-to-date, about:
 - a. the Faculty and its work
 - b. the staff in the Faculty
 - c. the leadership and management of the Faculty
 - d. research centres and research work in the Faculty
 - e. contact details
 - f. undergraduate and postgraduate programs offered and qualifications awarded
 - g. teaching and learning
 - h. news and events
 - i. internships, exchanges and special features
 - j. views of previous and present students
 - k. views of employers
36. External review, quality assurance and accreditation

37. Proposed student and staffing numbers over the next three years
38. Current strengths and weaknesses
39. Future directions
40. Key strategic challenges, prospects and advantages (e.g. for competitive position in research, teaching, programs, students) and the principal factors that will determine success in meeting these challenges and developments
41. Key changes, innovations, and developments taking place in the Faculty
42. Main self-recommendations for improvement and development

SECTION TWO: LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT OF THE FACULTY

1. Leadership and management of the Faculty
2. Membership of the Faculty Board and Program Committees
3. How and how well, the Faculty leaders guide, steer, develop and lead the Faculty in its academic activities
4. How leaders: develop and reach the Faculty's vision and values; promote a culture that emphasizes academic quality; promote an environment that fosters, requires and results in ethical behaviour and high academic standards; create a sustainable Faculty and staffing; create and sustain an environment for organizational performance, Faculty improvement and student and staff learning; develop future leaders for the Faculty; encourage frank, multi-directional communication; take an active role in reward and recognition of high standards of performance; create a focus on actions to accomplish the Faculty's objectives; improve academic performance
5. How does the Faculty leadership promote a safe, secure and supportive environment for the work of the Faculty?
6. How does the Faculty leadership identify key factors that affect workforce engagement and satisfaction, and foster and measure a culture conducive to high standards of academic performance and a motivated workforce?
7. How does the leadership promote cooperation, effective communication and sharing of skills and information at all levels?
8. How does the Faculty leadership promote innovativeness in the work environment, and draw on the benefits of diverse ideas, cultures and thinking?
9. How does the Faculty promote, improve and enhance the quality of teaching, learning, supervision, research and publication in its work?
10. How does the Faculty leadership promote a climate of change and sustainable development?
11. Staff professional development and maximization: breadth, needs-driven, depth, uptake and impact
12. How is communication handled within and beyond the Faculty, and its effectiveness in supporting high standards of academic performance?
13. How frank and open is the communication?

14. How are staff informed of, and involved in, decisions, changes and developments?
15. How, and how well, does the Faculty address its social and public responsibilities and ensure ethical behaviour?
16. What are the key communities within and outside the Faculty?
17. What are the duties and roles of the Faculty administrative officers?
18. How are decisions reached?
19. How are agendas for meetings set and communicated?
20. Which meetings are minuted?
21. Information systems for Faculty monitoring, review and development
22. How is information used to improve the Faculty, the performance of students and staff and the processes of the Faculty administration?
23. How are priorities for development identified and derived from monitoring and review, and how are these communicated to, and shared with staff?
24. Relationships to other Faculties
25. How are workloads decided and allocated in the Faculty? Who decides about these?
26. Do all staff know what the workloads are?
27. Are workloads spread evenly and equitably?
28. External review and quality assurance
29. Performance appraisal of staff in the Faculty
30. What provisions are there for the long-range planning of the Faculty?
31. What are the budgeting arrangements in the School? Are staff consulted about budgetary matters?
32. What student involvement is there in management and on committees and forums in the Faculty?
33. Current strengths and weaknesses
34. Future directions
35. Key challenges and prospects

SECTION THREE: FACULTY DETAILS

1. What does the Faculty seek to achieve for itself and the discipline?
2. Rationale for the Faculty:
 - a. Mission, key aims and purposes of the Faculty, how these are determined, and how these align themselves to the university's plans, and national and international trends
 - b. What does the Faculty seek to achieve for the university?
 - c. What does the Faculty seek to achieve for the wider community?
3. What are the specific objectives of the Faculty?
4. How the Faculty aligns itself to the university mission
5. Meeting students' and stakeholders' needs
6. What are the aims that are geared towards quality assurance?
7. Faculty's role in advancing the state of the field or discipline
8. How does the Faculty know that its aims, goals, purposes and objectives have been achieved?

