



THE HONG KONG  
POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY  
香港理工大學

---

香港理工大學  
2010 年質素核證

---

跟進項目進度報告

呈交

大學教育資助委員會

2012 年 12 月

# 香港理工大學

## 2010 年質素核證

### 跟進項目進度報告

2012 年 12 月

#### 引言

香港理工大學（理大）感謝質素保證局（質保局）對理大教與學質素的核證。理大一向致力為學生提供優質專業教育，對於評審小組認同我校有關質素保證的長期傳統及根深柢固的文化，並認為程序穩固健全，極感欣慰。令我們尤其欣喜的是評審小組確認理大的專業認可課程“質素優良，有利於畢業生升學就業”。

我們相信核證的真正價值，在於使我們有機會對質素保證工作進行嚴格的檢討，從而可以不斷作出改善。評審小組的專家評語及有益建議，使我們能夠從全新的角度檢討理大現行的政策、程序和做法，並探討進一步提高學生學習質素的方法，對此我們深表感謝。理大十分重視核證的結果，為嚴格跟進評審小組的贊同項目與改善建議，制定了工作計劃。我們很高興在此報告，就評審小組在核證報告中所關注的各個項目，理大已取得重大的進展。

本進度報告分為以下四部分：

- 跟進質保局建議及贊同項目的進度摘要
- 跟進質保局建議項目的詳細報告
- 跟進質保局贊同項目的詳細報告
- 補充資料

#### 跟進質保局建議及贊同項目的進度摘要

我們茲將理大在過去十八個月以來，就質保局核證提出的改善建議及贊同項目所取得的進展，分別在表 1 和表 2 中列出。

表 1：跟進質保局建議項目的進度摘要

	建議	跟進措施
1	<p>檢討大學本部的教務委員會和質素委員會與專業及持續教育學院的教務委員會和質素委員會的角色和關係</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 專業及持續教育學院修訂了管治和質素保證架構，2011年 12 月獲大學教務委員會審批通過；全面的實施安排在 2012 年 6 月獲大學教務委員會批准</li> <li>• 專業及持續教育學院的教務委員會改稱為專業及持續教育學院院務委員會，並成為大學教務委員會轄下委員會之一</li> <li>• 專業及持續教育學院的教務策劃及質素委員會廢止，其職責由新成立的專業及持續教育學院院務委員會以及學院教學委員會承擔</li> <li>• 專業及持續教育學院的教務策劃以及質素保證將由大學的教務策劃委員會及質素委員會（教學部門）監管</li> </ul>
2	<p>培養並深化嚴格的自我檢視風氣</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 各學系須繼續在年度運作計劃書中對其表現作嚴格的自我檢視，並為每六年進行一次的學系檢視提供一份自我檢視報告作為檢視的依據</li> <li>• 質素委員會（教學部門）於 2012 年 11 月審批通過以年度運作計劃制度代替現有的年度工作計劃書及年度質素保證報告</li> <li>• 修訂質素保證手冊，要求各學系在對學系檢視報告的回應中，必須包括計劃如何落實檢視小組提出的改善建議；計劃進度由所屬學院的院長監察</li> </ul>
3	<p>釐清專業及持續教育學院校董會的角色及職責，以及與理大校董會的關係</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 專業及持續教育學院的學院院務委員會成為大學教務委員會轄下委員會之一，令專業及持續教育學院直接受到大學校董會及大學教務委員會的監管</li> <li>• 大學校董會部分成員兼任專業及持續教育學院校董會的校外成員，以加強聯絡和監察</li> <li>• 專業及持續教育學院的事務將納入校長向大學校董會呈交的報告之內，並在有需要時作出討論</li> </ul>
4	<p>制定全校適用的策略，確保該校的主要運作範疇與審慎挑選的課程及院校進行基準比較</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 通過加強在學系檢視時對基準比較的要求來鞏固學系及課程現有的策略，並更清楚列明委任學系學術顧問及挑選對象和同類課程作基準比較的準則</li> <li>• 成立新的國際顧問委員會及學院顧問委員會，為理大及學系提供額外的基準比較參考</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 修訂理大的教職員委任和擢升制度，規定必須包括來自海外知名院校的校外諮詢人的意見，作為對教職員的質素的基準比較</li> <li>• 通過在專業及持續教育學院設立學術顧問制度，對學院的課程及其內容質素作更有系統的基準比較</li> <li>• 在評審教學支援部門的過程中包括校外專家，加強對此等部門的基準比較要求</li> </ul>
5	檢討現時採用的表現指標	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 教學委員會於 2012 年 3 月審批通過在 2012/13 至 2014/15 之三學年期間推行新的大學學習成果評核計劃</li> <li>• 成立專責小組以檢討及修訂現行的學系表現指標供質素委員會（教學部門）討論；修訂指標將與教員年度表現獎勵計劃掛鉤</li> <li>• 為非教學部門設立新的年度報告及工作計劃書制度</li> <li>• 所有非教學部門須制定一套與理大的使命一致、並反映該部門的工作成效是否符合大學預期的主要表現指標</li> </ul>
6	制定和推行全面的綜合方法，協助學生培養畢業生應有特質，並評估他們是否具備這些特質	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 教學委員會於 2012 年 3 月審批通過了一套綜合計劃，以協助學生培養畢業生應有的特質，並已指示各學系和教學支援部門執行</li> <li>• 教學委員會審批通過在 2012/13 至 2014/15 之三學年期間推行新的大學學習成果評核計劃；實施安排已取得顯著進展</li> </ul>
7	所有課程均須在籌劃和審批過程中邀請校外人士提供意見	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 理大本部學系的所有課程的籌劃及審批過程已有邀請校外專家提供意見</li> <li>• 新規定課程評審委員會須包括一名校外專家</li> <li>• 在專業及持續教育學院設立學院顧問委員會及學術顧問制度，加強校外專家在學院的課程發展和審批過程中的參與</li> </ul>
8	採用可靠一致的監察措施，確保所有課程達到相同的學術水平	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 理大已設有質素保證系統及程序，確保並監察所有學系的課程（包括本地和境外課程）達到相同的學術水平</li> <li>• 專業及持續教育學院的質素保證制度盡量依循理大本部的制度，以確保政策及程序的一致</li> </ul>

9	除問卷調查外，還應研究其他策略收集學生意見	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 調查理大現時收集學生意見的做法，並參考國際經驗</li> <li>● 於 2012 年 5 月舉辦論壇，邀請學系和教職員就此議題討論和交流經驗</li> <li>● 要求所有本科課程設立學生—教職員諮詢小組</li> <li>● 教學委員會在 2012 年 10 月通過如何收集和使用學生意見的指引，並已指示學系及教職員依循</li> </ul>
---	-----------------------	--

表 2：跟進質保局贊同項目的進度摘要

	贊同	跟進措施
1	推行新管理架構	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 新管理架構已如計劃推行</li> <li>● 2010 年 6 月成立工作小組以檢討大學教務委員會以及校長轄下各委員會及諮詢小組的架構；2011 年 6 月教務委員會通過修訂建議</li> </ul>
2	把學生取得課程學習成效的數據納入年度課程檢討內，加強檢討的效用	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 各學系已推行課程學習成果評核計劃，並將評核結果納入年度課程檢討報告內</li> <li>● 鑒於大學正於 2011 年檢討及簡化質素保證程序，各學系該年無須在年度質素保證報告中呈交年度課程檢討報告</li> <li>● 質素委員會（教學部門）在 2012 年 11 月通過年度運作計劃制度</li> </ul>
3	在制定課程時注意學科和專業的新趨勢及區內獨特情況，幫助學生和畢業生做好準備，在香港境外從事專業工作	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 在大學層面新設立國際顧問委員會</li> <li>● 設立學院顧問委員會</li> <li>● 在理大新一輪的策略發展計劃中制定具體的策略，以協助學生為在香港境外從事專業工作做好準備</li> <li>● 成立就業服務處</li> </ul>
4	致力制訂切合課程目標及預期學習成效的評核程序	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 通過學院院長、系主任，以及各學院和學系教學委員會，致力推動及督促學系及教員實施與預期學習成效一致的評核方法</li> <li>● 教學發展中心就評核的各個方面為教員舉辦工作坊，並提供專業支援</li> </ul>

## 跟進質保局建議項目的詳細報告

### R1 建議 1

*質保局建議理大檢討大學本部的教務委員會和質素委員會與專業及持續教育學院的教務委員會和質素委員會的角色和關係，確保該學院開辦可獲理大頒授學位的課程水平等同理大本部課程的水平，並且妥為監察這些課程。*

- R1.1 理大完全接納質保局評審小組此一建議，並已參考理大本部學系的管治及質素保證架構和系統，對專業及持續教育學院進行了相應的檢討，建議改善其管治及質素保證架構。建議獲校長行政委員會同意，並在 2010 年 12 月 15 日舉行之第 73 次大學教務委員會會議上批准 [補充資料 1]。由於此等修改，大學教務委員會轄下某些委員會以及專業及持續教育學院院務委員會的組成和職權範圍也作出了相應的檢討。全面的實施安排亦獲大學教務委員會在 2012 年 6 月 7 日召開的第 75 次會議上批准 [補充資料 2]，並於 2012 年 9 月起執行。
- R1.2 在新架構下，專業及持續教育學院教務委員會改稱為專業及持續教育學院院務委員會，並成為大學教務委員會轄下委員會之一。新的專業及持續教育學院院務委員會與理大其他學院的院務委員會有相同的角色和責任，負責監管學院內部所有與學術相關之事務，包括質素保證和課程規劃及評審。
- R1.3 為與理大本部其他學院的質素保證架構和程序保持一致，並避免與大學的質素委員會混淆，專業及持續教育學院舊有的教務策劃和質素委員會已被取消，其職責將由新成立的專業及持續教育學院院務委員會及學院教學委員會承擔。至於專業及持續教育學院的教務策劃和質素保證，則由理大的教務策劃委員會及質素委員會（教學部門）監管。

### R2 建議 2

*質保局建議理大培養並深化嚴格的自我檢視風氣，確保全校各部門都精益求精，不斷改進。*

- R2.1 通過嚴格的自我檢視來不斷改進是理大質素保證架構的基本精神。一如過往，理大會繼續要求各教學和支援部門在每年的工作／運作計劃書中，對過去一年的表現作嚴格的自我評估，並依期為每六年進行一次的學系檢視（教學部門）或部門評審（非教學部門）提交一份自我檢視報告，作為檢視或評審的依據。
- R2.2 在質保局核證後，理大檢討了過去要求教學部門遞交年度工作計劃書、年度質素保證報告、學系人事計劃書等制度，以便精簡質素保證程序，加強自我檢視的風氣。檢討結果建議過往的年度工作計劃書及年度質素保證報告改由年度運作計劃制度取代，並已獲質素委員會（教學部門）在 2012 年 11 月召開的第 24 次會議上通過。

在新制度下，各學系仍須對過去一年的表現作嚴格的自我檢視，並以之為基礎來規劃未來一年的工作和人力需求。

- R2.3 此外，我們亦對已完成一半的第一輪學系檢視作出了中期檢討。為加強不斷改善的風氣，理大要求各學系在對學系檢視報告的回應中，必須包括計劃如何落實檢視小組提出的改善建議。各學系制定的改善計劃由所屬學院的院長監察，並在下一次檢視中跟進。為協助推行這一程序，理大制定了一個標準報告格式 [補充資料 3] 以方便各學院向質素委員會（教學部門）提交轄下學系的檢視報告。該標準報告格式已獲質素委員會（教學部門）通過，並由 2012/13 學年起使用。

### R3 建議 3

*質保局建議理大釐清專業及持續教育學院校董會的角色及職責，以及與理大校董會的關係，並研究兩者的關係對該學院的整體學術管治有何影響。*

- R3.1 專業及持續教育學院是理大全資擁有、自負盈虧的附屬機構，其成立旨在提供專上程度的專業及持續教育。如上述我們對改善建議 1 的回應，專業及持續教育學院的管治和質素保證架構經修改後，其院務委員會自 2012 年 9 月起已成為大學教務委員會轄下委員會之一，令專業及持續教育學院直接受到大學校董會及大學教務委員會的監管。
- R3.2 專業及持續教育學院校董會的職權範圍、組成和成員可見於 [補充資料 4]。為加強大學校董會對專業及持續教育學院工作的聯繫和監察，大學校董會其中兩名成員由校長同時委任為專業及持續教育學院校董會的校外成員。此外，部分理大高層管理人員也是專業及持續教育學院校董會的成員，其中三位亦同時是大學校董會成員。
- R3.3 另外，新的管治及質素保證架構實施後，專業及持續教育學院的相關事務亦會納入校長定期向大學校董會呈交的報告之內，並在有需要時作出討論。

### R4 建議 4

*質保局建議理大制定全校適用的策略，確保該校的主要運作範疇，包括所有學術課程和專業及持續教育學院開辦的課程，與審慎挑選的同類型本地和國際課程及院校進行基準比較。*

- R4.1 理大過去已有策略，透過下列的質素保證機制和程序，為各教學部門和課程提供基準比較：
- 學系學術顧問制度
  - 學系檢視制度

- 課程籌劃、評審、監管及檢討程序

此外，理大多個課程亦已獲得相關的法定及/或專業團體認可。

R4.2 透過這些程序，理大已有系統地向任教於聲譽良好的本地及海外高等院校的知名學者，以及工商業和專業機構的代表收集意見和反饋，以確保理大課程和畢業生的質素和水平，與本地及國際院校同類課程相若。理大將繼續努力推行這方面的工作。

R4.3 惟理大亦贊同質保局關於審慎挑選課程、學系和/或院校作基準比較的建議。質素委員會(教學部門)於 2012 年 9 月 13 日的會議決定在學系檢視時要多作基準比較。具體議決如下：

