

TLQPR of Programmes Offered by Continuing Education Units (CEUs)

A. Relationship with the main TLQPR

1. The review of programmes offered by the continuing education units (CEUs) of institutions should have the same basic goals and the same focus on “education quality work” (EQW) as the main TLQPR. The same review protocol which sets out five domains of EQW for review and six review criteria should be followed. However, the actual conduct of the review should take into account the particular context in which each individual CEU operates.

B. Diversity between institutions

2. The fact that CEUs in different institutions vary considerably in their scales, modes of operation and stages of development should be recognized. Each institution should be allowed to work out with the Panel the most appropriate approach and logistics for the Review of its relevant CEU programmes. For example, the Panel may devote more time and attention to a large, semi-autonomous CEU than to a small unit that is completely integrated structurally and procedurally within the main body of the institution.

C. Programmes to be examined

3. The scope of CEU programmes to be covered in the review should include degree and sub-degree programmes organized by CEUs in the sole name of the UGC-funded institutions, but exclude those organized by non-local universities where the UGC-funded institutions only act as an agent. The sub-degree programmes should be confined to programmes at associate degree, advanced diploma, higher diploma and equivalent levels.

D. Self-evaluation document

4. The length of CEU supplements should not exceed 10 pages, and should vary with size of the CEUs and how far they are integrated with the main body of the institutions in terms of their operation and quality assurance processes. Institutions should include in their outlines a list of relevant programmes offered by CEUs, details intended to be covered in the CEU supplements and the intended length of the documents.

E. Site visit

5. In view of the highly varied scales of operation of CEUs in different institutions, institutions would be invited to indicate in their CEU supplements the need for site visits to their CEUs, and how they should be conducted. Details of CEU visits, if considered necessary, will be made available to the institution to be reviewed about a month prior to the actual visit to facilitate logistical and other arrangements.

F. Final report

6. A supplement to the TLQPR final report should be provided in respect of the relevant CEU programmes.

TLQPR of Research Postgraduate Education

A. Objective of the Review

1. The TLQPR for research postgraduate education has the same basic goals as the overall TLQPRs, in particular: to assist institutions in their effort to improve the quality of teaching and learning; and to enable the UGC and the institutions to maintain accountability for the quality of teaching and learning. However, the review is not an add-on to the main TLQPRs, but is intended to be a meaningful activity in its own right.

B. Focus of the Review

2. The review will not be concerned with the delivered quality of research postgraduate education, or the quality of research output. The focus of the review will be the “education quality work” undertaken by institutions and departments to assure and improve the quality of the formal and informal education of research students. The review will be particularly concerned with:
 - (a) Processes, activities, structures and resources to assure and enhance the quality of the student experience in the research environment;
 - (b) Supervisory, monitoring and advising practices, and the maintenance of academic standards;
 - (c) Processes, activities, structures and resources to support the career development of research students.

C. Criteria for Assessment

3. The criteria for assessing the work of institutions in assuring and improving research student education will be parallel to those employed for the main TLQPRs:
 - (a) The efforts of units and institutions to improve performance through measuring outcomes of delivered education (completion and attrition rates, routines for monitoring student progress, management of assessment, and evaluation of research standards are of particular interest).
 - (b) The orientation of quality assurance processes and activities to the process of student learning including: research methodology; critical thinking; self-learning; choice of research topics; thesis writing; and research use of libraries, laboratories, computation and information technologies.
 - (c) The degree of coherence in the various quality processes operating at different levels in the institution.
 - (d) The degree to which staff, units, and the institutions understand that the delivered quality of research education is a collaborative responsibility.
 - (e) The role of inputs sought from outside units and institutions to assess performance against benchmarks and good practice.
 - (f) The priority given to continuous improvement.

D. Arrangements for the Review

4. The timing of the review will be concurrent with that of the main TLQPRs. Institutions will be asked to prepare a four-page self-evaluation supplement to the TLQPR self-evaluation document assessing their policies, activities and resources directed at assuring and improving the quality of the education of research students.

5. A three-person Research Education Sub-Panel (RESP) will be appointed to look exclusively at research postgraduate education. The RESP will visit the institutions at the same time as the main TLQPR Panel, but will be concerned only with research education, visiting units such as the Graduate School/Faculty, academic staff of a sample of departments, a group of junior staff who supervise research postgraduate students, a group of research postgraduate students, and any other relevant groups. It is expected that the RESP will complete their visits in one day or less.
6. The RESP will provide a supplement to the TLQPR final report dealing with research education.