9. Medium of instruction
10. Equity principles
11. Commentary on how issues of employability and career development are taken into account in the design and delivery of the Faculty's programs
12. How are new and modified programs designed, approved and brought into effect?
13. Curriculum content of the Faculty: program by program:
 - a. quality of the curriculum
 - b. coherence of the curriculum within and across programs (and, where appropriate, other Faculties)
 - c. clarity and guidance for students
 - d. academic quality and integrity of the Faculty
 - e. how recently the curricula and programs have been reviewed or amended
 - f. how does the Faculty assure itself of the continuing relevance of its programs and their contents?
 - g. How does the Faculty assure itself that the highest academic quality is ensured in its programs, to meet the needs of stakeholders?
 - h. How is input from different stakeholders and partners gathered and used on the programs in the Faculty?
14. Structure of the Faculty and its contributing programs
15. Communication of organizing principles of the Faculty
16. How the Faculty meets students' different needs, abilities, rates of learning, and learning strategies and styles
17. Accelerated learning on the Faculty's programs
18. Student learning in the Faculty:
 - a. provision for, and suitability of, learning opportunities for students on different programs in the Faculty
 - b. quality of student learning
 - c. active student learning on the programs and engagement in them
 - d. students' higher order thinking and application in the programs
 - e. opportunities for, and uptake of, internship
 - f. student exchange arrangements
 - g. e-learning and blended learning, and the support for these (e.g. hardware, software, access, speed, stability of system)
 - h. incorporation of new technologies for student learning
 - i. collaborative and cooperative learning
 - j. fieldwork
 - k. depth and breadth of student learning
 - l. strategies for ensuring maximum student participation and sustained success and high quality
 - m. implementation and evolution of the Faculty's learning strategies and internal arrangements for reviewing these
 - n. internal arrangements in the Faculty for reviewing its provision of learning opportunities

- o. improvements/enhancements to the learning on the Faculty's programs over a specified period
- p. evaluation of the ways of judging, and the criteria for judging, how students progress through the Faculty, and how this progression is supported, monitored and reviewed, from admission to graduation
- q. disciplinary procedures and appeals in the Faculty
- r. staff development provided in the Faculty, and the uptake and impact of these

19. Teaching in the Faculty

- a. provision for, and quality of, teaching
- b. diversity and suitability of teaching strategies and processes
- c. guidance provided on teaching
- d. supervision of research students
- e. what core teaching competencies are there, how are they determined, and how do these relate to the Faculty's mission and for teaching and learning and to their programs and curricula?
- f. how, and how high, is the quality of teaching and learning, how are data gathered on this, and how are improvements made?
- g. evaluation of the teaching in the Faculty and how it supports students in their achievement on programs
- h. internal arrangements in the Faculty for reviewing teaching
- i. improvements/enhancements to the teaching on the Faculty's programs over a specified period
- j. staff development provided for developing teaching in the Faculty
- k. relationship between teaching and research
- l. strategies and processes for improving teaching, and the impact of these
- m. strategies and processes for staff development of teaching, and the impact of these
- n. is any of the teaching outsourced, and, if so, how is the quality assured?

20. Research

- a. provision for, and quality of, research and publication
- b. diversity and research
- c. support for research and publication
- d. funded and non-funded research in the Faculty
- e. research teams, individuals, their work and its impact
- f. functioning of research centres
- g. evaluation of the research and publication in the Faculty. How does the Faculty evaluate the quality of its research?
- h. What national, international and cross-institutional research is undertaken in the Faculty?
- i. range and coherence of research in the Faculty
- j. percentage of full-time and part-time staff who are active in research

