

Facilitating critical discussions on quality

André Müller

Division for Institutional Research and Planning
STELLENBOSCH UNIVERSITY



UNIVERSITEIT
STELLENBOSCH
UNIVERSITY

MY TOP TIPS FOR Facilitating critical discussions on quality

within a QA framework



UNIVERSITEIT
STELLENBOSCH
UNIVERSITY

Scope of the Quality Assurance Framework

- New programmes { Lecturer → Department → HEQC criteria → Faculty ← Programme
Advisory Committee → Academic Planning Committee → Senate
- Existing undergraduate programmes { Faculties → HEQC criteria → Quality Committee
→ Executive Committee of Senate
- Department / Support service: fitness for and fitness of purpose
 - Undergraduate modules
 - Postgraduate programmes
 - Research
 - Community interaction{ Department → Criteria → Dean ← External
Panel → Quality Committee → Executive
Committee of Senate → Follow-up report



TOP TIP #1 Get your foot in the door

- Identify where, at what level(s) within the process(es) there is a lack of critical discussion taking place
- Zoom in on that particular area and create opportunities for discussion at that level

- Department / Support service: fitness for and fitness of purpose

- Undergraduate modules
- Postgraduate programmes
- Research
- Community interaction

Department → Criteria → Dean → External Panel → Quality Committee → Executive Committee of Senate → Follow-up report



Super-uniqueness of groups

- Realize that perspectives on quality differ
- Each environment is unique, has its own challenges, recent past and current working style
- Accept that the levels of interest, experience and insight in HE practices and QA processes differ
- You represent the whole bureaucrazy
- Time = research ≠ templates



UNIVERSITEIT
STELLENBOSCH
UNIVERSITY

TOP TIP #2 Make yourself at home

- Expect the expected. Accept that you are an uninvited guest, but make yourself at home, nonetheless.
- Get to know the environment. First hear how they feel about quality. Be flexible. Prove yourself invaluable.

- Whole faculty evaluation of the Faculty of Theology
 - Strategic planning exercise
 - External panel from different denominations
- Campus Health Services and H1N1



1	KERNINLICHTING VIR DIE DEPARTEMENT WISKUNDE WETENSKAPPE				
2	CORE INFORMATION IN RESPECT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES				
3					
4	Maatstaf/Measure	2004	2005	2006	2007
5					
6	1. Totale getal voorgr. module-inskrywings/ <i>Total number of undergrad. module enrolments¹⁾</i>	8629	8115	7690	7435
7					
8	2. VE-studente-inskrywings/ <i>FTE student enrolments:</i>				
9	Voorgraads/ <i>Undergraduate</i>	744.45	699.40	645.75	613.72
10	Nagraads/ <i>Post-graduate</i>	85.00	61.75	65.29	66.08
11	Totaal/ <i>Total</i>	829.45	761.15	711.04	679.80
12					
13	3. VE-personeel/ <i>FTE personnel²⁾</i> :				
14	Onderrig/navorsing (C1-personeel)/ <i>Instruction/research (C1 personnel)</i>	43.05	45.35	35.62 (34.53)	34.45 (32.96)
15	Ander (C2-en C3-personeel)/ <i>Other (C2 and C3 personnel)</i>	21.47	18.36	14.64 (10.79)	13.77 (10.10)
16	Totaal/ <i>Total</i>	64.52	63.71	50.26 (45.32)	48.22 (43.06)
17					
18	"Ander" personeel as verhouding van Totale VE-personeel/ "Other" personnel as ratio of Total FTE personnel:				
19					
20	Departement/ <i>Department</i>	0.33	0.29	0.29	0.29
21	Fakulteit/ <i>Faculty</i>	0.54	0.55	0.55	0.53
22					
23	4. VE-studente per VE-onderrig/navorsingspersoneelid: <i>FTE students per FTE instruction/research personnel member:</i>				
24					
25	Departement/ <i>Department</i>	19.27	16.78	19.96	19.73
26	Fakulteit/ <i>Faculty</i>	13.58	13.37	14.00	15.54
27					
28	5. Posvlakbenutting deur C1-personeel met permanente aanstellings: <i>Post level utilization of C1 personnel with permanent appointments:</i>				
29					
30	Professor	8	9	9	7
31	Mede-professor/ <i>Ass. professor</i>	4	5	5	4
32	Senior lektor/ <i>Senior lecturer</i>	15	16	12	12
33	Lektor/ <i>Lecturer</i>	9	8	7	8
34	Junior lektor/ <i>Junior lecturer</i>	1	1		
35	Ander/ <i>Other</i>	16			
36	TOTAAL/ <i>TOTAL</i>	53	39	33	31
37					
38	6. Getal nagraadse kwalifikasies toegeken/ <i>Number of postgraduate qualifications awarded:</i>				
39	Honneurs/ <i>Honours</i>	21	21	21	26
40	Meesters/ <i>Masters</i>	7	14	20	22
41	Doktors/ <i>Doctoral</i>	3		3	5
42					

