進展報告

質素保證局

核證

質素保證局質素核證進度報告

目錄

附錄

前言

　　香港大學（港大）謹再次感謝質素保證局（質保局）為港大進行第二輪質素核證，令本港的高等教育界得以互相分享良好做法。整個核證過程為港大提供了嚴謹自評和持續自省的機會，從而更大大提升港大的教與學質素及學生的學習體驗。對於評審小組的讚揚和鼓勵，港大同仁深感鼓舞，並透過按時實施行動方案中所制訂的計劃，積極回應評審小組對港大的建議。港大迄今推行的相關計劃的進度概要列**附錄 A**，詳細闡述可見於本報告第二部份，以下第一部份則概述了港大為更完善校內教育質素所作的重要發展和計劃。

　　質保局的質素核證報告來得及時，正值大學四年制首屆本科課程學生畢業，也是港大制訂《2016-2025 發展願景》之時。港大矢志成為亞洲的國際大學，恪守「3+1 Is」的策略主題，即透過「國際化」（Internationalisation）、「創新」（Innovation）和「跨範疇」（Interdisciplinarity）的工作，從而發揮「影響力」（Impact）。為配合港大的策略發展，各學院均已訂立其教與學策略，令港大整體的教與學發展計劃更見周全、集中和一致。

第一部份　　教與學的發展

　　港大的本科課程旨在為學生提供整體學習經驗以達到港大的教育目標。港大非常關注改革後本科課程的成效，過去三年已按照計劃就所有共同學習體驗進行了專題檢討工作，即首年學習體驗與學習指導、核心課程、體驗學習、提升英語能力、環球學習體驗、總結性學習體驗以及完備課程架構等。以上所有的檢討結果皆確認了港大的本科課程能有效豐富學生的學習體驗並擴闊學生眼界，這與評審小組的核證結果相符。對於部份需作進一步改善的範疇，港大亦積極採取行動。面對全球高等教育界的熱熾競爭，主要持份者的期望不斷提高，港大並無安於現狀，更一直孜孜不倦勉力奮進，深明持續進步的重要性。

　　新舊制二批學生畢業前，港大趁機會與校內所有學院通力合作，詳細審視二零一二至二零一三學年起入學學生的學術表現，從而比較及觀察過去數年港大學生尤其是新舊制學生的表現。結果顯示港大三年制與四年制學生的學術表現相若，而四年制學生的整體表現隨著修讀的年級更有所提升。

　　除了上述的檢討工作外，港大亦制訂周詳的藍圖，擬在四年制首屆本科生畢業後三年內檢討所有本科課程。課程檢討是重要的質素保證和提升質素機制，有

助港大將課程與最高的國際標準進行基準參照。港大於二零一六至二零一七學年開始進行課程檢討，並取得良好進展。每項檢討工作中，除了與特定課程有關的事項外，港大規定課程小組必須回應「3+1 Is」策略主題以及質素核證評審小組的建議。另外，就修課式研究生課程進行的第一輪檢討已圓滿結束並證實非常有效，而第二輪檢討工作正在進行，且進展順利。

評審小組讚揚港大的核心課程對「整體本科生的才智、社交和道德發展有重大影響」。港大透過這個出色的共同學習體驗平台，進一步豐富學生的學習體驗，於二零一七至二零一八學年推出了數個重要項目，例如，開設了兩項核心跨學科副修課程及學科群組（即「可持續城市、文化及地球」和「宇宙與意義探索」），令學生在體驗核心課程時，主題更連貫一致，同時提倡各學科之間及跨學科學習，讓學生接觸相關領域的綜合性學術研究。建基於港大對可持續發展目標及聯合國的「他為她」（HeForShe） 行動的承諾，港大亦將開設另一項核心跨學科副修課程及學科群組－「性別、性向與多元」。港大的核心課程委員會亦設立了「核心課程[附加活動]」，旨在為學生提供多姿多采的聯課活動，以加深他們對核心課程四個探索範疇所涵蓋事項的體驗。「核心課程[附加活動]」提供平台以培育學生的文化敏感度並提倡不同背景的學生共融（見 R6.6（b）段）。為回應檢討核心課程報告中的一項建議，以及鼓勵學生在選修核心課程時進取嘗新，港大現已實施政策，當計算畢業成績平均積點時，會選用最高分數的五個核心科目（涵蓋全部四個探索範疇）或全部六個核心科目，以較高的畢業成績平均積點為準。此項政策獲得學生廣泛支持，並將於實施三年後進行檢討。