- k. internal arrangements in the Faculty for reviewing research, publication and their development
- l. alignment of the research to the Faculty's mission and goals
- m. improvements/enhancements to the research in the Faculty over a specified period
- n. relationship between teaching and research
- o. strategies and methods for improving research and publication, and the impact of these; staff development provided for developing research and publication in the Faculty and the impact of these
- p. study leave and its uptake
- q. provision and support for encouraging excellence in research and publication at local, national and international levels
- r. research training and knowledge transfer provided in the Faculty and by the university, for whom, and the uptake, impact and effectiveness of these
- s. dissemination of research to key communities
- t. research seminars and other related programs in the Faculty
- u. research evaluation and productivity: how it is monitored, developed and its quality improved in the Faculty
- v. how the support for research is evaluated, and how effective that support is
- w. how new research opportunities are identified and addressed
- x. resources for research in the Faculty
- y. developing competencies for staff and students in research
- z. how staff and students are encouraged to undertake, report and disseminate research at local, national and international levels
- aa. how a research culture and climate is developed and sustained in the Faculty for staff and students
- bb. how supervision of research is undertaken, how effective it is, and how this is evaluated and improved
- cc. how staff and students are inducted into research
- dd. what key services are provided by the Faculty for research and its development, and how these are evaluated

21. Supervision

- a. provision for, and quality of, supervision
- b. support for supervision of research and research students
- c. supervisor training and development
- d. evaluation and review of the supervision arrangements and practices, and their effectiveness, in the Faculty
- e. improvements/enhancements to the supervision arrangements and practices in the Faculty over a specified period
- f. strategies for improving supervision arrangements, practices and quality, and the impact of these; staff development provided for developing supervision in the Faculty and the impact of these

22. Resources for the Faculty

- a. Adequacy of resources for learning and student support in the Faculty
 - b. quality of resources and facilities
 - c. physical space and requirements
 - d. library, computing, media matters and new technologies
 - e. how resources are used
 - f. administrative and technical support in the Faculty, for staff and students, and support personnel
 - g. physical facilities: classrooms, laboratories, office space, tutorial rooms
 - h. equipment and instruments, and equipment needs
 - i. specialist/dedicated resources
 - j. access by students to resources and equipment
 - k. Faculty costs for resources/equipment
 - l. planned increases in resources
23. Health and safety in the Faculty
24. Ethical matters relating to the work of the Faculty
25. Student assessment and examination in the Faculty, strategies for improving student assessment, and the impact of these, strategies for staff development on student assessment, and the impact of these
26. Marking, grading and confirmation
27. Communication of criteria to students for judging their work
28. Actual student outcomes and standards
- a. student outcomes and standards reached
 - b. trends in examination results
 - c. comparability of standards with other institutions
 - d. comments of External Examiners
 - e. action taken by the Faculty as a result of data on standards and achievements
 - f. employment and career outcomes of the students
 - g. feedback from former students and on their career destinations and post-graduation activities;
 - h. surveys of employer satisfaction with the Faculty's graduates.
 - i. external measures of success
 - j. strategies for improving students' achievement and standards, and the impact of these
 - k. strategies for staff development to improve student outcomes, and the impact of these
29. Faculty evaluation
- a. annual Faculty Review
 - b. peer review and assessment
 - c. sharing of best practice
 - d. benchmarking
 - e. periodic review (how frequently and regularly, and by whom)
 - f. plans for ongoing Faculty Review

- g. fitness for purpose and fitness of purposes of the kinds, criteria, contents, methods, comprehensiveness, rigour of Faculty evaluation, and the clarity and suitability of these for the Faculty
 - h. regularity and frequency of Faculty and program evaluation
 - i. outcomes and impact of Faculty evaluation on Faculty and program development
 - j. use made of Faculty and program evaluations
 - k. comprehensiveness and appropriacy of Faculty reviews
 - l. external and internal review
 - m. strategies for improving Faculty evaluation, and the impact of these
 - n. strategies for staff development to improve Faculty evaluation, and the impact of these
 - o. how are data collected and used (and what data) for Faculty development and improvement
 - p. how does the Faculty manage the organizational knowledge and information for transfer and sharing in the Faculty (from, and to, staff, students and stakeholders)?
30. What measures of academic performance does the Faculty use? How are measures of academic performance used for decision making, improvement and development, and to identify priorities and opportunities?
31. External review and quality assurance
32. Current strengths and weaknesses
33. Future directions
34. Key challenges and prospects
35. Key opportunities