- 挑選基準比較對象時，應以同類課程、學系或院校的整體國際排名，被挑選學系的學術及/或研究實力，以及其他特殊因素等為原則。選作基準比較的課程和院校一般都應具有較高的學術和專業地位。
- 於同類型院校中至多可以選擇三項同類課程作基準比較。
- 作基準比較的項目應包括學系規劃、組織架構、課程、學生質素、學生學習經驗及成果、學生支援架構等等。

就此，理大已在質素保證手冊內有關學系檢視制度的指引中作出相應修改 [補充資料 5]，並已指示各學系依規定執行。

R4.4 此外，理大亦以下列方法加強課程和教職員質素的基準比較機制：

- 於大學層面設立新的國際顧問委員會，為理大的重點策略和發展方向提供國際視野 [補充資料 6]。
- 設立新的學院顧問委員會，為學院的整體規劃和發展提供建議，並對學院的工作進行基準比較 [補充資料 7]。
- 修訂理大的教職員聘任和擢升制度，規定在過程中必須包括從海外知名院校委任校外諮詢人，通過徵詢他們的意見，對教職員的質素作基準比較。

R4.5 專業及持續教育學院的管治及質素保證架構經 2012 年 9 月修改後，凡獲頒理大專業進修學院學術資格的課程，其籌劃、核准及檢討程序，必須與大學本部一致，並有系統地諮詢校外意見，作為對課程及其內容質素的基準比較。此外，專業及持續教育學院亦已如大學本部的學系一樣，設立學術顧問制度，委任其他知名大學的學者在廣泛學科的基礎上，監察學院的課程和其他與學術相關的事務。學院轄下的兩個教學單位 — 香港專上學院和專業進修學院 — 亦須每六年一次接受學系檢視。

R4.6 理大亦確定要對教學支援部門的運作進行基準比較。質素委員會（非教學部門）已於 2011 年 8 月修訂非教學部門的評審架構，授權負責監管該部門的高層管理人員可視乎需要，在香港或海外委任一名或以上有相關經驗的校外人士加入評審小組。



R4.7 另外，新修訂的教學支援部門的年度報告與工作計劃書制度（詳情見 R5.5 段）建議此等部門參照現有的國際基準，以制訂各自的質素比較基準。目前，理大部份教學支援部門，如資訊科技處及物業管理處，已採用多種不同的基準作比較，其中包括 EDUCAUSE 核心數據<sup>1</sup>及學生滿意度調查、專上教育設施管理協會數據<sup>2</sup>等。

## R5 建議 5

*質保局建議理大檢視現時採用的表現指標，確保這些指標配合教與學計劃的預期成效，並符合理大對各教學及支援部門的期望。*

R5.1 為評估學習成果是否達標，理大自 2009/10 學年起試點推行由兩個層面組成的大學學習成果評核計劃，以收集學生學習成果的數據和例證，作為持續提升成效的依據。

R5.2 根據上述計劃，各學系和課程須同時實施課程學習成果評核計劃，並將收集到的數據納入年度課程檢討報告之內。

R5.3 根據上述試點計劃所取得的經驗，教學委員會及成果為本教育工作小組在 2012 年 3 月 9 日舉行的聯席會議上，為新實施的四年制本科學位課程制定學習成果評核計劃，並通過於 2012/13 至 2014/15 之三學年期間推行 [補充資料 8]。計劃會因應理大的《2012/13 – 2017/18 策略發展計劃》中新修訂的畢業生應有特質進行下列評估活動，以衡量各方面學習成果。

- 在四年制本科課程內的專業及大學一般要求科目內實施學習成果評估 (Course-embedded Assessment)
- 畢業生的國際英語水平測試 (IELTS) 成績
- 大學學習成果評量 (Collegiate Learning Assessment)
- 畢業生就業情況調查
- 學生全人發展自我評估量表 (Students' Self-Assessment of All-Rounded Development)
- 校友調查
- 新生調查
- 畢業生離校問卷調查
- 僱主調查（引用教育局的調查數據）

理大會檢視各項評估所收集到的數據，以及各教學部門的表現指標，以衡量達至預期學習成果的成效，並作為改善的指引。

---

<sup>1</sup> EDUCAUSE 核心數據：EDUCAUSE Core Data，網址：<http://www.educause.edu/research-and-publications/research/core-data-service>

<sup>2</sup> 專上教育設施管理協會數據：Tertiary Education Facilities Management Association Data，網址：<http://www.tefma.com>

R5.4 理大亦檢討了現時用來衡量教學部門表現的量化指標。質素委員會（教學部門）為此成立專責小組，以修訂現行的指標，使更能反映畢業生應有特質和學習成果。小組預期在 2012 年 12 月提交建議，供質素委員會（教學部門）討論及通過。新修訂的表現指標通過後將與教職員年度表現獎勵計劃掛鉤。

R5.5 理大也為非教學部門設立了新的年度報告及工作計劃書制度，以取代年度工作計劃書及年度質素保證報告等制度。新制度要求所有非教學部門制定一套用來衡量其主要績效的表現指標。指標須與理大的使命一致，並能夠反映該部門的工作成效是否符合大學的預期。各非教學部門的主要表現指標已獲負責監管該部門的高層管理人員接納，並於 2012 年 5 月起生效。（另見 R4.7 段）

R5.6 所有非教學部門在年度報告和工作計劃書中，須依據其主要表現指標來嚴格檢討各項工作和進度。這套指標亦會在每六年一次的部門評審中成為衡量表現的主要工具。

## R6 建議 6

*質保局建議理大制定和推行全面的綜合方法，協助學生培養畢業生應有特質，並評估他們是否具備這些特質。*

R6.1 因應質保局此一建議，我們依據修訂的理大使命及畢業生應有特質，並諮詢教學部門及相關教學支援單位，為新實施的四年制本科課程制定了一套綜合計劃，以協助學生培養畢業生應有的特質。計劃已獲教學委員會及成果為本教育工作小組在 2012 年 3 月 9 日舉行的聯席會議上通過 [補充資料 9]。

R6.2 綜合計劃簡要列明理大如何透過正規和非正規的課程，培養具批判性思維、能有效溝通、對問題能提出有創意的解決方法、具終身學習精神及專業道德操守的領袖人才。計劃已傳達各教學部門和教學支援單位，並已開始執行。依照計劃建議，各教學部門須確保每一課程的課內外活動能恰當地幫助學生培養畢業生應有特質，而教學支援部門則須在年度報告與工作計劃書中，說明為協助培養畢業生應有特質而籌劃的活動。

R6.3 如 R5.3 段所述，理大為 2012/13 至 2014/15 之三學年從新制定了大學學習成果評核計劃，以評估學生是否具備畢業生應有的特質。理大已指示各教學及教學支援部門依計劃執行，而實施安排亦已取得顯著進展如下：

- 為配合大學新制定的學習成果目標，理大對沿用的校友調查問卷作出了修訂。此外，為避免重複調查及減少對校友造成負擔，又整合了以往分大學及學系兩個層面進行的校友調查。經修訂的校友調查問卷及實施安排已獲教學委員會於 2012 年 8 月通過，並已於同年 11 月在本科課程開始實行。

- 理大已就推行大學學習成果評量制定實施方案，並正設立工作小組研究具體細節。
- 大學學習成果評核計劃將包括每年進行一次新生調查，用以研究新生在理大第一年的學習經驗和投入學習的模式。教學委員會已於 2012 年 10 月通過新生調查問卷和安排，並於 2012/13 學年試點實施。
- 理大正在制定新推行的畢業生離校問卷調查。

## R7 建議 7

*質保局建議理大規定所有可獲理大頒授學術資格的課程，不論是否須經專業評審，均須在籌劃和審批過程中邀請校外人士提供意見。*

- R7.1 理大所有課程，不論是否須經專業或法定團體認可，在其籌劃、評審與批准過程中均已有邀請校外人士提供專業意見。唯一例外是少數由專業及持續教育學院開設而無須得到專業認可的課程。
- R7.2 為加強課程評審過程中校外人士的參與，質素委員會（教學部門）在 2012 年 9 月 13 日舉行的第 23 次會議中，規定所有課程評審委員會必須包括一名校外人士。課程籌劃、評審和管理指引及規例已作相應修訂，並指示所有學系依規定執行。
- R7.3 如 R1.1 段所述，大學教務委員會於 2011 年 12 月通過修訂專業及持續教育學院之管治和素質保證架構，規定所有頒授理大專業進修學院學術資格的本科課程的籌劃、評審與檢討過程，均須依循大學本部的制度。按此規定，課程的初步籌劃提議書須得到專業及持續教育學院之顧問委員會（成員包括校外專家）的支持才能獲得批准，而課程評審亦須包括校外學術顧問的參與。
- R7.4 大學教務委員會亦於 2011 年 12 月批准專業及持續教育學院引入一套以廣泛學科為基礎的學術顧問制度。該制度旨在委任高水平的校外學術顧問就不同問題提供意見，其中包括質素保證制度、人力和資源需求、學術課程、教與學及評核、學術研究、顧問與社區服務，以及其他如學術水平、課程發展與評審等相關範疇。學術顧問亦會協助學院與國際上的同類課程和同等院校進行基準比較。目前已有八名學者獲委任為學院的學術顧問。

## R8 建議 8

*質保局建議理大採用可靠一致的監察措施，確保所有課程，包括在不同地點授課的課程，達到相同的學術水平。*

- R8.1 為確保所有頒授理大學術資格的課程有相同的學術水平，所有理大本部的學院/學系開設的課程（包括境外課程）均須依循理大的質素保證架構和程序，其中包括設立學系顧問委員會、委任學系學術顧問、尋求法定/專業團體認可，以及依循課程籌劃、評審與批准的程序。
- R8.2 大學教務委員會在 2012 年 12 月 15 日舉行的 73 次會議中決定，所有頒授理大專業進修學院學術資格的本科課程，其籌劃、評審及檢討程序，均須依循理大為本部學院所訂定的制度。此外，大學教務委員會亦決定在專業及持續教育學院設立以廣泛學科為基礎的學術顧問制度。理大相信這兩個機制能確保大學本部和專業及持續教育學院的課程有一致的質素保證程序。
- R8.3 此外，為保證學系委任學術顧問時有一致的程序和準則，並確保他們在課程質素和水平的基準比較中充分發揮作用，質素委員會（教學部門）在 2012 年 9 月 13 日舉行的第 23 次會議中同意，學院院長應定期向質素委員會匯報學系委任學術顧問的情況。同時，學系委任學術顧問的標準也作出了相應的修改，不僅加強了顧問在基準比較這方面的職能，還加入了“顧問所在院校的同類學術課程之水平”一項，作為衡量該顧問人選是否合適的因素之一。理大質素保證手冊已就此更新 [補充資料 10]。

## R9 建議 9

*質保局建議理大除以問卷調查收集學生意見外，還應研究其他策略，以及制訂可靠和有系統的機制，知會學生校方因應他們循各種途徑表達的意見而採取的改善措施。*

- R9.1 就此建議，教學委員會和成果為本教育工作小組在 2011 年 9 月舉行的聯席會議上，決定採取以下的方法，探討如何更有效地收集學生意見以改善學習質素：
- 以問卷形式調查各學系設立的學生—教職員諮詢小組的現況，以找出有效可取的模式；
  - 借鏡國際上對收集學生意見的做法；
  - 於 2012 年 5 月舉辦公開論壇，邀請教職員討論如何更好地收集和使用學生意見以改善學習，並交流經驗；以及
  - 根據上述活動所收集到的資料，草擬一套收集及使用學生意見的指引 [補充資料 11]。
- R9.2 質素委員會（教學部門）在 2012 年 11 月 30 日舉辦的第 24 次會議上，接受了教學委員會的建議，要求所有學系為本科課程設立學生—教職員諮詢小組，作為學生問卷調查以外另一個收集學生意見的正式途徑。課程籌劃、評審和管理指引及規例已相應更新，並指示所有學系依規例執行。

## 跟進質保局贊同項目的詳細報告

### A1 贊同 1

*質保局贊同理大推行新管理架構，藉此釐清高層行政人員的角色及職責，以及加強制訂政策的能力。*

A1.1 2009 年唐偉章校長上任後，大學校董會通過了新的高層管理架構，並已按計劃逐步推行。所有高層管理人員的職能及其負責監管的單位，均有明確界定。

A1.2 由校長在 2010 年 6 月設立的工作小組對大學教務委員會以及校長轄下各委員會和諮詢/顧問小組的架構進行了檢討。小組就教務委員會轄下各委員會之修訂建議，已獲教務委員會在 2011 年 6 月 2 日舉行的第 71 次會議通過，並於同年 7 月 1 日起生效。修訂的內容包括：

- 恢復設立教務規章委員會；
- 教學委員會有關訂定教務規章的職能，移交教務規章委員會負責；
- 因應需要微調大學教務委員會轄下個別委員會的職能及組成；以及
- 把校長轄下某些委員會及顧問小組的監管，改由有關高層管理人員按其職能範圍負責。

更新後的理大組織與管理架構可參閱下列網址：

[http://www.polyu.edu.hk/cpa/polyu/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=14&Itemid=37&lang=en](http://www.polyu.edu.hk/cpa/polyu/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=14&Itemid=37&lang=en)

A1.3 每名高層管理人員亦會由校長因應其職能範圍，委任為大學教務委員會或校長轄下之相關委員會或諮詢/顧問小組的主席或委員。各委員會之成員名單及職權範圍已相應更新，並通過大學內聯網知會所有理大教職員，網址為：