教學發展及語文培訓補助金向來是港大賴以推動教與學創新的重要及有效橋樑。港大根據「3+1 Is」策略主題，在早前呈交予大學教育資助委員會（教資會）的報告中已闡述了港大未來三年的教與學發展計劃（見**附錄 B**）。當中，港大將致力透過包括學術交流、訪問團、會議、專題研討會以及聯合和雙學位課程等方式，加強與全球頂尖大學在各方面的合作。本港方面，港大亦將積極籌辦和參與各類活動分享最佳的教與學方法。例如，港大於二零一七年三月舉辦了題為「影響教與學做法－達至漣漪效應」的會議，約有一百五十名來自本地高等院校的參加者出席，並分享了高等教育界不同的創新教學法。不少與會教師，包括「教資會傑出教學獎」得主，講解如何透過他們的研究充實教學，以及展示了教與學的學問。此項會議成果美滿，反應熱烈。此外，港大亦於二零一七年五月舉行了第三屆亞洲網上平台（網上學習）年度會議，吸引了來自九所亞洲區大學的高級管理層參加，並於會上討論了涉及網上內容的混合式學習的策略和經驗，以及教師在學習和應用新科技方面的支援等事宜。

港大非常感謝教資會於相關的教與學資助計劃中，慷慨支持港大的項目。在教資會資助的三十八個項目中，港大負責帶領其中十項（數目為本地大學之冠）、並參與另外的十四個項目，為港大提倡的多項計劃，包括教與學國際化、進一步加強學生的英語能力、豐富校園的藝文活動以及舍堂教育等提供極大幫助，同時建立了非常有效的架構，促進各大院校分享良好做法。

港大精心策劃的教員發展計劃，令港大得以在教與學上再攀高峰，並將繼續提升校內的質素保證機制及完善學生的學習體驗。部份港大推行的教與學項目概列如下：

(a) 自二零一七至二零一八學年，港大開始推行一項新的課外學習體驗學分獎勵計劃，以肯定學生在課堂以外的成就。任何課外體驗和活動的成效如符合港大的六項教育目標其中至少一項，便可申請上述學分。每項課外體驗可獲得一個學分，上限為六個學分。體驗所需時間大致根據「歐洲學分轉移及累積制度」計算，即每個學分等於學生學習二十至三十小時。所獲學分為學業學分，但將不會用作計算港大學位所需的學分。此計劃將試驗三年，然後進行檢討。

(b) 自二零一五至二零一六學年第二個學期起，核心課程事務處、何耀棣體驗學習中心與境外學習規劃及拓展處合辦每年兩次的「學生學習節」，以表揚學生的創意及成就。此項活動讓不同學科的學生展視其在融合跨學科知識、方法及媒介的創新成果，展視形式多元化，包括海報、錄像、播客及模型等，首屆「境外學習規劃及拓展體驗獎」在二零一七年四月舉行的「學生學習節」上頒發。

(c) 港大將發展一系列能強化溝通技巧的本科課程，培育學生具備在創新、經濟及社交方面所需的主要溝通能力，讓他們無論於學業和職場上皆能取得佳績。課程將針對溝通的四個領域，包括書寫、會話、視覺能力及數碼知識。港大希望透過校內十個學院的個別課程、應用英語中心提供的必修英語課程以及指定的核心課程，提升本科生的溝通技巧，成為「傑出的溝通專家」。

(d) 核心課程事務處根據其策略重點「小組工作的跨文化共融」，現正籌備一項名為「跨越差異：多元、共融及跨文化能力」的活動，以助學生提升興趣及能力，積極了解文化差異、種族特性、身體殘障及性取向等多元文化和差異。

(e) 學生發展及資源中心正推行一項計劃，透過建立學習社群提升學生的語言能

力，尤其著重在日常生活中運用英語以及增加機會進行跨文化交流的能力。另外，「培育環球領袖」計劃將於二零一八年一月一日起由應用英語中心籌辦，港大學生將聯同其他大部份來自本港中學的參加者，在柬埔寨、緬甸及泰國教授英語。此項活動旨在培育關心別人、有責任感、具備環球視野、了解多元文化以及解難能力、並致力貢獻香港和世界的未來棟樑。