Revised Guidelines for the Preparation of Self-Evaluation Documents

1. The self-evaluation document (SED) should cover the mechanisms in place for maintaining and improving teaching and learning quality in the institution.
2. It should consist of a main document of 20 pages for undergraduate and taught postgraduate education, a 4-page supplement on research postgraduate education, and supplement on CEU programmes at a maximum of 10 pages.
3. There has been a developed understanding that the reviews in this round would be characterized by both uniformity (via a common core) and diversity (via customized elements). The uniformity is provided by the agreed framework, comprising the five domains subject to review and six criteria for assessing the success of education quality work (EQW). The diversity is derived from the different institutional philosophies, specialisms and goals, resulting in self-evaluations that better represent these individual perspectives, as reflected in their TLQ processes.
4. The introductory material to the SED would be a set of statements reflecting the institutional philosophies and derived framework for its EQW. They would also describe the nature of the quality assurance and improvement processes at that institution, and the extent to which these all interact and support each other.
5. The common core of the SEDs would mirror the framework or template for this round of TLQPRs. That is, there would be reference to all five domains of EQW and the criteria used in assessment of these domains of activity. These would be related back to the processes described earlier.
6. All SEDs would also discuss issues identified in the first round of TLQPR, the extent to which the institution has responded to these, and an evaluation of the outcomes from these changes.
7. There should be some concluding analytical and evaluative comments (for example, about the range, effectiveness, and integrity of the constituent processes, or about areas currently planned or under development).
8. The procedures for developing the SEDs are based on a consultative process between the institution and the Panel. Each institution will send to the UGC a summary document at the time specified in the timetable for preparation of SEDs, which will indicate the nature of the SED to be provided. This would make particular reference to areas where the SED departs from the common core described above. The Panel would then comment on the extent to which this SED would be expected to fulfil its own requirements, identify areas of omission, identify areas of redundancy, and offer suggestions for change.
9. Following the submission of the SEDs, the Panel would call for supplementary materials from the institutions to support or clarify parts of the SEDs as identified by the panel. These might include audit trails, minutes of meetings, and summary or other statistics. They could be provided by the institution in any convenient form (e.g. digital, paper, graphic, reference to a website).

General Outline of Second TLQPR Visits

First Day

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| Panel preparatory meeting | About 1.5 hours |
| Meeting with leadership group | 45 minutes |
| Parallel unit level meetings – session 1 | 2 hours |
| Parallel unit level meetings – session 2 | 2 hours |
| Panel debriefing | 1 hour |

Second Day

| | |
|---|------------|
| Parallel unit level meetings – session 3 | 1 hour |
| Panel debriefing | 45 minutes |
| Meeting with Faculty Deans ⁴ | 1 hour |
| Meeting with rank and file members of institution level QA&I groups | 1 hour |
| Panel debriefing | 1.5 hours |
| Closing session with leadership group | 30 minutes |

⁴ This was made a separate meeting after the visits to the first two institutions under review.

Second TLQPRs
Nomination of Faculties/Departments/Units to be Visited

Proposed Guidelines

For degree and sub-degree programmes of UGC-funded institutions

There should be a broad balance between traditional faculties/departments, faculties/departments geared towards professional training and units/departments which render support services to the university as a whole.

For research postgraduate education

Visits should cover graduate school/faculty, academic staff of a sample of departments, research postgraduate students and junior staff who supervise them.

CEU programmes

To be discussed between institutions and the Panel (Appendix A is relevant).

Visit Timetable of Second Round TLQPRs

| Institution | Dates of Visit |
|--|---------------------------|
| The University of Hong Kong | 3 and 4 June 2002 |
| The Hong Kong Institute of Education | 5 and 6 June 2002 |
| The Chinese University of Hong Kong | 16 and 17 September 2002 |
| Hong Kong Baptist University | 18 and 19 September 2002 |
| The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology | 13 and 14 January 2003 |
| Lingnan University | 15 and 16 January 2003 |
| City University of Hong Kong | 31 March and 1 April 2003 |
| The Hong Kong Polytechnic University | 2 and 3 April 2003 |

Framework of Education Quality Work

Education Quality Work refers to the processes of UGC institutions in assuring and improving the quality of 3 areas of education delivery, namely (1) Curriculum, (2) Teaching and Learning, and (3) Assessment.

In each area, quality assurance (QA) and quality improvement (QI) in relation to 3 selected aspects of EQW processes and activities, namely (a) Design, (b) Implementation, (c) Resource Allocation will be reviewed.

The relationships among the 3 areas of education delivery, the 3 aspects of EQW processes and the 5 EQW domains are illustrated in the diagram below.

| | | | | |
|--|----------------|--|---|--|
| Aspects of EQW Processes and Activities | | Areas of Education Delivery | | |
| | | Curriculum | Teaching & Learning | Assessment |
| | Design | <u>Domain 1</u> Design of Curriculum QA QI | <u>Domain 2</u> Design of Teaching & Learning Processes QA QI | <u>Domain 3</u> Design of Student Assessment & Use of Assessment Results QA QI |
| | | <u>Domain 4</u> Implementation Quality QA QI | | |
| | | <u>Domain 5</u> Commitment of Resources to EQW QA QI | | |
| | Implementation | | | |
| Resource Allocation | | | | |