<https://www2.polyu.edu.hk/Script/staff/committee/commit.htm>

### A2 贊同 2

*質保局贊同理大採取措施，把學生取得課程學習成效的數據納入年度課程檢討內，加強檢討的效用。*

A2.1 如理大為核證而向質保局呈交的報告所述，各學系在 2009/10 學年須為所有本科課程試行課程學習成果評核計劃，以收集學生是否已取得預期學習成果的數據，作為課程檢討及改善之用。

- A2.2 為使這方面的工作能持續不懈地進行，理大已在質素保證手冊以及課程籌劃、評審和管理指引及規例中，規定學系必須把學習成果評核的結果納入年度質素保證報告所包括之年度課程檢討報告內，供有關高層管理人員評核。
- A2.3 各學系已依計劃在所有本科課程推行學習成果評核計劃，並將結果納入有關的課程年度檢討報告內。惟鑒於質素委員會（教學部門）在 2011 年正考慮精簡年度工作計劃書、年度質素保證報告和學系人事計劃書等制度，各學系無須在該年的工作計劃書及質素保證報告中呈交課程檢討報告。
- A2.4 如 R2.2 段所述，質素委員會（教學部門）已於 2012 年 11 月通過教學部門以年度運作計劃書代替原來的年度工作計劃書和年度質素保證報告。因此，包括有課程學習成果評核結果的年度課程檢討報告以後將透過年度運作計劃書，提交予有關高層管理人員以作評核。

### A3 贊同3

*質保局贊同理大在制訂課程時注意學科和專業的新趨勢及區內獨特情況，幫助學生和畢業生做好準備，在香港境外從事專業工作。*

- A3.1 理大現時已設有不少機制諮詢校外的意見。在課程籌劃及修訂方面，我們已有學系顧問委員會、學系學術顧問制度以及在學系檢視小組內包括海外專家等機制來獲得校外意見。在大學和學院層面，則有成員來自本地和非本地學界、工商界、專業界及社會其他界別的國際顧問委員會和學院顧問委員會，分別為大學未來的方向及學院的課程發展提供更廣闊的視野。此等措施有助理大在制訂課程時能配合學科的新趨勢和區內的獨特情況。
- A3.2 為幫助學生為日後在香港境外的專業發展做好準備，理大在《2012/13 至 2017/18 策略發展計劃》中列出了具體策略，以協助學生取得香港境外的學習和/或工作經驗。這些策略包括：
- 與海外大學和中國內地大學建立關係、簽訂協議，增加外地學生來港及本校學生到外地交流的機會（教與學主要目的 4，策略（a））
  - 積極鼓勵及支持所有理大學生到香港以外地區作最少一個月的學習經歷（教與學主要目的 4，策略（b））
  - 加強課程的國際視野，提供更多國際交流與實習機會，培養學生成為國際公民（國際化、品牌建立主要目的 1，策略（b））
  - 發掘及提供在中國內地進行實習及研究的機會，提升學生的專業能力（參與國家發展主要目的 1，策略（a））
  - 發掘及提供在中國內地進行社會服務學習的機會，培養學生成為有學識的、熱心服務社會的國際公民（參與國家發展主要目的 1，策略（b））

- 善用理大在中國內地的校友及工商界網絡，為學生提供更多學習及發展事業的機會（參與國家發展主要目的 1，策略（e））

A3.3 理大已指派相關的高層管理人員，為有關策略制定具體計劃和目標，並監察實施進度。

A3.4 為幫助學生畢業後在香港或境外從事專業工作做好準備，理大於 2012 年 7 月設立了就業服務處，負責協調校企協作教育，安排實習，以及為學生提供就業教育和輔導服務。

#### A4 **贊同 4**

*質保局贊同理大致力制訂切合課程目標及預期學習成效的評核程序。*

A4.1 理大一向着重和鼓勵教師採用切合大學預期學習成果的評核方式。理大因此要求學院院長與學系主任通過下列機制在課程和科目兩個層面監察評核策略是否切合預期學習成果：

- 在課程層面 — (a) 在課程學習成果評核計劃中闡明每項學習成果的評核方法；  
(b) 把評核結果納入學系年度運作計劃書所包括的年度課程檢討報告內。
- 在科目層面 — (a) 在供課程評審用的課程大綱中，教師須使用劃一的科目大綱表格來列出科目的預期學習成果及詳細說明所採取的評核方法；(b) 學院和學系的教學委員會須仔細檢視科目大綱表格來衡量評核方法是否恰當。

A4.2 為推廣和鼓勵有效的評核方法的實施，理大的教學發展中心不時就有關評核的各個方面舉辦工作坊和提供專業支援，其中包括如何制定恰當的評核方法、如何正確使用標準參照評核、適時給予學生回饋等。2010 年 11 月至 2012 年 12 月期間，理大共舉辦了五十五場相關的工作坊／研討會 [補充資料 12]，其中部份工作坊更納入《大學教學入門課程》和《教學助理培訓課程》之內，以幫助新入職的教師瞭解和制定有效的評核策略和方法。

## 結語

上述進度報告顯示了理大持續優化質素保證工作和提升學生學習質素的努力和決心。理大衷心感謝質保局評審小組提出的良言灼見，有助我們為學生提供優質的教育。

## 補充資料（只提供英文版）

補充資料 1：專業及持續教育學院之質素保證及管治架構

補充資料 2：經修訂的專業及持續教育學院之管治及質素保證架構之實施安排

補充資料 3：學院向質素委員會（教學部門）提交轄下學系檢視報告之標準報告格式

補充資料 4：專業及持續教育學院校董會之職權範圍、組成及成員

補充資料 5：學系檢視制度指引（修訂）

補充資料 6：國際顧問委員會之職權範圍及組成

補充資料 7：學院顧問委員會之職權範圍及組成

補充資料 8：大學學習成果評核計劃（2012 - 2015）

補充資料 9：協助學生培養畢業生應有特質之綜合計劃（2012 - 2015）

補充資料 10：學系學術顧問制度指引（修訂）

補充資料 11：收集及使用學生意見指引

補充資料 12：教學發展中心就有關評核而舉辦之工作坊（2011 年 9 月 - 2012 年 12 月）



## Revised governance and QA framework for CPCE

### Background

1. The governance and quality assurance (QA) of CPCE programmes were reviewed in two external quality audits - first by the Joint Quality Review Committee (JQRC) and more recently by the UGC Quality Assurance Council (QAC). The JQRC review focused primarily on the operation of CPCE/HKCC as a provider of self-financed sub-degree programmes. The QAC Quality Audit, on the other hand, chose a CPCE/SPEED undergraduate programme that leads to a PolyU SPEED award as one of the three sampled programmes for detailed inspection during the audit visit.
2. The JQRC Institutional Review Report published in November 2009 commended CPCE on its well-established and adequate QA system and culture while, at the same time, recommended CPCE to:
  - Report to Senate on a regular basis
  - Bring in more advice/inputs from external experts in the QA and programme planning and review processes
  - Rationalize and simplify the current QA processes.
3. The QAC Audit Report on PolyU was released on 9 June 2011, with 9 commendations, 4 affirmations and 9 recommendations. A number of the recommendations are closely related to the governance and QA of CPCE/SPEED, as follows:
  - The QAC recommends that PolyU review the role and relationships of the Senate and the University quality assurance committees relative to the Academic Board and quality assurance committees in CPCE to ensure equivalence and appropriate oversight of those programmes delivered within CPCE for which the University grants a University award (Recommendation 1)
  - The QAC recommends that PolyU clarify the roles and responsibilities of the CPCE Council relative to the University Council and explore the implications for academic governance in the CPCE as a whole (Recommendation 3)
  - The QAC recommends that PolyU develop an institution-wide strategy to ensure that key aspects of the University's operations including all academic programmes and those offered through CPCE, are benchmarked against carefully chosen local and international peer programmes and institutions (Recommendation 4)
  - The QAC recommends that PolyU implement a requirement for external input into the development and approval of all programmes leading to a University award whether or not a given programme is subject to professional accreditation (Recommendation 7)
  - The QAC recommends that PolyU ensure reliable and consistent monitoring of equivalence in standards across all programmes and locations (Recommendation 8)

## **Recommended changes to CPCE Governance and QA system**

4. In response to the recommendations of the JQRC and QAC Quality Audit Reports, CPCE submitted, in July 2011, a paper proposing a number of changes in the governance and QA of CPCE. Subsequent discussions were held between VP(AD) and CPCE key staff on their initial proposal. The *Annex* explains in more detail the guiding principles and the recommended changes for enhancing governance and QA of CPCE in response to the recommendations of JQRC and UGC QAC quality audit.
5. Essentially, the recommended changes include:
  - (i) CPCE to keep its Council, but with additional membership from PolyU Council to provide stronger linkage and oversight.
  - (ii) CPCE to re-name its Academic Board as College Board, with the same responsibilities and standing as other Faculty/School Boards in PolyU, and to carry out similar QA functions. Consistent with the practice of other Faculties/Schools, a College Learning & Teaching Committee and a College Research Committee will be set up under the College Board to oversee T&L and research of the College.
  - (iii) CPCE to abolish its Academic Planning and Quality Assurance Committee (APQAC) to avoid confusion with the University's APC and QAC, and to streamline the programme planning, validation and QA processes.
  - (iv) CPCE to follow the identical programme planning, approval and review processes for all of its programmes leading to a PolyU SPEED award. Senate can delegate the approval authority for sub-degree programmes leading to a PolyU HKCC award to APC and that for programmes not leading to a PolyU award to CPCE College Board.
  - (v) A Departmental Academic Advisors (DAA) system to be introduced at the college level on broad discipline basis. Both SPEED and HKCC are required to undergo the 6-yearly Departmental Review exercise similar to other PolyU academic units.

Encl.  
December 2011

**Quality Assurance and Governance  
in the College of Professional & Continuing Education (CPCE)**

**Guiding principles for enhancing governance and QA of CPCE**

1. On the understanding that the Senior Management's plan is to bring CPCE closer to the PolyU proper as an integral part of the University rather than turning it into an independent self-financed educational unit separated from PolyU, the proposed changes should be guided by the following two underpinning principles:
  - a. The revised system and processes proposed should be aligned, to the fullest extent possible, with the University's generic QA framework, mechanisms and processes for all Faculties and Departments, as well as the policy and guidelines governing the programme planning, validation and review processes. In short, CPCE should be viewed and treated as one of the Faculties or Schools – albeit with a different mission and primary source of funding.
  - b. The overall strategy should be to rationalize and simplify, wherever appropriate, the existing CPCE systems and practices to reduce redundancy, rather than to merely add extra layers to comply with recommendations of the QAC Quality Audit or the JQRC Institutional Review reports.

**Recommended changes to the governance and QA of CPCE**

2. CPCE Council is formed to meet the governance requirement of a limited liability company and hence needs to be retained. To provide a stronger oversight and linkage, it is recommended that additional membership from PolyU Council be invited to serve as members of the CPCE Council. This will help address the issue raised by the QAC audit panel in their Recommendation 3.
3. If CPCE is to become an integral part of PolyU and follow the University's generic QA framework and processes, the CPCE Academic Board should be renamed as CPCE College Board (to avoid confusion and be in line with other Faculty or School Boards). The CPCE College Board will be designated as one of Boards/Committees of Senate, and should take on the role and responsibilities similar to those of other Faculty/School Boards where all academic matters – including QA and programme planning and validation – within the College are dealt with. The composition and terms of reference of the College Board will be revised accordingly. There might no longer be a need to include members from other PolyU Departments on the Board.
4. It is recommended that all CPCE programmes leading to a PolyU SPEED award at the Ug degree level should go through an identical programme planning, validation and review processes as prescribed by the University and followed by all other Faculties (e.g. supported by College Advisory Committee, endorsed by College Board, approval by APC and Senate, etc.). Given the differences in the nature and level of those programmes, Senate can delegate the approval authority for sub-degree programmes leading to a PolyU HKCC award to APC (with the list of programmes approved presented to Senate for information), and that for programmes not leading to PolyU award to CPCE College Board.

5. To align with the normal structure and processes adopted by Faculties and Schools and to rationalize and simplify the current QA processes as recommended by the JQRC Review Panel, CPCE is recommended to abolish the CPCE Academic Planning and Quality Assurance Committee (APQAC), and let the CPCE College Board and the CPCE College LTC take over its current responsibilities. This will also help to address the issues raised by the QAC Audit Panel in their Recommendation 1.
6. One major change that needs to be enforced across all CPCE programmes is the mandatory requirement for including inputs/advice from external experts (defined as experts from outside PolyU) in the programme planning and validation process to benchmark the quality of the programme and curriculum. Currently, not every programme in CPCE adopts this practice - but this is a salient point explicitly recommended by the QAC Audit Panel (Recommendation 4) and JQRC Review Panel in their reports.
7. To bring CPCE closer to the PolyU proper as an integral part of the University, it is recommended that CPCE be subject to the same Generic QA framework on par with other Faculties under the oversight of QAC(AD). Under this framework, the College and its constituent departments will be required to follow, as far as practicable, the same QA mechanisms and processes, including:
  - Annual QA Report
  - Biennial Report on Departmental Performance
  - Annual Business Plan
  - Departmental Review for Academic Departments
  - Departmental Academic Advisor System

It should be noted, however, that the first three items listed above are currently under review by PEC.