(f) 教與學促進中心與英國的高等教育學院合辦了全新的「高等教育領導教與學專業證書」課程，旨在培育中層教員的領導才能。此項證書課程的設計參照英國專業發展標準架構，為教與學促進中心的持續專業發展課程尋求國際認可的策略之一，此項計劃已於二零一七至二零一八學年開始，並將維期三個學年。

(g) 為研究在港大成立教學學院的可行性，教與學促進中心將於二零一八年十二月舉辦國際會議，主題暫定為「教學學院：形式、功能與前景」。成立教學學院相信有助推動與教學發展相關的學術活動、表揚傑出教育家、樹立模楷以及推動課程創新。

(h) 科創習新將於二零一七年十二月舉行名為「翻轉課堂學習 – 分享教學法與實踐」專題研討會，以促進並推廣令學生投入學習的教學方法。得獎教師和業界人士將與逾一百五十名與會者，分享採用翻轉課堂教學方法的理念、策略、挑戰和對策。

(i) 科創習新開發的學習平台「港大在線學習」（https://learning.hku.hk）於二零一五年九月一日推出，此新增的平台旨在鼓勵教師採用混合式教學以加強學生的學習體驗，現時有七十個科目，超過一萬六千人採用此平台。

港大亦致力完善及提升學習環境。智華館現時設有新的「數碼知識技能實驗室」，為學生和教師提供製作多媒體資源的專業拍攝場地和剪輯工具。科創習新為加強「數碼知識技能實驗室」的服務，已著手設立提供多媒體諮詢服務的專區，配備為教師而設的自助服務和服務台，協助他們製作網上授課和翻轉課堂活動等媒體內容。此專區的興建工程預計將於二零一八年三月竣工。智華館同時設有全新二十四小時開放學習區，配備電腦、打印及掃描機、飲水裝置以及浴室，並全天候提供無線互聯網服務。位於莊月明文娛中心的月明劇院是一座現代化並設備齊全的鏡框式劇場，可作為戲劇、舞蹈、現場音樂、電影放映、會議及講座場地。劇場 303 是一個支持學生文藝發展的黑盒劇場，是不同藝術類型的實驗表演的理想演出場地。展望未來，圖書館二樓將設立新的學習中心，讓港大社群開展數碼

學習的旅程。此學習中心將以側重智識及深入的數碼方式，激發靈感、熱誠、創意及創建。此學習中心的規劃藍圖旨在創造涵蓋概念、虛擬化、視像化和製作的綜合流動過程，第三期翻新工程預計將於二零一九年初完成。

港大根據「3+1 Is」策略主題制訂其教與學的策略和發展計劃。為推動「國際化」，港大將為學生提供更多課堂以外及境外學習機會，並將改善校園的學習環境以加強「在校國際化」的發展。就「創新」方面，港大將制訂嶄新的教學法，利用科技促進及提升學生的學習、推動由學生倡議的項目，以及支持創新及創業活動，其中包括「追夢者」（一項匯聚港大校友、學生和其他港大友好以革新並改變世界的跨界別和跨世代活動）、「創業學院」（一個為期十個星期的研討會，通過加強學生能力以協助他們將發明及研究創業）以及「iDendron」（旨在吸引及發展創業社群、建立跨領域創業合作以及支持和培育港大的初創項目的創新和創業中心）。就「跨範疇」方面，港大將於各學院及核心課程進一步推廣跨學科研究，並開辦新的跨學科課程。港大深信本校的畢業生將成為各自領域的未來領袖，為二十一世紀的社會及世界帶來重要的影響。