SECTION FOUR: STUDENTS

1. What does the Faculty seek to achieve for its students?
2. What are the expectations of the students? How, and how well, are these met?
3. How are students' needs, expectations and preferences identified and addressed in the Faculty?
4. How does the Faculty build relationships, networks, contacts and strategies for recruitment, retention and satisfaction of students and stakeholders?
5. Target students populations, and how these are/are not changing over time, and why
6. Profile of student population
7. Equity principles
8. Student progress and success rates, and their monitoring
9. Student dropout, transfer and deferral, and the reasons for these (by program and overall)
10. Mentoring of students
11. Student support in the Faculty
 - a. nature and amount of student support

- b. quality of student support in the Faculty
 - c. the number and utilization of assistants
 - d. counselling support
 - e. extra-curricular support
12. Students with disabilities
 13. How is student performance enhanced and assured to be of the highest quality?
 14. Research training for students
 15. What contact mechanisms exist in the Faculty for staff and students to communicate, how well are these used, and with what outcomes?
 16. How does the Faculty build positive relationships with students in the achievement of their, the Faculty's and the program's objectives?
 17. Feedback *to* students and action taken from this
 18. Feedback *from* students and action taken from this
 - a. collecting and using student feedback
 - b. questionnaires
 - c. discussion and dissemination of feedback
 - d. staff/student consultative committees
 19. How is student satisfaction determined in the Faculty? Are there surveys of student satisfaction, and how are they used?
 20. How is student feedback (including complaints) handled? What use is made of feedback for Faculty, program, research and administrative development?
 21. How is student feedback kept up to date as programs change and new developments occur?
 22. How are student feedback and other data used for faculty and program improvement?
 23. Career development
 24. Status of, and attention given to, orientation, guidance, career guidance and academic advice
 25. Integration of students into the Faculty
 26. Student representation on committees
 27. Arrangements for consultations with students
 28. How are students kept informed of developments and decisions in the Faculty?
 29. Are staff available for consultation with students? Are there office hours for staff to be available?
 30. Student evaluation, satisfaction and morale
 31. Post-graduation career and employment of students
 32. Alumni: communication, satisfaction, loyalty
 33. External review and quality assurance
 34. Student records
 35. Strategies for improving student support, and the impact of these
 36. Strategies for staff development to improve student support, and the impact of these
 37. Current strengths and weaknesses

38. Future directions
39. Key challenges and prospects
40. Key opportunities

SECTION FIVE: ACADEMIC STAFF

1. What does the Faculty seek to achieve for its staff?
2. Academic staffing in the Faculty
3. How staff are recruited and appointed to, and promoted and appraised in, the Faculty
4. Are there sufficient staff to service the Faculty and its programs?
5. Are there sufficient staff to ensure health and safety in the Faculty?
6. Equity principles
7. Number of (regular) faculty and areas of expertise: full-time and part-time
8. Quality, credentials and experience of the faculty
9. Match between background, expertise and qualifications of the staff and the programs and courses on which they work
10. Induction and support for new staff
11. Expectations of faculty in respect of teaching, research and publication, supervision, scholarly activity and service
12. Research training for staff
13. Supervision training for staff
14. Publications of faculty (in an Annex)
15. How does the Faculty provide for the realization of the full potential of the staff, and reward staff in their movement toward achieving the highest possible standards of performance?
16. How are data used to improve staff and to enable them to achieve their highest performance?
17. How is a climate of staff support promoted in the Faculty?
18. How are staff complaints, grievances and concerns identified and addressed in the Faculty?
19. How are cooperative activities, teaching, planning and mutual support addressed in the Faculty?
20. How can, and do, staff share and benefit from innovative ideas in the Faculty?
21. How are staff professional development needs and wishes identified and addressed?
22. What staff development is provided for curriculum content, teaching, learning, research, supervision, assessment, quality assurance, community networking and relationships,
23. Staff professional development and engagement of staff in it
24. Why do staff engage/not engage in staff professional development?
25. How relevant, timely, sufficient and useful are the staff development activities?