STRATEGIESE BESTUURSAANWYSERS (SBAs) VIR 2006-2007: DEPARTEMEN
STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT INDICATORS (SMIs) FOR 2006-2007: DEPARTMEI

SBA-definisie vir 2008/SMI definition for 2008	2006			2007			2008		
	Departement/ Department	Fakulteit/ Faculty	US/SU	Departement/ Department	Fakulteit/ Faculty	US/SU	Departement/ Department	Fakulteit/ Faculty	US/SU
1a: PE (2007) per VE-SLE-C1-personeellid (2007) <i>PU (2007) per FTE SLE C1 staff member (2007)¹⁾</i>	0.48	1.03	0.73	0.72	1.35	0.87	0.61	1.13	0.86
1b: % Perm C1-pers wat gedoktooreerd is in 2008 <i>% Perm C1 staff with doctoral degree in 2008</i>	82.35	88.28	57.36	86.67	92.86	61.54	74.36	82.84	57.92
1c: NNS-geëvalueerde pers in 2008 as % van perm C1-pers <i>NRF evaluated staff in 2008 as % of perm C1 staff</i>	48.48	61.11	27.33	45.16	60.33	28.57	34.29	59.23	28.71
1d: Sukseskoers van voorgraadse studente (2007) <i>Success rate of undergraduate students (2007)</i>	73.69	74.03	78.51	72.17	76.26	80.84	71.23	73.67	81.62
1e: VE-nagraadse studente in 2007 as % van alle VE-studente <i>FTE post-graduate students in 2007 as % of all FTE students</i>	8.11	12.66	23.10	9.18	12.07	22.03	9.72	12.41	22.99
1f: Geweegde M- en D-grade (2007) per VE-SLE-C1-pers (2007) <i>Weighted M and D degrees (2007) per FTE SLE C1pers (2007)</i>	0.29	0.99	1.08	0.74	1.07	1.03	0.99	0.95	1.30
2a: Nagr kopinskr uit Afrika (2008) as % van alle nagraadse kopinskr. <i>Post-grad enrolm from Africa (2008) as % of all post-grad enrolm.</i>	25.89	18.95	8.23	17.39	17.88	9.67	20.97	16.67	9.70
2b: Afrika betrok.(punte in 2008) per VE-SLE-C1-personeellid (2007) <i>Africa involv. (points for 2008) per FTE SLE C1 pers memb (2007)</i>	0.19	0.17	0.27	0.10	0.25	0.34	0.27	0.26	0.45
3a: Innovasiepunte (2008) per VE-SLE-C1-pers (2007) <i>Innovation points (2008) per FTE SLE C1 pers (2007)</i>	0.00	0.30	0.36	0.00	0.43	0.35	0.00	1.52	0.63
3b ⁴⁾ : Koste personeel vir GI as % van totale personeeluitg in 2008 <i>Personnel cost for CI as % of total personnel cost in 2008</i>					0.008	0.035	0.210	1.24	1.14
3c: Derde geldstroom (R'000 in 2008) per VE-SLE-C1-pers (2007) <i>Third money stream (R'000 in 2008) per FTE SLE C1 pers (2007)</i>	20.60	141.90	64.15	30.24	140.24	86.52	91.69	226.83	120.57
4a: % Perm C1-pers uit aangewese groepe (2008) <i>% Perm C1 pers from designated groups (2008)</i>	27.27	35.71	47.41	32.26	38.84	48.98	28.57	38.46	48.44
4b: % Swart, Ind en Bruin Nagraadse kopinskrywings (2008) <i>% Black, Indian or Coloured post-grad headcount enrolm (2008)</i>	34.82	31.25	42.08	29.57	33.08	43.25	35.48	34.46	45.89
4c ²⁾ : % Swart, Ind en bruin nuweling eerstejaars (2008) <i>% Black, Indian or Coloured first time entering first yr stud (2008)</i>		21.89	20.33		28.57	21.08		29.69	22.81
6 ³⁾ : Onderriginsetteenhede in 2007 per VE-SLE-C1-pers (2007) <i>Teaching input units in 2007 per FTE SLE C1 pers (2007)</i>	39.80	48.37	42.97	48.50	49.86	47.07	49.71	55.94	51.96
7 ³⁾ : Bedryfsbalans (2008) as verh van totale inkomste in 2008 <i>Operational(current) balance (2008) as ratio of total income in 2008</i>	0.18	-0.04	0.00	0.01	-0.03	0.00	0.03	-0.06	0.00