有關改善研究院研究課程訓練的計劃，研究學院將繼續協助研究課程研究生為未來的學術及就業發展作好準備，邀請更多研究課程研究生（每所學院最少一名）為其他研究生主持知識或研究為本的研討會，並探討與各學院透過學科為本的方式合辦職業發展研討會或對談的可能性。就此方面，研究學院於二零一七年四月推出的研究課程學術庫，在港大學術庫設有研究課程研究生的個人專頁，旨在提高學生的知名度並促進新的研究合作。為改善現有收集及回應學生意見的制度，以及追蹤畢業生首項及其後的學術或工作發展，港大研究學院計劃於二零一八年為過去二十年所有研究院研究課程校友及二零一八年畢業的研究課程研究生，進行「校友發展延伸調查」。此外，由二零一八年九月起，港大將推行「成就卡」，以記錄學生在修讀期間達成研究院研究課程八個教育目標的進程。

第二部份　　行動方案執行進度

建議一 – [R1]
評審小組建議港大就訂立頒授資格的學術標準作明確表述及公布有關總體策略方針 (核證報告第 **2.12** 段)。

R1.1　　　港大作為中國唯一一所以英語教學及研究主導的綜合型大學，致力為優秀學生提供學科範圍廣泛的世界級課程。港大矢志栽培未來領袖及

精英，以應對日新月異的全球環境所帶來的挑戰。港大的《2016-2025 發展願景》以及「3+1 Is」策略主題，將引領港大在未來十年朝著亞洲的國際大學的抱負邁進。《2016-2025 發展願景》明確闡述了港大的課程以世界頂尖學府的標準作為基準參照，並具備國際競爭力。港大在訂立《2016-2025 發展願景》後，亦相應重闡了港大的抱負宣言，並將「3+1 Is」策略主題納入其中。

R1.2   為配合港大的策略發展，以及回應評審小組就有需要清楚闡述港大學術標準的建議，港大副校長（教學）已率領工作小組檢討港大的使命宣言，以及本科課程和修課式研究生課程的教育目標和院校學習成效。與此同時，由研究學院院長擔任主席的研究課程委員會已對研究院研究課程的教育目標進行檢討。上述檢討工作完成後，相關委員會、港大教務委員會及校務委員會已在二零一六至二零一七學年考慮並通過重闡的港大使命宣言，以及本科課程、修課式研究生課程及研究院研究課程的教育目標和院校學習成效。

R1.3   港大以致力追求的學術標準水平作為特定參考，重闡了港大的抱負宣言、使命宣言和教育目標（見**附錄 C**）。這批文件已向港大教職員和學生發布，港大教職員和學生以及公眾人士亦可在港大網頁參閱。

建議二 – [R2]
鑑於教務委員會是負責所有教務的主要組織，評審小組建議應檢討教務委員會及其轄下各小組委員會的職權範圍，以提升教務委員會行使監督的能力，確保教務委員會適當及定期地得悉港大在質素保證程序及提升措施的成效 (第 **3.7** 段)。

R2.1   就如何提升教務委員會行使監督的能力進行檢討後，教務委員會現要求轄下所有與教與學有關的委員會呈交年度報告以匯報每年的工作，此項新安排已在二零一七至二零一八學年起實施。

R2.2   港大在檢討教務委員會轄下和教與學有關委員會的過程中，探討了精簡現有委員會架構的可能性，以提高效能及效率。檢討工作旨在提升港大的質素保證機制，委派教與學質素委員會監管與正規課程及聯課有關的所有課程及活動的質素保證，以及提升質素事宜，藉此精簡架構，以期為教與學委員會建立兩大支柱，分別由負責課程發展的學務委員會，以及負責監管質素保證和提升質素事宜的教與學質素委員會

領導。有關此項架構重組的建議書正在諮詢階段,預計新架構將於二零一八至二零一九學年起生效。

建議三 – [R3]
評審小組建議,港大應協助學生了解學生信息管理系統中科目資料範本所載的等級說明,而教師及學業導師亦應向學生提供有關指導 (第 4.4 段)。

R3.1 評估制度是支援及指導學生學習的重要工具。清晰的等級標準有助學生了解預期的表現水平及範例作業的性質。港大規定所有科目的等級說明須刊載於學生信息管理系統讓學生參考。

R3.2 鑑於評審小組的意見,港大評估政策已加入下列條文,以強調闡釋評估準則的重要性:

「5.3 每科科目開課之初,教師應協助學生了解該科目用作評估學生表現的等級說明及準則,向他們闡釋該科目各等級的預期表現水平,包括與他們討論範例(唯此等範例不應視為可複製的標準答案)。」