26. How does the Faculty know that the skills and capabilities of the staff are sufficient for the demands of their work, teaching, research, changes in the external environment etc.?
27. Teaching loads, their calculation and distribution
28. Teaching assistants
29. Commentary on the number of new faculty and faculty who have left each year over the preceding three years and the present year
30. Commentary on the faculty to graduate ratio
31. Commentary on the faculty to student ratio
32. Staff morale
33. Staff consultation and involvement in Faculty matters (and what these are)
34. Staff promotion and appointments
35. External review and quality assurance
36. Strategies for staff career development, and the impact of these
37. Number of support staff
38. Future directions
39. Key challenges and prospects
40. Key opportunities

SECTION SIX: QUALITY ASSURANCE

1. Policy on, and strategy and procedures for, quality assurance in the Faculty
2. How does the university know that the Faculty is meeting its aims, goals and intended learning outcomes to the highest possible standards?
3. Quality assurance:
 - a. responsibilities for quality assurance, enhancement and development in the Faculty, and who is responsible for what
 - b. involvement of students in quality assurance
 - c. stakeholder involvement in quality assurance
 - d. external review of the Faculty, and its outcomes
4. Quality assurance mechanisms, processes, timeliness, frequency, contents, standards, outcomes and impact with respect to monitoring, developing and improving (i.e. how does the university inform itself about, and guarantee, the quality here)
5. How and where are quality and its enhancement and development discussed, promoted and continuously ensured in the Faculty?
6. Information systems and indicator systems
7. Admissions
8. Faculty
9. Equity principles
10. Staff professional development
11. Administration
12. Stakeholder input
13. Leadership and management
14. Programs and courses

15. Curricula
16. Learning
17. Teaching
18. Research training
19. Supervision training
20. Learning resources
21. Student support
22. Monitoring student progress
23. Assessment and examining of students
24. Standards of achievement and attainment
25. Student success rates
26. How much 'value added' the Faculty provides, and how this is measured
27. Student outcomes and careers
28. Public information
29. External Examiners and accreditation agencies
30. Value for money
31. Faculty evaluation, monitoring and review
32. Faculty developments and changes
33. Use of data and information in development planning
34. Periodic review of the Faculty
35. Performance review of staff and the Faculty
36. How policy is implemented, monitored and revised
37. Involvement of students in quality assurance
38. External review and quality assurance
39. Benchmarking
40. Strategies for improving quality assurance, and the impact of these
41. Strategies for staff development to improve quality assurance, and the impact of these
42. Current strengths and weaknesses
43. Future directions
44. Key challenges and prospects
45. Key opportunities

SECTION SEVEN: STRATEGIC PLANNING

1. How is strategic planning in the Faculty developed and undertaken, and by/with whom?
2. How are strategic academic challenges and advantages identified and addressed? What are these?
3. How does the Faculty Board convert the Faculty's strategic aims and objectives into action plans, how these relate to key performance indicators and how these and other benchmarks are used to set performance projections
4. How are action plans deployed and monitored in order to meet the Faculty's objectives and targets? What indicators are used to show that the action plans are on track, are working effectively and are meeting the