1) VE-SLE is 'n aangepaste VE-C1-personeelwaarde. Die aanpassingsfaktor word bereken deur die weging van die onderskeie C1-range in die departement/fakulteit.

Die gewigte word uit die vergoedingskale (maks) vir elke rang verkry, met die senior-lektorrang se gewig as 1 geneem.

FTE SLE is a adjusted FTE staff value. The adjustment factor is calculated by weighing the respective C1-ranks used in the department. The weighting factors are

**PRESTASIE VAN VOORGRAADSE STUDENTE VOLGENS MODULE, JAAR, RAS EN UITSLAGKATEGORIE FOR 2006-2007: DEPARTEMEN
PERFORMANCE OF UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ACCORDING TO MODULE, YEAR, RACE AND RESULTS CATEGORY FOR 2006-2007:**

Nota: Hierdie inligting is programmeer onttrek uit die studente-inligtingstelsel datastoor wat slegs Afrikaanse benamings het/
Note: This information is extracted from the student information system warehouse which has only Afrikaans designations

Jaar/Maand	Subdepartement	Modulenaam	Uitslagkategorie	Bruin	Indier	Swart	Wit	Grand Total	Slaag-%	
200606	Rekenaarwetenskap	18139 114 Rekenaarwetenskap	Druip 1e eksamen	1	1			2		
			Druip hereksamen	2			3	5		
			Getal stakings	2			7	9		
			Kwal nie eksamen	12		3	17	32		
			Slaag 1e eksamen	7		2	51	60		
			Slaag hereksamen	1			1	2		
		18139 114 Rekenaarwetenskap Total			25	1	5	79	110	56.36
		18139 214 Rekenaarwetenskap	Druip 1e eksamen					1	1	
			Druip hereksamen				1	1	2	
			Getal stakings					1	1	
			Kwal nie eksamen	1			4	5		
			Slaag 1e eksamen	3			36	39		
		18139 214 Rekenaarwetenskap Total			4		1	44	49	81.63
		18139 314 Rekenaarwetenskap	Afw vir eksamen					1	1	
			Getal stakings					5	5	
			Kwal nie eksamen	1			4	5		
			Slaag 1e eksamen	2			61	63		
		18139 314 Rekenaarwetenskap Total			4			78	82	86.59
		18139 324 Rekenaarwetenskap	Afw vir eksamen					2	2	
			Druip 1e eksamen	1			3	4		
			Druip hereksamen	1			4	5		
			Getal stakings				1	1		
			Kwal nie eksamen				2	2		
			Slaag 1e eksamen	2			16	18		
		18139 324 Rekenaarwetenskap Total			4			31	35	60.00
		18139 414 Rekenaarwetenskap	Druip 1e eksamen	1			1	2		
			Getal stakings				1	1		
Slaag 1e eksamen					12	12				
18139 414 Rekenaarwetenskap Total			1			14	15	80.00		
18139 424 Rekenaarwetenskap	Slaag 1e eksamen				5	5				
18139 424 Rekenaarwetenskap Total					5	5	100.00			
59536 212 Rekenaarwetenskap E	Druip hereksamen					1	1			
	Getal stakings					1	1			
	Kwal nie eksamen	2		1	11	14				
	Slaag 1e eksamen	3			36	39				
	Slaag hereksamen	2			1	3				
59536 212 Rekenaarwetenskap E Total			7		1	50	58	72.41		
Rekenaarwetenskap Total			45	1	7	301	354			
Toegepaste Wiskunde	20710 214 Toegepaste Wiskunde	Druip 1e eksamen	1			6	7			
		Getal stakings	1			1	1			

Page 1

What should the profile of a QA officer be?