8. Similar to other academic units, both SPEED and HKCC will have to undergo a 6-yearly Departmental Review. As HKCC is also subject to an external review by the JQRC on a regularly basis, it is suggested that DR for HKCC might be held after the JQRC review in order to avoid duplication of effort in preparing for the reviews.
9. In response to Recommendations 4, 7 and 8 of the QAC audit panel, it is recommended that an Academic Advisor system be set up in CPCE. However, given the wide spectrum of programmes offered by SPEED and HKCC, it is proposed that the Academic Advisors be appointed on a broad discipline rather than on a departmental basis, who will oversee the programmes and other related activities of both SPEED and HKCC within the broad discipline.
10. The proposed changes suggested above and by CPCE will require some modifications to the University's Generic QA Framework, the line of oversight and accountability, as well as the compositions and terms of reference of related University and CPCE committees (e.g. APC, QAC(AD), LTC, CPCE College Board, etc.). Relevant departments/units/committees will be asked to follow this up as appropriate according to the final decisions of the University regarding these.
11. The proposed changes, if endorsed by the Senior Management, will need formal approval by Senate. To allow sufficient time for preparation for the changes, the suggested date for implementation is 2012/13 academic year.





## SENATE

Paper for : Information

Subject : Revised Governance and QA Framework of the College of Professional and Continuing Education (CPCE)

1. At its 73rd meeting on 15 December 2011, Senate had approved a revised governance framework for CPCE, including the QA framework for CPCE programmes which lead to PolyU-HKCC and PolyU-SPEED awards. Senate noted that arising from this revised governance and QA framework for CPCE, the composition and terms of reference of some Senate committees and of the CPCE's College Board will need to be reviewed, and a comprehensive set of implementation arrangements will be made in due course (Ref. SEN/73/M30-M32). These arrangements (see Annex 1 attached) have been drawn up by Dean(PCE) and endorsed by the Academic Council for implementation with effect from the 2012/13 academic year.
2. Since some of the arrangements concern Senate committees, they are highlighted below for members' easy reference and the relevant section in Annex 1 listed in parenthesis:
  - (i) CPCE's Academic Board will be re-designated as College Board and a committee of Senate, similar to the Faculty/School Boards in terms of role and responsibilities (2.1).
  - (ii) CPCE will retain its *Academic Regulations Committee*, *Academic Appeals Committee*, and *Student Discipline Committee*. For practical reasons, these issues will continue to be dealt with at the College level, rather than through the relevant committee of the University (2.3).
  - (iii) CPCE will have representation on relevant Senate committees, viz. Dean(PCE) will be included in the ex-officio membership of both *Academic Planning Committee* (APC) and *Quality Assurance Committee (Academic Departments)* [QAC(AD)], similar to the Faculty/School Deans. The membership of the *Learning and Teaching Committee* (LTC) will also be revised to include the Chairman of the College's LTC and a nominated staff, similar to the arrangements for Faculties/Schools (3.2).
3. Based on (iii) above, the composition and terms of reference of *APC*, *LTC* and *QAC(AD)* have been revised and are attached in Annexes 2 to 4 for members' information.

Encls.  
June 2012

## Revisions to CPCE's Governance and QA Framework

### 1. Introduction

- 1.1 With due reference to Senate paper (SEN/73/A12) on “Revised Governance Framework for CPCE, including the QA Framework for CPCE programmes which lead to PolyU-HKCC and PolyU-SPEED awards”, CPCE has undertaken to review its QA framework, so that the CPCE systems and processes would be aligned, to the fullest extent possible, with the University's generic QA framework, mechanisms and processes for all Faculties and Departments. This will include the policy and guidelines governing the programme planning, validation and review processes.
- 1.2 As the existing CPCE systems and processes are very similar to those of PolyU, the required changes for closer alignment are generally limited in nature. These are outlined below.

### 2. Committee Structure of CPCE

#### *College Board*

- 2.1 The CPCE Academic Board will be renamed as CPCE College Board from 2012/13, and will be designated as one of the Boards/Committees of Senate, assuming the role and responsibilities similar to those of other Faculty/School Boards with all academic matters – including QA and programme planning and validation – dealt with by the College Board. The terms of reference and composition of the College Board, revised according to those for Faculty/School Boards, are presented in [Appendix 1](#).

#### *Committees of College Board*

- 2.2 In order to align the structure and processes adopted by Faculties and Schools and to rationalize and simplify the current QA processes, CPCE will discontinue its Academic Planning and Quality Assurance Committee (APQAC) by the end of the 2011/12 academic year.
- 2.3 CPCE has introduced two new committees under the College Board, namely the College Learning and Teaching Committee and CPCE General Education Committee. The terms of reference and composition of these two committees are presented in [Appendices 2 and 3](#). The existing CPCE Research Committee, CAM Committee, Academic Regulations Committee, Academic Appeals Committee, and Student Discipline Committee will continue operating.

#### *Advisory Committees*

- 2.4 Due to the multi-discipline nature of HKCC and SPEED and the emphasis on articulation opportunities between the two units, CPCE is of the view that it will be simpler and more focused for HKCC and SPEED to have a joint CPCE Advisory Committee, rather than individual Departmental Advisory Committees. Following the recent PolyU senior management decision on the introduction of Faculty/School Advisory Committees, CPCE will include academics on the CPCE Advisory Committee. The terms of reference and

composition of the CPCE Advisory Committee are presented in [Appendix 4](#).

### **3. CPCE Representation at Senate committees**

- 3.1 In line with the practice for PolyU faculties/schools, it is recommended that CPCE will have suitable representations in relevant PolyU Committees from 2012/13. These will include Academic Planning Committee (APC), Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC), and the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC(AD)). Details are presented in 3.2 below.
- 3.2 It is recommended that as from 2012/13, Dean(PCE) will join APC and QAC(AD), while the College Board will nominate staff to join the LTC. The Chair of the CPCE LTC will also be an ex-officio member of the PolyU LTC.

### **4. Programme Planning, Validation and Review Processes**

- 4.1 As from 2012/13, all CPCE programmes leading to PolyU-SPEED awards at the undergraduate degree level will go through identical programme planning, validation and review processes as prescribed by the University and followed by all other Faculties. While planning approval for sub-degree programmes leading to Poly-HKCC or PolyU-SPEED awards will be delegated by Senate to APC (with the list of programmes approved presented to Senate for information), implementation approval will continue to lie with Senate. Approval authority for programmes not leading to a PolyU award will be delegated by Senate to the CPCE College Board.

### **5. Generic QA Framework**

- 5.1 CPCE will follow the same generic QA framework as other Faculties/ Schools, with the main mechanisms and processes listed below.

#### *Academic Advisor System*

- 5.2 Given the wide spectrum of programmes offered by HKCC and SPEED, Academic Advisors are appointed on a broad discipline rather than on a departmental basis. These Academic Advisors will oversee the programmes and other related activities of both HKCC and SPEED within the broad discipline. Adapted from the PolyU Departmental Academic Advisor System, the CPCE Academic Advisor System is presented in [Appendix 5](#).

#### *Unit Review for HKCC and SPEED*

- 5.3 Both HKCC and SPEED will undergo a 6-year Unit Review cycle. This is similar to the Departmental Review of PolyU academic departments. However, as HKCC is also subject to regular external review by the JQRC, HKCC's review exercise will be held after the JQRC review in order to avoid duplication of effort.

- 5.4 According to the PolyU Guidelines for Departmental Review, three leading academics from reputable overseas universities [one of whom will be the current Departmental Academic Advisor (DAA) unless he/she is a local person from the industrial sector] will be invited by the department (with the endorsement of the Faculty Dean/School Board Chairman) to serve as the advisors to the departments.
- 5.5 In CPCE, Academic Advisors are appointed on a broad discipline rather than on a departmental basis, and they are expected to oversee the activities of both HKCC and SPEED within the broad discipline. With some 6 to 10 Academic Advisors being appointed, it is proposed that CPCE will not appoint any additional advisors. Similar to the PolyU system, the Academic Advisors are to present a comprehensive report to Dean(PCE) after each annual visit. These annual reports will be made available for the Panel at the Unit Review exercise.
- 5.6 During the Unit Review exercise, the Review Panel will be comprised of Dean(PCE) (as the Panel Chairman), at least 3 current CPCE Academic Advisors, as well as an internal academic member from another department/school. Dean(PCE) will decide whether the addition of a local industrial member (who can be a CPCE Advisory Committee member from industry) will be beneficial to the Review exercise.

***Annual QA Report, Biennial Report on Unit Performance, Annual Business Plan***

- 5.7 As from 2012/13, HKCC and SPEED will follow the PolyU system for the above processes.

June 2012



**The Hong Kong Polytechnic University**  
**College of Professional and Continuing Education**  
**College Board**

**Terms of Reference**

1. Generally, to co-ordinate and promote the work of the College.
2. To formulate (using the University's Strategic Plan as a basis) a College business plan which will guide the formulation of unit business plans.
3. To consider unit business plans.
4. To receive and consider initial programme proposals and then submit them, if approved, to the Academic Planning Committee.
5. To be responsible for the quality of academic programmes offered by the College and to implement institutional quality assurance policies and procedures as approved by Senate.
6. To receive and consider programme validation reports, and to submit College recommendations to Senate for implementation approval.
7. To consider and approve proposals for courses to be offered under the Credit Accumulation Mechanism (CAM).
8. To receive and consider annual Quality Assurance reports from units in the College.
9. To periodically review and advise on quality assurance matters within the College and, in particular, to submit the College's annual Quality Assurance report to the Quality Assurance Committee (Academic Departments).
10. To submit a College Report on the College's Unit Review exercises to the Quality Assurance Committee (Academic Departments).
11. To provide a forum to stimulate academic and development initiatives, particularly those involving innovation and inter-unit collaboration, as well as collaboration with other PolyU faculties.
12. To approve the entrance requirements for individual programmes offered by units of the College.
13. To be responsible for overseeing admission matters.

14. To be responsible, on behalf of Senate, for the examination and assessment of students in the College.
15. On behalf of Senate, to confirm examination and assessment results and academic awards for all programmes offered by the College\*.
16. To consider and approve proposals for programmes to be offered in collaboration with external institutions/universities which lead to their awards.
17. To receive and review, on a regular basis, the minutes of Unit Advisory Committees.
18. To receive and review reports submitted by Academic Advisors (AA) and responses to the AA reports.
19. To submit an annual report to Senate covering the College Board's activities during the previous 12 months from 1<sup>st</sup> July to 30<sup>th</sup> June.

---

\* Where necessary, the Board Chairman can identify an item of business as 'reserved business', and requires the student members to withdraw. Examination and assessment results will usually be regarded as 'reserved business'.

### **Composition**

Chairman: Dean, College of Professional and Continuing Education

Members: All Associate Deans

Heads of Unit in the College

Heads of Cluster in the College

One senior academic staff member from each Unit in the College, nominated by the Head of Unit

Two elected members of academic staff from each Unit in the College

Two students from HKCC and one student from SPEED, elected by and from among students in the respective Unit

Secretary: Head of Administration

**The Hong Kong Polytechnic University**  
**College of Professional and Continuing Education**  
**College Learning and Teaching Committee**

**Terms of Reference**

1. To be responsible to University LTC (ULTC) for all matters pertaining to learning and teaching development in the College.
2. To promote, and to monitor the implementation of, policies and procedures relating to learning and quality teaching formulated by ULTC, and to make recommendations accordingly to ULTC.
3. To promote and to facilitate new and innovative learning and teaching methodologies in the College.
4. To develop, promote and disseminate good teaching and learning practices in the College.
5. To monitor the progress and quality of learning and teaching development projects in the College, and to allocate resources where such are assigned by ULTC or this Committee.
6. To consider matters of general academic procedures relating to all taught programmes, and to make recommendations accordingly to ULTC.
7. To keep under review changes in academic policies and regulations for the admission, progression and assessment of students and for the granting of awards for all taught programmes, and to make recommendations accordingly to ULTC.
8. To keep the College Board informed on a regular basis about its decisions/ deliberations.

**Composition**

Chairperson: Dean(PCE) or his nominee

Ex-officio: Chairpersons of HKCC and SPEED LTCs

Other Members: Up to 2 full time academic staff appointed by the College Board

1 student, elected by and from among students of HKCC and appointed by the College Board

1 student, elected by and from among the students of SPEED and appointed by the College Board

1 EDC representative nominated by Director of EDC

Secretary Chair's nominee

**Mode of Operation**

1. The Chair of the CLTC is to be an ex-officio member of ULTC.
2. The term of service of the two full time academic staff members appointed by the College Board shall not exceed two years. They may not serve for more than two consecutive terms.
3. The term of service of the two student members appointed by the College Board shall be of one year. They may not serve for more than two consecutive terms.
4. The CLTC shall meet at least once each semester.

**The Hong Kong Polytechnic University**  
**College of Professional and Continuing Education**  
**General Education Committee**

**Terms of reference**

1. To be responsible to the College Board and work closely with clusters/discipline teams and units/programme teams for the development and implementation of General Education (GE) subjects to be offered in programmes leading to PolyU-HKCC and PolyU-SPEED awards with, as and where appropriate, due reference to:
  - a. the General University Requirements (GUR) of the PolyU 4-year undergraduate degree curriculum
  - b. the relevant requirements of other local universities and institutions,.
2. To endorse, monitor and review these GE subjects on offer, including their quality and implementation.
3. To seek recognition of these GE subjects from the PolyU Committee on General University Requirements (CoGUR) for meeting the PolyU GUR.
4. To take up relevant issues as may be referred to the Committee by the College Board.

**Composition**

Chairman: A senior academic staff to be appointed by Dean(PCE)

Members: *Normally one representative for each of the four clusters*

- Cluster of Business
- Cluster of Hotel and Tourism Management
- Cluster of Humanities, Communication and Social Sciences, and
- Cluster of Science and Technology

*Normally one representative for each of the following subject areas*

- Human Nature, Relations and Development
- Community, Organisation and Globalisation
- History, Cultures and World Views
- Science, Technology and Environment
- Language and Communication
- Service Learning
- Leadership and Intra-personal Development

Secretary: A staff from Dean's Office

Note: The term of service of the members shall not exceed two years, and they normally may not serve for more than two consecutive terms.

