

Review Methodology for the Second Round TLQPRs

Two broad phases have been involved in the Review, as identified below.

PRIOR to the Review visits there were the following elements.

1. Finalization of the TLQPR template, based on consultations between the Review Panel and the Consultative Committee: see Annex B for the template.
2. Production of an *outline* Self Evaluation Document (SED) by each institution. This outline was considered by Panel members separately, and a consolidated report on these comments was prepared. Following members' consideration of this consolidated report, and endorsement subject to further changes, the report was conveyed to the institution concerned.
3. Each institution then produced a full SED within the guidelines contained in the template. Separate SEDs were prepared for:
 - Taught programmes;
 - Research postgraduate education programmes; and
 - Programmes (as specified in the template) offered via Continuing Education Units (CEUs).

The SEDs are reproduced in Annex C.

Together with their SEDs, institutions made suggestions for the particular units to be visited by Panel members during the site visits.

4. The SEDs were then considered separately by Panel members, who commented on these in terms of:
 - (a) issues and questions to be raised during the site visits;
 - (b) supplementary information required either before or during the site visit.
5. The full Panel met in early March 2002 to consider all issues related to the conduct of the Review in general, and arrangements for the site visits in particular. Following this meeting the following information/requests were conveyed to institutions.
 - (i) A detailed programme for the site visits, including the units to be visited and further requests for information.
 - (ii) Requests for:
 - (a) A "talking paper" from each unit to be visited, outlining accomplishments in the template domains at the unit level;
 - (b) A four-page supplementary document outlining exemplary accomplishments and areas for improvement at the institutional level.

The supplementary document (b) provided by the institution is included in Annex C.

DURING the site visits the following arrangements (conveyed to the institutions in written form following the March 2002 meeting) were adopted; shortly before the actual visits took place, logistical arrangements were covered by a face-to-face meeting between an institutional representative and the UGC Secretariat.

1. Separate Panel sub-groups took responsibility for each of:
 - The review of taught programmes;
 - The RPgE Review;
 - The review of the CEU.
2. The core of the site visit consisted of unit-level meetings in which 2 or 3 Panel members met with a unit group that typically consisted of about 10 teaching staff and 5 students. The structure of the meeting, over the 2 hours that was allocated for each, followed the format below*:

[*Note: Owing to the different structure of CEU operations, this procedure was not followed by the CEU sub-panel, who engaged in a series of meetings that was tailor-made for the particular CEU arrangements.]

- Brief introduction by a departmental representative;
 - Whole group conversation, based on questions/issues raised by Panel members, which occupied the majority of the session;
 - Discussion with student representatives on their own;
 - Private discussion by Panel members.
3. Following each set of unit level meetings, there was a whole-panel discussion in private at which emergent understandings were discussed, based upon the unit level meetings that had taken place.
 4. Following this discussion, each Panel member (or team) completed a short open-ended pro-forma report form that allowed for comment on the TLQPR domain areas *vis a vis* the unit that had just been visited. There was also space for comment on areas of commendation, recommendation, and relationship between institutional and unit level perspectives and initiatives.
 5. At the end of the whole site visit there was an extended Panel discussion, in order to reach agreement on the major points to be reflected back to the institution and included in the final report. There was further discussion on these matters at a Panel meeting that took place on the final day of the week of the site visits.
 6. Based on all of the information generated in all of the earlier phases, a draft report was written and circulated to all Panel members for comment. These comments were included in a further draft that was discussed in a face-to-face meeting of Panel members. Following this, a final draft was produced and circulated to institutions for comment concerning points of factual accuracy. Institutional comments were considered and incorporated as appropriate into a final report that was considered and endorsed by the UGC.