- intended targets and goals, what are the success criteria and indicators?
How does the Faculty know that the measures used cover all major areas of the action plan and the work in the Faculty?
5. How is progress measured in the achievement of strategy, planning and implementation?
 6. Strategies for improving strategic planning, and the impact of these
 7. Strategies for staff development to improve strategic planning, and the impact of these
 8. Key strategic targets, goals and developments
 9. Strategic academic objectives, timetable/time frames for their achievement and sustainability, and indicators used to assess their achievement
 10. Future directions, aligned to Faculty and university strategy and national and international trends
 11. How the strategic planning of the Faculty addresses: staff and Faculty's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats; early indications of change in the external environment, including changes in student demand, employer and/or professional demands, and changes in the university that might require a review of the strategy;
 12. Long-term and medium-term Faculty predicted changes and sustainability, and how the Faculty balances short-term and long-term challenges, needs and opportunities
 13. Alignment of Faculty plans with the university plans and strategy
 14. Research training and staff development
 15. How the Faculty committee collects and analyses relevant data and information pertaining to these factors as part of the strategic planning process
 16. Key opportunities for innovation in research, teaching, learning, programs etc.
 17. Key challenges, advantages and prospects
 18. Key indicators for the Faculty to demonstrate that its performance is improving

SECTION EIGHT: GENERAL ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Strengths of the Faculty
2. Weaknesses of the Faculty
3. How has the Faculty improved its quality over time, and on what evidence?
4. Recommendations for improvement
5. Student learning outcomes
6. Progress toward meeting aims of the Faculty and the university
7. Overall conclusions

APPENDICES

WHAT SHOULD AN ACTION PLAN INCLUDE?

The Action Plan is prepared by the Faculty Board in response to the report from the Faculty Review Panel. Within 30 working days of receipt of the final Faculty Review Panel's report, the Faculty Board produces the action plan to address points raised and recommendations made in the Faculty Review Panel's report. The Action Plan is sent by the Dean to the Faculty Review Panel and to the Learning and Teaching Committee, and the Learning and Teaching Committee monitors its implementation and effects in a time scale that it (the Learning and Teaching Committee) determines.

An Action Plan address questions such as:

- Where are we now?
- Where do we want to be?
- How will we get there?
- How will we know when we have got there?

Put into greater detail it raises questions such as:

- Where are we now?
- What is the staff capability/capacity to move ahead?
- Which existing staff have the required expertise?
- What are the specific goals and targets?
- What is to be done (clear, specific, concrete action/activities)?
- Who is to do it (responsibilities)?
- When it is to be done by?
- How progress will be monitored (by whom, when, how)?
- How progress will be evaluated (by whom, when, how)?
- What are the success criteria (with quantitative targets against which to judge progress)?
- What timescales are there for different stages of implementation?
- What resources are required?

The Action Plan comprises:

- A series of 'SMART' objectives to address the areas of need identified in the Faculty Review report, e.g.:
 - a. **Specific**/Significant/Short-term
 - b. **Measurable**/Motivating/Manageable
 - c. **Achievable**/Agreed/Aligned/Advantageous
 - d. **Relevant**/Realistic/result-oriented/Resourced
 - e. **Time-framed**; Time-bound/Timely/Tangible

- Intended outcomes and success criteria;
- A detail of what is to be addressed (the contents and priorities);
- How the objectives and intended outcomes will be met;
- Defining tasks, targets and responsible individuals, resource allocation and costings, and time frames/dates for completion;
- Success criteria and evidence;
- Monitoring progress;
- Producing the public version of the plan in summary form.
- Targets, tasks and success criteria to check progress (monitoring) and to evaluate/check success
- Initial tasks and checks for readiness
- Tasks and routes to the achievement of targets, and means to monitor and check progress;
- Targets and intended destinations, and success criteria to check when and how well these have been achieved/reached.

A good action plan:

- Addresses all the key issues;
- Is concise and clearly written;
- Identifies priorities, specific targets and outcomes;
- Is clearly focused on classroom improvement;
- Lists manageable steps towards raising standards of achievement;
- Includes reference to monitoring and evaluation of intended outcomes and student achievement;
- Provides indicators and criteria to recognize improvement;
- Identifies and quantifies resources;
- Is drawn up consultatively.

The action plan can be set out following these headings, for each item:

- (a) Recommendation
- (b) Response
- (c) Objectives of the action
- (d) Action proposed
- (e) Responsibility
- (f) Time frame
- (g) Progress indicators
- (h) Expected outcome
- (i) Success criteria and indicators