**The Hong Kong Polytechnic University**  
**College of Professional and Continuing Education**  
**CPCE Advisory Committee**

**Terms of Reference**

1. To provide a forum for academics, industry, commerce, Government, the professions and the community to advise the College of Professional and Continuing Education (CPCE) and to contribute to its strategic direction and development.
2. In relation to the needs of Hong Kong and the region, to advise CPCE on the scope and nature of its academic programmes, research and other activities.

**Composition**

- Chairman : A person external to the University, appointed by the President with delegated authority from Council, on the recommendation of Dean(PCE)
- Vice Chairman : A person external to the University, appointed by the President, on the recommendation of Dean(PCE)
- Members : Dean(PCE)
- 4 to 6 staff of CPCE, appointed by Dean(PCE)
- 6 to 12 persons external to the University, including academic members, with expertise and experience in one or more of the areas of work of CPCE and its units, appointed by Dean(PCE)
- Secretary : A member of staff appointed by Dean(PCE)

Terms of Office and Period of Appointment

The Chairman, Vice Chairman, if applicable, and all members are appointed on two-year terms, and may be re-appointed for not more than two terms, i.e. the maximum term of office shall not exceed six consecutive years.

Frequency of Meetings

Advisory Committees shall meet as frequently as necessary, preferably twice or more per year.

**The Hong Kong Polytechnic University**  
**College of Professional and Continuing Education**

**Academic Advisor System**

**1. Introduction**

- 1.1 At CPCE, External Examiners/Advisors may be appointed for individual programmes of study, as and when these are required by the respective Validation Panels or Professional Bodies. External Examiners/Advisors are normally appointed on a programme or scheme basis.
- 1.2 The JQRC (Joint Quality Review Committee) undertook a full institutional review of the sub-degree programmes of HKCC and SPEED in December 2008. The Panel's Report, received in late 2009, made a number of recommendations, including one in respect of 'Externality in Quality Assurance'. In response to the JQRC Report, CPCE management proposes the introduction of an Academic Advisor System.
- 1.3 Upon the appointment of Academic Advisors, Units should review the need for the continued appointment of External Examiners/Advisors for individual programmes. In this regard, particular attention should be given to the requirements of relevant professional bodies.

**2. The appointment of Academic Advisors**

- 2.1 Academic Advisors will be appointed at the CPCE level on the basis of academic disciplines. Their role is to give advice to HKCC, SPEED and the relevant academic cluster in respect of academic activities falling within the area of the Academic Advisors' expertise.
- 2.2 The Head of Cluster will, in consultation with the Directors of HKCC and SPEED, identify the academic disciplines within the Cluster for the appointment of Academic Advisors. Following consultation with the Directors of HKCC and SPEED, nominations for Academic Advisor should be submitted by the Cluster Head to Dean(PCE) for endorsement, and to Vice President (Academic Development) for approval. The nominations should contain information on the Academic Advisor's background and employment history, plus information on the Advisor's expected contributions to the academic activities of the relevant CPCE units.
- 2.3 Appointment of Academic Advisors will normally be made initially for a term of 3 years with the possibility of renewal for another term of 3 years. The maximum period of appointment should not normally exceed 6 years.
- 2.4 Academic Advisors can be appointed either locally or from overseas.



- 2.5 Academic Advisors should be invited to visit CPCE and its units once each year for a period of about one week, i.e. 3 visits for each term of appointment.
- 2.6 Prior to nomination, potential Academic Advisors should be approached informally by the Head of Cluster to see if s/he is willing to serve. In this process, it must be made clear to the potential nominee that the approach is in the nature of an enquiry and is not a formal commitment on the part of CPCE.
- 2.7 If it is considered appropriate for the Academic Advisor to visit CPCE and its units more than once each year, or once only for the 3-year term, this can be allowed subject to the endorsement of Dean(PCE) and the approval of the Vice President (Academic Development).
- 2.8 CPCE and/or the Academic Advisor may choose to shorten the period of appointment provided that due notice is given.

### **3. Criteria for the appointment of Academic Advisors**

- 3.1 Candidates proposed for appointment as Academic Advisor should be of a high academic and/or professional standing. They should possess expertise appropriate to the academic discipline in question, and should be in a position to provide advice on academic matters related to curriculum planning, subject development, inter-unit cooperation, articulation pathways, provision of equipment and facilities, research and consultancy, and other relevant issues.
- 3.2 Academic Advisors are expected to be currently active in their profession. Their period of office should normally not extend beyond their expected time of retirement from full-time employment by more than one year, unless they are still active in their profession.

### **4. Duties of Academic Advisors**

- 4.1 An Academic Advisor is expected to give advice, in the relevant academic discipline, to cluster/units in the following areas:
  - (i) *Staffing and resources*
    - staff qualifications and experience
    - staff recruitment and development policies
    - effectiveness of staff appraisal system
    - resources allocation and management
  - (ii) *Quality assurance system*
    - performance standards and measurement systems



- feedback mechanism from students, articulation partners, employers and External Examiners etc.
  - action on feedback
- (iii) *Academic programmes*
  - curriculum design, monitoring and review
  - articulation pathways within CPCE
  - Programme Learning Outcomes Assessment Plans (LOAP) and results, if appropriate
- (iv) *Teaching, learning and assessment*
  - alignment of teaching, learning and assessment with intended learning outcomes
  - learning environment, academic support services
  - evidence of students' attainment of intended learning outcomes
- (v) *Research, consultancy, other scholarly activities and services to the professional community*
  - performance
  - future development
  - relationship with industry/the professional community

These areas are listed merely as a guide. Not all areas need to be covered to the same extent, nor is the work of the Academic Advisor restricted to these areas alone.

- 4.2** An Academic Advisor should submit a report to Dean(PCE) within 6 weeks after his/her visit to CPCE and its units. The report should contain his/her findings and recommendations on the areas listed in Section 4.1 above, plus any other comments s/he may wish to make. The report, to be copied to the Heads of Cluster/Units, will be considered and discussed by the College Board. The Head of Cluster, in consultation with the Directors of HKCC and SPEED, will also submit to the College Board comments and any actions to be take in response to the report.

**5. Information to be made available to Academic Advisors**

The Head of Cluster, in conjunction with the Directors of HKCC and SPEED, should provide sufficient information to an Academic Advisor to facilitate his/her carrying out his/her duty. While the Cluster and Units have full discretion to decide on the type of documents to be provided to the Academic Advisor, the documents should normally be those which have already been prepared and used for the normal management and operation of the Cluster/Units, and should include information about CPCE's philosophy and position on quality assurance, teaching and learning, research and other relevant policy areas.

**6. Administrative arrangements**

All administrative arrangements including liaison with the Academic Advisor, arrangement of the visit, processing of payment arrangements, forwarding of the Academic Advisor's report to Dean(PCE), submission of the report together with the response to the College Board etc. will be coordinated by the Cluster, in collaboration with HKCC and SPEED.

**7. Honorarium for Academic Advisors**

**7.1** An annual honorarium will be paid to an Academic Advisor after the completion of his/her duties, including the submission of the annual report.

**7.2** In the case of overseas Academic Advisors, CPCE will cover the cost of his/her visit to Hong Kong. S/he will be given a lump sum to cover travel, hotel accommodation, subsistence allowance, plus airport tax.

**Terms of Reference**

1. To advise Senate on all matters relating to the academic planning and review of taught programmes leading to PolyU awards.
2. To review and revise, as required, policies relating to academic planning and review of taught programmes and, where necessary, to formulate new policies for the consideration of Senate.
3. To advise Senate on initial programme proposals\*, prior to their further development and validation by the Faculties, Schools and CPCE.
4. To approve, on behalf of the Senate, initial programme proposals for sub-degree programmes leading to PolyU-HKCC or PolyU-SPEED awards, for their further development and validation.
5. To undertake advance planning and preparation for submission of the triennial Academic Development Proposals (ADPs) to the UGC, in consultation with Faculties/Schools and Departments, and giving due regard to the University's Strategic Plan.
6. To submit an annual report to Senate covering the Committee's activities for the previous 12 months from 1<sup>st</sup> July to 30<sup>th</sup> June.

---

\* These include all taught programmes leading to PolyU and PolyU-SPEED (at undergraduate degree level) awards.

**Composition**

Chairman : Vice President (Academic Development)

Members : Deputy President and Provost

All Faculty Deans and School/College Board Chairmen

Four senior members of academic staff, appointed by the Chairman of Senate

Academic Secretary

Director of Finance

Secretary : A member of staff from the Academic Secretariat, appointed by the Academic Secretary

[Note: Changes are highlighted.]

**Learning and Teaching Committee****教學委員會****Terms of Reference**

1. To be responsible to Senate for matters pertaining to learning and teaching development, inclusive of the use of modern education technology.
2. To develop policies and procedures relating to the promotion of learning and quality teaching for approval by Senate.
3. To promote and facilitate new and innovative learning and teaching methodology, and to disseminate good practices in teaching and learning for sharing purpose.
4. To allocate grants which have been earmarked for the improvement of learning and teaching.
5. To submit an annual report to Senate covering the Committee's activities for the previous 12 months from 1<sup>st</sup> July to 30<sup>th</sup> June.

**Composition**

Chairman : A senior member of academic staff appointed by the Chairman of Senate

Members : One nominee of each Faculty/School/College Board

FB(AST)  
 FB(FB)  
 FB(CE)  
 FB(ENG)  
 FB(FH)  
 FB(HSS)  
 CPCE

Chairmen of Faculty/School/College Learning and Teaching Committee

FAST  
 FB  
 FCE  
 FENG  
 FH  
 FHSS  
 SD  
 SHTM  
 CPCE

Dean of Students

Director of Educational Development

Two undergraduate student members, nominated by the Students' Union and appointed by the Chairman of Senate

One postgraduate student member, nominated by the Postgraduate Association and appointed by the Chairman of Senate

Secretary : A member of staff from the Educational Development Centre, appointed by Director of Educational Development

June 2012

[**Note:** Changes are highlighted.]

**Quality Assurance Committee (Academic Departments)**

質素委員會(教學部門)

**Terms of Reference**

1. To monitor the implementation of the University's Quality Assurance framework, as approved by Senate, and its associated policies and processes.
2. To formulate and review the quality assurance policies and processes pertaining to academic departments under the purview of this Committee.
3. To receive and consider Departmental Review and Quality Assurance reports from Faculty/School/College Board on their academic units.
4. To conduct academic audits, as and when appropriate, on specific aspects of the academic functions of the University.
5. To promote the sharing of experience and good practices across academic departments and to provide a forum for the discussion of matters relating to quality assurance, performance measurement, and related issues.
6. To submit an annual report to Senate covering the Committee's activities for the previous 12 months from 1<sup>st</sup> July to 30<sup>th</sup> June.

**Composition**

Chairman : Vice President (Academic Development)

Members : Vice President (Research Development)

All Faculty Deans and School/College Board Chairmen

Chairman of Quality Assurance Committee (Non-academic Units)

Academic Secretary

Head of Internal Audit

Director of Educational Development

Two undergraduate students, nominated by the Students' Union and appointed by the Chairman of Senate

One postgraduate student, nominated by the Postgraduate Association and appointed by the Chairman of Senate

Secretary : A member of staff from the Academic Secretariat, appointed by the Academic Secretary

[Note: Changes are highlighted.]

## Quality Assurance Committee (Academic Departments)

Paper for : Discussion

Subject : Template for Faculty/School Report to QAC(AD) on DR exercise

1. At the last (22nd) meeting, QAC(AD) had made an interim review of the DR system. It was suggested that, to facilitate Faculties/Schools to draw up their reports on the DR exercises to QAC(AD), and for the Committee to consider them, there ought to be a common template for these reports. Accordingly, a proposed template has been drawn up in the *Annex*, and as explained below.

2. The Dean will need to give a critique of the Department's current Teaching & Learning, research and programme activities, as measured against its peers (both local and international).

*Rationale: Although the focus of DR is more on quality enhancements and strategic vision than on past performance, the University need to be assured that Departments are doing well enough to remain sustainable and competitive locally, and that they are making progress towards enhancing their profile at an international level (the Dean can gauge this through discussions with the DR Panel members if necessary).*

3. Based on Faculty/School Board's discussion of the DR Panel report and Departmental Response, the following items should be included:

(i) Account for the follow up to the Panel's key recommendations which have been accepted - **what** these are; **how** they will be followed up; and by **which party** (Dean or HoD). If an action plan has already been drawn up by the Department, the Dean will have the responsibility to monitor the progress of the action plan, and that it is being implemented on schedule.

(ii) Account for any recommendation which is **not** accepted by the Department, the FB's adjudication on the matter, and how it will be followed up.

(iii) Highlight any recommendation which cannot be addressed at Departmental or Faculty/School level, and need to be followed up by either Senior Management or a university level Committee. Depending on the nature of the recommendation (which can be of an academic or non-academic nature), QAC(AD) will consider the appropriate way forward.

4. There is no need to append the Panel Report nor the Departmental Response, to form part of the Faculty/School Report.

Encl.  
September 2012

**Template for Faculty/School/College Report  
to QAC(AD) on Departmental Review (DR) Panel exercise**

The Report should include the following key elements:

1. Panel's Key Recommendations which have been accepted by the Department

Recommendation	Action Plan	Action Party (Dean/HoD)
i.		
ii.		
iii.		
<i>(please add/delete rows as appropriate)</i>		

2. Panel's Recommendations which are not accepted by the Department

Recommendation	Faculty Board's Adjudication	Action Plan, if any
i.		
ii.		
iii.		
<i>(please add/delete rows as appropriate)</i>		

3. Panel's Recommendations which cannot be addressed at Departmental or Faculty/School/College Level (Need to be followed up by either Senior Management or a University level Committee)

i.
ii.
iii.
<i>(please add/delete rows as appropriate)</i>

4. Panel's observations on the following essential parameters of the Department, which have been measured against the benchmarked institutions (or programmes/disciplines):

i. Departmental planning
ii. Organization structure
iii. Academic programmes
iv. Quality of students
v. Student's learning experience and outcome
vi. Support to the students/infrastructure
<i>(please add/delete rows as appropriate)</i>

Please state the programme, Department or institution which have been selected as benchmarking partners: \_\_\_\_\_

Note: There is no need to append the Panel Report nor the Departmental Response, to form part of the Faculty/School/College Report.