- QA officers should not *just* be filing clerks who maintain evaluation schedules and write minutes
- A creative, lateral thinker will start drawing comparisons between different departments, faculties, support divisions and HE institutions; simplifying and streamlining processes
- QA officers are in ideal positions to propose solutions to cross-cutting institutional problems and challenges; they have access to data which should be analyzed and interpreted
- Nonetheless, being good at filing, also helps.



UNIVERSITEIT
STELLENBOSCH
UNIVERSITY

TOP TIP #3 Invite yourself back

- Share stories of other departmental and support service evaluations, illustrating best practices and common pitfalls
- Do not simply provide all the information at once; you want to be able to track the conversations at different stages

IN THE PERIOD 2008 – 2010:

- New programmes: 29
- Departmental evaluations: 16 departments
- Programme evaluations: 6 faculties
- Support division evaluations: 12 divisions



Less *why* and more *why not*

- Embed critical reflection opportunities in each process and form
- Design clean, clear and concise templates, with clarifying notes where applicable
- Work from the premise that every environment is striving for greater quality; we are all working towards quality *improvement* rather than *monitoring*
- Focus less attention on descriptive narratives of the status quo, and more time on analysis and strategy formulation
- Keep self-evaluation reports and programme/module forms *alive* as strategic documents; ensure that documents are readily available and *googleable*
- Structure processes in such a manner as to direct thought and reflection towards quality issues



UNIVERSITEIT
STELLENBOSCH
UNIVERSITY



2. Academic integrity

2.1 Criteria

Programme outcomes, learning methods, learning material and expected time of completion cater for the learning needs of its target student intake and other stakeholders and meets international standards. The programme content is academically grounded and meet international standards. Modules and/or courses in the programme are coherently planned with regard to content, level, credits, purpose, outcomes, rules of combination, relative weight and delivery.

2.2 Key Question – After reading the criteria above, what is the main issue (question) pertaining to this programme?

█ ?

2.3 Evaluation – Rate yourself on this criterion using the scale on the bottom of the page:

2.4 Motivation – Motivate your rating. Why did you give yourself, e.g. a 2 and not a 1 or a 3 in the Evaluation question above?

█

2.5 Strategy – What strategies can you employ to address the key question for this criterion? Write each strategy in the infinitive, e.g.: “to increase the practical component in the second year by introducing more tutorial classes in module 114 and 244”

» to █

» to █

» to █

2.6 Documents – Please attach relevant key evidence documents as addenda. List the documents below.

» **Document 2.1** █

» **Document 2.2** █

» **Document 2.3** █

	EVALUATION SCALE FROM 1 TO 5 FOR QUESTIONS 1.3, 2.3, 3.3, 4.3, 5.3, 6.3, 7.3, 8.3, 9.3, 10.3, 11.3
1	Consistently excellent, significantly exceeds the required standards of an academic programme.
2	Consistently exceeds the required standards of an academic programme.
3	Consistently meets the required standards of an academic programme.
4	Consistently does not meet the required standards of an academic programme.
5	Insufficient and below the required standards of an academic programme. Performance at this level is unacceptable.

TOP TIP #4 Leave your door wide open

- Encourage further dialogue through forums and identified quality risk topics
- Focus on closing the loop and then provide feedback and communicate successes
- Blog about quality issues and filter discussions down to students
- Make QA and strategy documents readily available, and have induction sessions with new academic staff members

So how do you facilitate critical discussions on quality?



MY TOP TIPS FOR FACILITATING CRITICAL DISCUSSIONS ON QUALITY WITHIN A QA FRAMEWORK

- #1 Get your foot in the door
- #2 Make yourself at home
- #3 Invite yourself back
- #4 Leave your door wide open

Thank you! Dankie!

Enkosi!



**DANKIE
THANK YOU
ENKOSI KAHKULU**



**UNIVERSITEIT
STELLENBOSCH
UNIVERSITY**