November 2012



**The Hong Kong Polytechnic University**  
**College of Professional and Continuing Education (CPCE)**  
**College Council**

**Terms of Reference**

1. To govern CPCE and to develop its mission and strategic directions;
2. To establish and approve major policies for its management in accordance with the mission and strategic directions of CPCE;
3. To approve the business plans and annual budget of CPCE and its units;
4. To approve other operating and capital investment budget, tuition fees and other income, lease and purchase of property;
5. To approve staffing and compensation policy ;
6. To appoint, on the recommendation of the President of PolyU, Heads of the constituent school, college or other operating unit(s) of CPCE;
7. To have the right to delegate part of its authority to its committees or the Dean (PCE);  
and
8. To co-opt up to two members to serve on the College Council.

## **Composition and Membership List**

### **Chairperson**

*President of PolyU*  
Professor Timothy Tong

### **Vice-Chairperson**

*A Senior PolyU staff member, appointed by the President of PolyU*  
Vacant

### **Ex-officio members**

*Deputy President & Provost*  
Professor Philip Chan

*Executive Vice President*  
Mr. Nicholas Yang

*Dean, College of Professional and Continuing Education*  
Professor Peter Yuen

*Director of School of Professional Education and Executive Development*  
Dr. Jack Lo

*Director of Hong Kong Community College*  
Dr. Simon Leung

*Finance Officer of College of Professional and Continuing Education*  
Mr. Louis Heung, Director of Finance, is co-opted pending the appointment of this Finance Officer

### **Appointed members**

*Three Senate members of PolyU, appointed by the President of PolyU*

Professor Louis Cheng, Professor, School of Accounting and Finance

Professor Kaye Chon, Chair Professor & Dean of School of Hotel and Tourism Management

Professor Maurice Yap, Chair Professor of School of Optometry & Dean of Faculty of Health and Social Sciences

*Three external members, appointed by the President of PolyU*

Ir Dr. Ng Tat Lun, Deputy Chairman of PolyU Council & Chairman of CPCE Advisory Committee

Professor Kenneth Pang, PolyU Council Member

Mr. Samuel Yung, Senior District Director, American International Assurance Company

**Co-opted member**

Dr. Peter GP Walters, Associate Dean (QA)

**Secretary**

*A senior member from College of Professional and Continuing Education, appointed by the President of PolyU*

Dr. YL So, Deputy Director, Hong Kong Community College

**Assistant Secretary**

*A senior member from College of Professional and Continuing Education, appointed by the President of PolyU*

Ms. Cathy Ho, Head of Administration, College of Professional and Continuing Education

*(November 2012)*

## Guidelines on the Departmental Review System for Academic Departments

### Introduction

1. Starting from the 2008/09 academic year, the University will introduce a new quality assurance (QA) mechanism for academic departments, namely the Departmental Review (DR) system, to replace the Departmental Assessment (DA) system, under which all academic departments had completed two rounds of DA exercise since the system was implemented in 1996/97. The new DR system represents a natural evolvement of the institutional QA framework, from quality assessments and evaluating a department's past performance (i.e. judgmental) to quality enhancements, broad future directions, visioning and positioning for the department concerned (i.e. developmental). It is anticipated that the DR system can better integrate with other existing QA systems which support the work of a department, and bring about more synergy with our international benchmarking and branding efforts, whilst at the same time simplifying the QA procedures at departmental level.

### Purposes and focus of the Departmental Review system

2. The Departmental Review (DR) system aims to serve two main purposes:
  - (i) To be an instrument for quality enhancements in academic departments; and
  - (ii) To be a major input for future strategic planning and visioning of the academic departments, and for international benchmarking.
3. The focus of the Departmental Review exercise will be more on quality enhancements, and not solely on quality assessments or evaluating a department's past performance. It will also focus on international benchmarking to align with our strategic vision to become a world class university.

### Review cycle

4. Each cycle of a Departmental Review will be for six years. For the first five years, preparation for the review will be undertaken through visits of overseas academic members (to be appointed as advisors to the department) and their reports afterwards. The comprehensive Review will be undertaken in the 6<sup>th</sup> and final year of the review cycle, and a Review Panel, with both overseas and internal members, will be set up for this specific purpose (As HKCC is also subject to regular external review by the JQRC, HKCC's review exercise will normally be held after the JQRC review).

### Review mechanism

5. *Appointment of overseas academic members*
  - 5.1 Three leading academics from reputable overseas universities [one of whom will be the current Departmental Academic Advisor (DAA) unless he/she is a local person from the industrial sector] will be invited by the department (with the endorsement of the Faculty Dean/School Board Chairman) to serve as the advisors to the department.

- 5.2 In steady-state, these advisors will be appointed to a 6-year term of office, to tie in with the DR cycle, and they will form the core of the Review Panel mentioned in paragraph 4 above. If the DAA is not able to serve for the full 6-year DR cycle due to special circumstances, one of the other two overseas academic members will be appointed as the new DAA, and another overseas academic member will be appointed as a replacement advisor.
- 5.3 If there are more than one discipline in a department, separate Panels/overseas academic members will be formed/appointed to review each discipline, as deemed appropriate and determined by the Faculty Dean/School Board Chairman.

*[Note: For CPCE, academic advisors are appointed on a broad discipline rather than on a departmental basis, and they are expected to oversee the activities of both HKCC and SPEED within the broad discipline. The operational guidelines of the Academic Advisor System for CPCE are attached in Appendix G.]*

6. *Annual/biennial visits of the overseas academic members in the first five years of each review cycle*
- 6.1 The DAA will be invited to visit the department for a period of one week once every year, whilst the other two overseas academic members will only need to come for one to two days every two or three years (or two to three days if there is only one visit before the Review Panel exercise). Even though it cannot be expected that each of the three overseas academics will serve for the full 6-year cycle of a DR exercise, it must be ensured that every overseas academic member who will be part of the DR Panel will have visited the department (with a view to gathering information and giving advice) at least once before the actual Review Panel exercise.
- 6.2 After each annual visit, the DAA will present a comprehensive report to the Faculty Dean/School Board Chairman on the broad directions of the department, and recommend how the department can further enhance in terms of benchmarking against its international peers. The other two overseas academic members will submit a report after their visit(s), but the report can be more succinct than the DAA's. The academic department will then copy a full set of these reports to the DAA and overseas academic members, to facilitate the exchange of views between the three of them (see also paragraph 6.4). Since another QA mechanism, i.e. the Annual QA Report exercise, will be retained, the DR exercise/reports will also provide the forum for the Faculty Dean/School Board Chairman to comprehensively review a department's performance over the years.
- 6.3 The DAA's annual visit should, as far as practicable, be scheduled to tie in with a Departmental Advisory Committee (DAC) meeting, to enable the DAA to share with DAC members his observations pertinent to the academic activities and the future development of the department, and for the DAA to gauge the needs from the industrial perspective. *(This Section 6.3 is also applicable to CPCE.)*
- 6.4 It is anticipated that the three overseas academic members may visit the department at different times of a year and therefore may not be able to meet together every year. They will be expected to exchange views on the department through correspondence, and after perusal of the annual/biennial reports submitted by the other advisors concerned.

7. *A comprehensive Review exercise in the 6<sup>th</sup> year of each review cycle*
- 7.1 In the 6<sup>th</sup> year of each review cycle, a comprehensive Review exercise will be undertaken by a Review Panel comprised of the Faculty Dean<sup>4</sup> and School/College Board Chairman (as the Panel Chairman), the three overseas academic members (at least 3 current CPCE academic advisors for HKCC/SPEED), and an internal academic member from another department/School. The Faculty Dean<sup>4</sup> and School/College Board Chairman will decide whether the addition of a local industrial member (who can be a DAC member from industry, or a CPCE Advisory Committee member from industry for HKCC/SPEED) will be beneficial to the Review exercise.
- 7.2 The Review exercise to be undertaken by the Review Panel will be for a duration of one to two days. The Review Panel will take account of (1) a brief self-evaluation document prepared by the department, and (2) the annual/biennial reports submitted by the overseas academic members during the previous five years, and how the department has addressed the issues raised therein to enhance its quality, raise its profile, and strengthen its position etc. The Review Panel will also conduct interviews with departmental leaders, the department's staff and students, relevant industrial representatives and alumni, and will come up with an overall report on the Review exercise. The Review Panel will not be required to give the department a rating. However, the Review Panel will indicate how the department compares, on a variety of aspects, with the academic departments elsewhere and in the same discipline (and which the DR Panel is familiar with), which will serve as part of the benchmarking exercise for the department.

## 8. *Focus on International Benchmarking*

- 8.1 To achieve the purpose of international benchmarking, the system requires the appointment of overseas academic members who then serve as key members of the Review Panel. Further to this, cognate programme, Department or the institution as a whole can be identified and selected as benchmarking partners, to form part of the focus of the Review Panel's deliberations.
- 8.2 The general criteria for selecting benchmarking partners should include the international ranking of the cognate programme, the Department or the institution as a whole; the academic and/or research strength of the (external) Department concerned, and any other special justifications for making the choice. The programmes and institutions selected for benchmarking should generally be of high academic and professional standing.
- 8.3 If cognate programme(s) are to be selected for benchmarking purpose, it should involve not more than 3 such programmes of peer institutions. The Department can propose the specific programme(s) for approval by the Faculty Dean (same procedure as for the appointment of overseas academic member).
- 8.4 If an external Department or institution are to be selected for benchmarking purpose, the selection process will involve nomination by the Head of Department, endorsement by the Faculty Dean, and approval by the VP(AD), (same procedure as for the appointment of DAA).
- 8.5 The following are the essential parameters to be measured against the benchmarked institutions:



- (i) Departmental planning
- (ii) Organization structure
- (iii) Academic programmes
- (iv) Quality of students
- (v) Student's learning experience and outcome
- (vi) Support to the students/infrastructure

## 9. *Departmental Response*

- 9.1 The department will prepare a response to the DR report by the Review Panel, which will then be considered by the Faculty/School/College Board. In areas where the department does not see it appropriate to take the advice of the Review Panel, the Faculty/School/College Board will adjudicate on the course of action to be adopted.

### **Involvement of academic department**

#### ~~8.~~ 10. *Nomination of overseas academic members*

- ~~8.1~~ 10.1 Under the DR system, each academic department shall submit their nominations of three leading academics from reputable overseas universities (one of whom will be the current DAA unless he/she is a local person from the industrial sector) to serve as advisors to the department, to the respective Faculty Dean/School Board Chairman for endorsement.

- ~~8.2~~ 10.2 In the case of the appointment of the DAA, the nomination should be submitted to Vice President (Academic Development) [VP(AD)] for approval via the Faculty Dean/School Board Chairman. For details of the appointment of DAA and the nomination form, please refer to *Appendix F I*. Further details of the appointment of Academic Advisors for CPCE are given in *Appendix G*.

#### ~~9.~~ 11. *Documentation requirements*

- ~~9.1~~ 11.1 An academic department under review will not be required to prepare any documentation for the annual/biennial visits by the overseas academic members. For the 6<sup>th</sup> year Review Panel exercise, it will only be required to prepare a brief self-evaluation document, and to collate any documentations previously prepared as part of the quality enhancement (assurance) procedures.

#### ~~10.~~ 12. *Response to DR report*

- ~~10.1~~ 12.1 The academic department shall submit its response to the DR report made by the Review Panel, to the respective Faculty/School/College Board for consideration (Ref. paragraph 7.3). The Head of Department (or his delegate) will be excused, after presenting the DR report, from the deliberations part, when the Faculty/School/College Board reviews both the DR Report and the Departmental responses. This is to ensure the 'objectivity' of the decision making process.

### **Involvement of Faculty Dean/ and School/College Board Chairman**

- ~~11.~~ 13. The Faculty Dean/ and School/College Board Chairman will be the owner of the DR system in the Faculty/School/College concerned. He/She will, at the recommendation

of the Head of academic department, endorse the appointment of the overseas academic members.

- ~~12~~ 14. For the Review Panel exercise in the final year of each 6-year cycle, the Faculty Dean and School/College Board Chairman will:
- (i) chair the Review Panel;
  - (ii) nominate, for the approval of VP(AD)/Chairman of QAC(AD), an internal academic member from another department/School to serve as member of the Review Panel; and
  - (iii) invite, as deemed beneficial to the Review exercise, a local industrial member (who can be a DAC member from industry, or a CPCE Advisory Committee member from industry for HKCC/SPEED) to be a member of the Review Panel.
  - (iv) present the Faculty/School/College Report to QAC(AD) on DR Panel exercise(s) conducted in the year. A template for this Faculty/School/College Report is attached in the Annex.

#### **Remuneration for DAA and overseas academic member**

- ~~13~~ 15. The current remuneration package for external specialists will be applicable to the DAA and the overseas academic members, as follows:
- (i) *Departmental Academic Advisor* (DAA) [or Academic Advisor for CPCE] will receive an honorarium per annum, as at present.
  - (ii) *Overseas academic member* will receive an honorarium per annum, following the rate previously used for overseas panel member of a DA exercise.
- ~~14~~ 16. For other expenses arising from their visits to an academic department and for the DR Panel exercise, the DAA (or Academic Advisor for CPCE) and overseas academic member will be reimbursed at the same rate which is currently applicable to all categories of external specialists.

November 2012



## International Advisory Board

國際顧問委員會

### Terms of Reference

1. To contribute international perspectives to strategic priorities and development imperatives at PolyU.
2. To act as a sounding board to the President on major initiatives of PolyU.
3. To dedicate time to meet twice a year.
4. To serve for a term of three years.

### Composition

Chairman : Dr David C. Chang, Chancellor (Global Programmes) and President Emeritus of Polytechnic Institute of New York University, USA

Members: Dr Christopher Cheng, GBS, OBE, JP, Chairman of Wing Tai Properties Limited, Hong Kong

Professor Siwei Cheng, Former Vice Chairman of National People's Congress of China and Chairman of International Financial Forum (Beijing), P. R. China

Dr Jang-Moo Lee, President Emeritus of Seoul National University, Korea

Mrs Margaret Leung, SBS, JP, Chairman of the Board of Governors of Hang Seng Management College, Hong Kong

Dr Simon Leung, CEO of Harrow International Management Services, Hong Kong

Professor Robert A. Mundell, Nobel Laureate in Economics and University Professor of Columbia University, USA

Professor Gang Pei, President of Tongji University, P. R. China

Dr G. P. "Bud" Peterson, President of Georgia Institute of Technology, USA

Professor Guaning Su, President Emeritus of Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

Ms Vivienne Tam, Chief Designer and CEO of Vivienne Tam, New York, USA

Professor Nigel Thrift, Vice-Chancellor and President of University of Warwick, UK

Dirk Jan van den Berg, President of Delft University of Technology, The Netherlands

Emeritus Professor Mark S. Wainwright AM, Honorary Visiting Professor of The University of New South Wales, Australia

Professor Jianhua Wang, Chair of The University Council of Xi'an Jiaotong University, P. R. China

Dr Jianzhou Wang, Former Chairman of China Mobile Communications Corporation, P. R. China

Professor Mark S. Wrighton, Chancellor of Washington University, St Louis, USA

Professor Henry T. Yang, Chancellor of University of California, Santa Barbara, USA

Professor Wei Yang, President of Zhejiang University, P. R. China

Professor Qifeng Zhou, President of Peking University and Academician of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, P. R. China

Secretary: To be appointed by the President

Mrs Winnie Eley, Director of International Affairs

Notes

Current term of office: 2010 - 2013

16 November 2012

## Faculty Advisory Committee 學院顧問委員會

### **Terms of Reference**

The role of the Faculty Advisory Committee is to provide a forum for the non-local/local academics, the industries, the professions and the community to advise the Faculty and contribute to its planning and development. The Committee will:

1. Give advice to the Dean and the Faculty Board on the Faculty Plan and future developments.
2. Identify opportunities in research and education.
3. Advise the Dean on ways in which the community can contribute to the further development of the Faculty.
4. Receive summary reports on Departmental Advisory Committee meetings, and others, as appropriate, on the work of the Faculty, using suitable statistical data and benchmarks.

### **Membership**<sup>1</sup>

Chairman	: A lay member*, appointed by the President on the recommendation of the Dean
Convenor	: The Dean
Honorary <sup>2</sup> Members	: A lay member(s), appointed by the President on the recommendation of the Dean
Members	: Up to 6 lay members*, appointed by the Dean in consultation with the Heads of Department in the Faculty to represent non-local/local peer institutions, the industries, the professions and the community
Secretary	: The Faculty Secretary or his/her nominee

\* A person external to the University

#### Note 1

To provide a broad view and develop international benchmarking, the membership of FAC should include academic members from non-local/local peer institutions and members from the industries or the professions. There should be a balance between the two categories of members, say, half and half. Depending on the nature of the discipline, the proportion of academic members would be up to individual Faculties to decide, but there should be a strong academic representation.

#### Note 2

The position of Honorary Member may be included in the membership of FAC if deemed appropriate by the President. Only a very limited number of persons will be appointed as Honorary Members. They will not be required to assume any functional role in the Committee.

#### Terms of Office and Period of Appointment

The Chairman, Honorary Members, if applicable, and all members are appointed on three-year terms, and may be re-appointed for another term, i.e. the maximum term of office shall not exceed six consecutive years in total.

#### Frequency of Meetings

Faculty Advisory Committees shall meet as frequently as necessary, preferably once every two to three years.

11 January 2012

## School Advisory Committee 學院顧問委員會

### **Terms of Reference**

The role of the School Advisory Committee is to provide a forum for the non-local/local academics, the industries, the professions and the community to advise the School and contribute to its planning and development. The Committee will:

5. Give advice to the Dean and the School Board on the School Plan and future developments.
6. Identify opportunities in research and education.
7. Advise the Dean on ways in which the community can contribute to the further development of the School.
8. Receive summary reports on School Industry Advisory Committee meetings, and others, as appropriate, on the work of the School, using suitable statistical data and benchmarks.

### **Membership**<sup>1</sup>

Chairman	: A lay member*, appointed by the President on the recommendation of the Dean
Convenor	: The Dean
Honorary <sup>2</sup> Members	: A lay member(s), appointed by the President on the recommendation of the Dean
Members	: Up to 6 lay members*, appointed by the Dean to represent non-local/local peer institutions, the industries, the professions and the community
Secretary	: The School Board Secretary or his/her nominee

\* A person external to the University

#### Note 1

To provide a broad view and develop international benchmarking, the membership of SAC should include academic members from non-local/local peer institutions and members from the industries or the professions. There should be a balance between the two categories of members, say, half and half. Depending on the nature of the discipline, the proportion of academic members would be up to individual Schools to decide, but there should be a strong academic representation.

#### Note 2

The position of Honorary Member may be included in the membership of SAC if deemed appropriate by the President. Only a very limited number of persons will be appointed as Honorary Members. They will not be required to assume any functional role in the Committee.

#### Terms of Office and Period of Appointment

The Chairman, Honorary Members, if applicable, and all members are appointed on three-year terms, and may be re-appointed for another term, i.e. the maximum term of office shall not exceed six consecutive years in total.

#### Frequency of Meetings

School Advisory Committees shall meet as frequently as necessary, preferably once every two to three years.

11 January 2012

## PolyU Institutional Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan 2012-15

	Professional competence	Other desired graduate attributes of PolyU					Remarks
		Critical thinker	Effective communicator	Innovative problem solver	Lifelong learner	Ethical leader	
<b>Direct assessments</b>							
<b>1. Assessment via P-LOAP</b>							
• Via course embedded assessment in DSR	●	●		●	●		Implemented by respective programme teams, reported in PLOA Report to be included in the Dept Annual QA Report (with improvement plan/actions), to be submitted to Faculty Dean/School Board Chairs for monitoring and review
• Via assessment of Capstone Project	●	●	●	●	●		
• Via assessment of students' performance in WIE			●				
• Via assessment of DSR language subjects	●		●				
<b>2. Assessment of GUR outcomes</b>							
• Via course embedded assessment in CAR subjects [New]		●	● [For subjects with W Requirements]				Implemented/assessed by the subject teachers concerned, reported to CoGUR for monitoring and review
• Via course embedded assessment in LCR subjects [New]			●				
• Via course embedded assessment in L&IPD subjects [New]				●	●		
• Via course embedded assessment in S-L subjects [New]		●		●		●	
<b>3. Other direct assessment measures/activities</b>							
• IELTS results of graduating students			●				Required by UGC, collected by AS & reported to CoGUR for monitoring and review
• Collegiate Learning Assessment (developed by CAE, USA)		●	●	●			Conducted <u>biennially</u> for international benchmarking purposes on a stratified sample basis, coordinated by VPAD Office and reported to CoGUR for monitoring and review
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4+1</b>	<b>6+1</b>	<b>3+1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	
<b>Indirect assessments via institutional surveys*</b>							
1. Graduate employment survey							Conducted by SAO, on employment of graduates of all FT taught programmes (HD, Ug and TPg) irrespective of sources of funding [focusing on employment data only]
2. SAARD		●	●	●	●	●	Conducted by SAO, for promoting students' personal development as well as for estimating the 'value-added' change in students' attainment of the intended outcomes
3. <u>Revised</u> Alumni survey	●	●	●	●	●	●	Conducted by EDC, <u>in collaboration with departments</u> , on alumni's perception of attainment of institutional as well as programme learning outcomes (can be extended to track graduates' employment and career growth over time)
4. Employer survey by EMB/EDB **	●		●	●		●	Conducted (triennially) by EMB/EDB and reported to UGC and institutions concerned
5. Survey of Students' First year Experience at PolyU [New]							A <u>new survey</u> to be developed, focusing on students' First Year Experience at PolyU, including academic advising
6. Student exit survey [New]	●	●	●	●	●	●	A <u>new survey</u> of graduating students to be developed, for collecting data on three major aspects: SAARD, student engagement, and total learning experience at PolyU

\* To be coordinated by the VP(AD) Office, results to be collated and reported annually to QAC(AD) and LTC for review and improvement purposes

\*\* Departments and programmes are strongly advised to collect employer feedback on their programmes and graduates via survey or interviews for the purpose of Programme LOAP

[Revised 1 March 2012]

## An Integrated Plan for Fostering the Development of the Desired Graduate Attributes at PolyU 2012-15

	Professional competence	Other desired graduate attributes of PolyU					Department or units with primary responsibility	Remarks
		Critical thinker	Effective communicator	Innovative problem solver	Lifelong learner	Ethical leader		
<b>Planned curricular activities/experience for the 4-year curriculum</b>								
<b>Major/Programme</b>								
• <b>Totality</b> of the Major curriculum (all DSR subjects together)	●	●	●	●	●	○	F/S Board, Dept and Programme Team and Committee concerned	May vary from programme to programme
○ Capstone project <b>[new]</b>	●	●	●	●	●			
○ WIE	○	○	●	○	○			
○ DSR language subjects <b>[new]</b>	●		●		○		ELC/CLC	
<b>General University Requirements</b>								
• Freshman Seminar <b>[new]</b>	○	○	○	○	○		F/S Board	
• Language and Communication Requirement <b>[new]</b>			●		○		CoGUR and ELC/CLC	
• Leadership and Intrapersonal Development <b>[new]</b>		○	○	○	●	●	CoGUR	
• Service Learning <b>[new]</b>	○	●	○	●	○	●	CoGUR	
• Cluster Area Requirement <b>[new]</b>		●	●		●		CoGUR	To develop also "multidisciplinary perspective"
			[particularly for CAR with R&W Requirements]					
• Healthy Lifestyle Requirement <b>[new]</b>					●	○	CoGUR and SAO	To promote a healthy lifestyle
<b>Co-curricular activities/experience</b>								
								<b>Planned provisions /participation</b>
• Study trips and other co-curricular activities organized by Departments or programmes	●	○	○	○	○	○	Dept and Programme Team	
• Academic exchange, other non-local experiences including offshore WIE	○	●	●	●	●		Dept, IAO, CMAO and SAO	
• Language Enhancement Programme and activities			●				ELC/CLC	
• Read@PolyU <b>[new]</b>			●				LIB	
• Cultural activities organized by CPEO							CPEO	
• Student SPECIAL ePortfolio [SAO]			●		○		SAO	
• Mental Health Caring Project			○	●		●	SAO	
• Entrepreneurship Programme	○	○	●	●			SAO	
• Community service learning Programme	○	○	●	●		●	SAO	
• Hall Education Programme		○	○	○	●	○	SAO	
• Complementary Studies Programme	○	○	○	○	●	○	SAO	
• Learning Enhancement Programme	○		○		●		SAO	
• Peer Mentoring Programme (including Non-local Students' Mentorship Programme)			●	○		●	SAO	
• Personal Development Programme	○	○	●	○	●	○	SAO	
• Sports Team Development Programme				○	●	○	SAO	
• Physical Education Courses					●	○	SAO	
• Career and WIE training organized by SAO			●		○		SAO	

**Key:** ● : Target to make a significant contribution to the attribute ○ : Only some of the programmes/subjects/activities target to make a significant contribution to the attribute



## Departmental Academic Advisor System

### 1. Introduction

- 1.1 Before the introduction of the Credit-based System, an External Examiner was appointed for each programme leading to an award of the University. The External Examiner was expected to moderate examination questions and play an active part in the final assessment.
- 1.2 With the implementation of the Credit-based System, a Departmental Academic Advisors (DAA) system has been introduced. Under the new system, instead of appointing an External Examiner for each programme, each Department should appoint a Departmental Academic Advisor to monitor and maintain the standard of all academic functions of the Department. The Departmental Academic Advisor will advise on all aspects of the Department's work (see Section 4.1 below).
- 1.3 In exceptional cases, and where the appointment of an External Examiner is a condition to fulfill requirements of the professional body, the Department concerned should inform the relevant professional body of the introduction of the new system and make every effort to get them understand the role of Departmental Academic Advisors which replaces External Examiners. If the retention of External Examiner is still considered necessary, the request for the retention should be put forth to Vice President (Academic Development) for approval via the Faculty Dean/School Board Chairman concerned.

### 2. The appointment of Departmental Academic Advisors

- 2.1 Each Department shall normally have one Departmental Academic Advisor. Departments offering programmes in more than one specialised area may, with the agreement of the relevant Faculty Dean/School Board Chairman and approval of Vice President (Academic Development), appoint more than one Departmental Academic Advisor.
- 2.2 Nominations for Departmental Academic Advisor should be submitted by the Head of Department to the Faculty Dean/School Board Chairman for endorsement, and to Vice President (Academic Development) for approval. The nominations should contain information on the Departmental Academic Advisor's background and employment history, plus information on the Departmental Academic Advisor's expected contributions to the Department in respect of his expertise. Please refer to Annex I for a sample of the Nomination Form to be used.
- 2.3 Appointment of Departmental Academic Advisor will normally be made initially for a term of 3 years with the possibility of renewal for another term of 3 years. The maximum period of appointment should not exceed 6 years.
- 2.4 Departmental Academic Advisors can be appointed either locally or from overseas.
- 2.5 Departmental Academic Advisors should be invited to visit the Department once each year for a period of about one week, i.e. 3 visits for each term of appointment.

- 2.6 Before a nomination for the appointment is made to the Faculty Dean/School Board Chairman, the nominee should be approached informally by the Head of the Department to see if he is willing to accept. In this initial approach it must be made clear to the nominee that the approach is in the nature of an enquiry and is not a formal commitment, either on the part of the University or the nominee.
- 2.7 If a Department considers it appropriate for the Departmental Academic Advisor to visit the Department more than once each year, or once only for the 3-year term, this can be allowed subject to the endorsement of the relevant Faculty Dean/School Board Chairman and the approval of Vice President (Academic Development).
- 2.8 The University and/or the Departmental Academic Advisor may choose to shorten the period of appointment provided that due notice has been given.
- 2.9 Departmental Academic Advisors are responsible for the continuous monitoring of a Department, in accordance with its strategic directions and macro plans. For better integration with the Departmental Review (DR) system, a department will nominate, for the respective Faculty Dean/School Board Chairman's endorsement, its current Departmental Academic Advisor (unless he/she is a local person from the industrial sector) to serve as an overseas academic advisor to the department under the Departmental Review system. (For details of the DAA's role in the DR system, please refer to the "Guidelines on the Departmental Review System for Academic Departments".)

### 3. Criteria for the appointment of Departmental Academic Advisors

- 3.1 Candidates proposed for appointment as Departmental Academic Advisor should be of a high academic and/or professional standing. They should possess expertise appropriate to the Department/discipline in question, and should be the persons from whom the Department may seek advice on academic matters related to curriculum planning, subject development, inter-departmental cooperation, provision of equipment and facilities, research and consultancy, etc.
- 3.2 Departmental Academic Advisors are expected to be currently active in their profession. For candidates reaching the age of retirement, their period of office should be determined so as not to extend beyond their expected time of retirement from full-time employment by more than one year, unless they are still active in their profession.
- 3.3 The standard of cognate study programmes in the DAA's current university/institution is one of the factors for considering his suitability for appointment.
- 3.4 Departmental Academic Advisors are also expected to complement the international benchmarking efforts of the PolyU, at the Departmental and programme levels.

### 4. Duties of Departmental Academic Advisors

- 4.1 A Departmental Academic Advisor is expected to give advice to the Department on all aspects of the Department's work, including the following:
  - (i) *Departmental mission, strategic plan and organisation*

- departmental mission and objectives
  - departmental strategic plans, and its harmonization with the Institutional Strategic Plan
  - committee structure of the Department
- (ii) *Departmental staffing and resources*
  - staff qualifications and experience
  - staff recruitment and development policies
  - effectiveness of staff appraisal system
  - resources allocation and management
- (iii) *Departmental quality assurance system*
  - communication of departmental strategic plan
  - performance, measurement and expected level
  - feedback mechanism from students, employers and External Examiners etc.
  - action on feedback
- (iv) *Academic programmes (including self-financed programmes)*
  - curriculum design, monitoring and review
  - Programme Learning Outcomes Assessment Plans (LOAP) and results
  - service teaching provided by the Department
- (v) *Teaching, learning and assessment*
  - alignment of teaching, learning and assessment with intended learning outcomes
  - learning environment, academic support services
  - evidence of students' attainment of intended learning outcomes
- (vi) *Research, consultancy, other scholarly activities and services to the professional community*
  - strengths and weaknesses
  - plans
  - output
  - relationship with industry/the professional community

These areas are listed merely as a guide. Not all areas need to be covered to the same extent, nor is the work of the Departmental Academic Advisor in any sense restricted to these areas alone. In addition, Departmental Academic Advisors are also expected to complement the international benchmarking efforts of the PolyU, at the Departmental and programme levels.

- 4.2** A Departmental Academic Advisor should submit a report to the Head of Department within 6 weeks after his visit to the Department. The report should contain his findings and recommendations on the areas listed in Section 4.1 above, plus any other comments he may wish to make. A copy of the Report Form is in Annex II. The report, to be copied to the Faculty Dean/School Board Chairman and Vice President (Academic Development), will be considered and discussed by the Faculty/School Board. The

Department will also submit to the Faculty/School/College Board its comments and also on any actions it intends to take in response to the report. Departmental Academic Advisors would be expected to include, in this Annual Report, a critical analysis of the Department's various work portfolios.

**5. Information to be made available to Departmental Academic Advisors**

The Department should provide sufficient information to a Departmental Academic Advisor to facilitate his carrying out his duty. While the Department has full discretion to decide on the type of documents to be provided to the Departmental Academic Advisor, the documents should normally be those which have already been prepared and used for the normal management and operation of the Department, and should include information about the University's philosophy and position on teaching and learning.

**6. Administrative arrangements**

All administrative arrangements including liaison with the Departmental Academic Advisor, arrangement of the visit, processing of payment arrangements, forwarding of the Departmental Academic Advisor's report to the Faculty Dean/School Board Chairman and Vice President (Academic Development), submission of the report together with the Department's response to the Faculty/School Board etc. will be made by the Department.

**7. Honorarium for Departmental Academic Advisors**

**7.1** An annual honorarium will be paid to a Departmental Academic Advisor after the completion of his duties, including the submission of the annual report. Request for payment to Departmental Academic Advisors should be made on the Payment Form, a copy of which is provided as Annex III.

**7.2** For overseas Departmental Academic Advisor, the University will cover the cost of his visit to Hong Kong. He will be given a lump sum to cover travel, hotel accommodation, subsistence allowance, plus airport tax.

## **Learning and Teaching Committee**

### **Guidelines on Collecting and Using Student Feedback**

**October 2012**

#### **Overview**

PolyU is committed to providing quality education for its students. Student feedback is indispensable in this endeavour as it provides useful and important information for improving learning and teaching.

In addition to the Faculty-based Student Feedback Questionnaire (SFQ) system, the University also encourages departments to set up other channels for collecting student feedback. In particular, by the “Guidelines and Regulations for Programme Planning, Validation and Management” (Section C1 Part 5) [See Appendix], departments are required to provide formal channels, including a Student/Staff Consultative Group (SSCG), through which student views can be solicited.

To strengthen the existing practices in collecting and using student feedback, and to make them more consistently implemented across the University, departments are strongly recommended to follow and observe the following set of guidelines for collecting and using student feedback. This set of guidelines is applicable to SSCGs as well as other channels for collecting student feedback.

#### **Strategies for Collecting and Using Student Feedback**

1. Frequency and timing
  - (a) It is recommended that instead of a single end-of-semester feedback (e.g. SFQ), interim/multiple feedback should be collected during the semester to allow improvement be made to benefit the current cohort of students.
  - (b) Where possible, it is desirable to schedule the collection of student feedback on a programme prior to programme committee meetings to allow issues to be followed up by the programme committee.
2. Collecting feedback
  - (a) In general, using a combination of strategies to collect feedback is more effective than relying on a single one. In order not to overload students, alternate use of ‘fast’ and more in-depth feedback collection method can be considered. In addition to Student/Staff Consultative Groups, other appropriate methods such as interim feedback questionnaires and online feedback system may also be used based on individual needs. Departments can exercise their own discretion to determine whether or not they should use a combination of strategies to collect student feedback. Workload of staff and students has to be taken into consideration as well.



- (b) Before requesting feedback from students, departments should let them know the following:
    - why teachers are interested in their input
    - what teachers are interested in (identify specific areas of concern if necessary)
    - how teachers/department will use the information collected
    - that identity of individual students will be kept confidential although a summary of data may be disseminated
  - (c) Teachers should encourage students to identify both strengths and weaknesses, as well as problems and solutions.
  - (d) The collection of feedback should focus on topics relevant to the improvement of educational provision, such as quality of teaching, academic programmes/subjects, various university facilities (e.g., computing, library, recreational and sporting facilities).
3. Using feedback for improvement
- (a) Student feedback should be actively and timely considered for improving teaching, learning and the programme. Action plans in response to student feedback should be drawn up by appropriate staff (e.g., programme leaders) who have a major role in managing the quality of the programme.
  - (b) Programme leaders should ensure that actions planned in response to student feedback are communicated to all teaching/support staff involved for proper implementation.
  - (c) Feedback which concerns academic support units such as the Library, ITS, SAO, etc. should be forwarded to the respective units for follow up.
4. Informing students of outcomes
- (a) Students should be informed of the outcomes of feedback collection. The following framework can be used for relating the outcomes to students:
    - Which suggestions will be acted upon promptly and how
    - Which suggestions will be worked upon but will take a longer time and why
    - Which suggestions teachers would like to act on but are unable to and why
    - Which suggestions will not be acted upon and why
    - Which suggestions will be forwarded to other committees/units concerned for follow-up actions and why
  - (b) Departments can choose the channel of communication with students as appropriate, e.g., circulation of minutes to student representatives for their reporting to other students, LEARN@PolyU, notice board, newsletters, email, posts on students' portal and departmental intranet.
  - (c) Teachers collecting feedback on the subjects can consider more interactive approaches to informing students, e.g., verbal report to the class, discussing with students their feedback and improvement plans.

5. Documentation and reporting

- (a) Departments are advised to keep a record of the feedback collected from their students, regardless of the means by which the feedback is collected.
- (b) For SSCG, the minutes of meetings, content of feedback and action plans for improvement in response to the feedback should be included in the record. Minutes should be circulated to relevant committees and/or personnel such as Departmental Undergraduate Programme Committee, DLTC, subject leaders and/or Scheme Chairs and students.
- (c) Responses to student feedback should be reported in the Annual Report and Business Plan (ARBP).
- (d) Documentation about collecting, recording and using student feedback should be made readily available to demonstrate the department's commitment to quality improvement in quality audit/review exercises.

October 2012

**Appendix 9: Workshops on Assessment (from November 2010 to Dec 2012)**

2010.11.10	Re-visiting P-LOAP: Assessment design and implementation
2010.11.16	Employer survey for OBE
2010.11.17	Setting assessment questions using the standard-setting method
2010.11.24	Developing assessment rubrics
2010.12.02	Developing assessment criteria and standards with students
2010.12.06	Assessing learning outcomes and improving student learning
2010.12.08	Re-visiting P-LOAP: Assessment data-based improvement
2010.12.09	Using authentic cases for assessment
2010.12.23	Using questions and feedback to help students learn (BTTR, Module 3)
2011.01.13	Essentials of assessment (IUT, Module 5)
2011.01.20	Developing assessment items to assess higher-order outcomes
2011.01.26	Using questions and feedback to help students learn (BTTR, Module 3)
2011.02.28	Designing rubrics for assessing problem solving and critical thinking skills
2011.03.09	Revising P-LOAP: Assessment design revisited
2011.03.17	Assessing individual and group projects
2011.03.18	Diagnosis and tracking of students' English proficiency through eAssessment
2011.03.30	Classroom assessment techniques for large classes
2011.04.06	A new approach to assessing creative contributions
2011.04.14	Developing and assessing laboratory skills
2011.05.04	Developing criteria and standards for assessing essays and reports
2011.06.13	Assessing students in credit-bearing service learning subjects
2011.06.17	Using questions and feedback to help students learn (BTTR, Module 3)
2011.07.13	Using questions and feedback to help students learn (BTTR, Module 3)
2011.08.11	Essentials of assessment (IUT, Module 5)
2011.08.25	Essentials of assessment (IUT, Module 5)
2011.09.30	Criterion-referenced assessment - What is it and how to do it?
2011.10.13	Setting good assessment questions
2011.10.21	Giving feedback to improve student learning
2011.10.31	Assessing individual and group projects
2011.11.18	Developing criteria and standards for assessing essays and reports
2011.12.15	Essentials of assessment (IUT, Module 5)
2012.01.13	Setting criteria and standards for assessing students by project work



2012.01.19	Using questions and feedback to help students learn (BTTR, Module 3)
2012.02.20	Solving the problem of assessing a large number of students
2012.03.09	Using multiple choice items to assess critical thinking
2012.03.23	Developing criteria and standards for assessing students' creativity in projects and written work
2012.03.29	Classroom assessment techniques for large classes
2012.04.17	Marking and grading (BETA, Module 3)
2012.04.26	Essentials of assessment (IUT, Module 5)
2012.04.27	Setting criteria and standards for assessing students by dissertation
2012.05.18	Designing and grading students' assessment tasks
2012.06.14	Marking and grading (BETA, Module 3)
2012.06.27	Marking and grading (BETA, Module 3)
2012.08.16	Essentials of assessment (IUT, Module 5)
2012.09.05	Essentials of assessment (IUT, Module 5)
2012.09.12	Marking and grading (BETA, Module 3)
2012.09.14	Marking and grading (BETA, Module 3)
2012.09.28	Criterion-referenced assessment (CRA) - What it is and how to do it
2012.10.09	Setting good assessment questions
2012.10.26	Giving feedback to improve student learning
2012.11.16	Using the standard-setting method to design good assessment tasks
2012.11.21	Marking and grading (BETA, Module 3)
2012.11.22	Developing assessment rubrics to ensure fair assessment of students' work
2012.11.30	Making assessment criteria and standards transparent to students
2012.12.07	Using real-life cases for setting assessment questions

IUT: “Introduction to University Teaching” course

BTTR: “Basic Teaching Techniques for Research Staff and Research Students” course

BETA: “Becoming an Effective Teaching Assistant” course