R3.3 此外,透過教師及學業導師的指導,學生亦提高了他們對等級說明的了解:

(a) 港大副校長(教學)自二零一六至二零一七學年起,每年向所有教員發放提示,使他們注意以下事項的重要性,包括:i) 於每科科目開課之初,向學生闡釋該科目各等級的預期表現水平,以及 ii) 就評估事宜向學生提供適時回應。

(b) 除整體的教員發展活動外,教與學促進中心亦已推行多項措施加強教師制訂評分準則及等級說明的能力,並提醒教師向學生闡釋此等評分準則及等級說明的需要。有關措施包括加強為新入職教員而設的發展課程、特設的研討會與講座、以及豐富網上資源。有關港大自二零一六年起舉行針對等級說明和回饋的教員發展活動列表見**附錄 D**。

(c) 核心課程的等級說明在課程大綱中清楚列明。所有核心課程簡介會及為學生而設的常見問題網頁(https://commoncore.hku.hk/faqs/),

均有討論等級說明如何能促進了解及推廣反思文化。所有為導師而設的核心課程研討會,均會討論有關題目以加強對老師的支援,而有關不同種類的學生習作的等級說明樣本可見於核心課程教師支援網頁(https://tl.hku.hk/staff/support-for-cc-teachers/)。

R3.4   鑑於教與學促進中心及核心課程事務處積極協助學生加深對等級說明的了解,現時已見令人鼓舞的發展,包括:

(a) 由布德祿博士(「教資會傑出教學獎」得主)領導以及在核心課程事務處與科創習新通力合作下,港大現正研發一個方便學院與學生及同輩之間進行回饋的網上平台,以加深學生對核心課程評估標準的了解。待此網上平台成功推行後,港大將研究將其應用於不同學科科目的可能性。

(b) 港大已在二零一七年推出一項由學生主導的全新「教學回饋獎」,以表揚教師在回饋學生方面的卓越表現及鼓勵教師與學生就回饋進行討論。此外,教與學促進中心除在校內廣泛宣傳外,亦為學生舉辦了研討會闡釋教師具建設性和適時回饋的價值。

R3.5   雖然建議三本意針對修課式研究生課程,然而研究學院亦藉此機會深思此項建議並改善有關安排。由二零一七至二零一八學年起,研究學院各科目的教師於每科科目開課之初,會向學生闡釋研究學院各修課式科目的預期標準及評估準則,令學生得以了解教師對他們的要求。港大已向導師、科目教師及學生公佈研究院研究課程的修課式科目的評估標準,評估準則亦已刊載於科目手冊及科目 Moodle 網頁。

> **贊同一 – [A1]及建議四 – [R4]**
> 港大現正通過課程學習成效概覽計劃,進一步蒐集個別學生成就的直接證據。該校為此付出不少努力,評審小組予以贊同。...評審小組認為,擬議的六年推行期過於保守,因此建議港大加快推行課程學習成效概覽計劃,以確保全體師生能盡快受惠於在試驗階段所得的正面成果 (第 **4.7** 段)。

R4.1   港大致力建立有效機制,為用於課程學習成效的學生成績評核工作收集直接及間接證據。除課程學習成效概覽外,直接的證據包括校外主考報告和專業機構評審報告;間接的證據則包括院校調查、校外持份者意見和學生回饋等。

R4.2 質保局為港大進行質素核證時，港大的課程學習成效概覽正在試驗階段。鑑於評審小組的意見，港大副校長（教學）成立了工作小組檢討課程學習成效概覽，以期進行修改令概覽更有效及切合實際需要，並研究縮短暫定的六年推行期的可行性。

R4.3 工作小組完成檢討並參照國際最佳做法後，修改了課程學習成效概覽並建議較短推行期的草案範本。此草案範本已在二零一六至二零一七學年呈交教與學質素委員會考慮。

R4.4 教與學質素委員會就草案範本進行討論，並在校內完成廣泛諮詢後，同意由二零一七至二零一八學年起推行新制度。已通過的範本包括課程學習成效評估計劃及課程學習成效成績報告（見**附錄 E**）。新制度以三年的周期運作，每開設一項新課程後須隨即完成課程學習成效評估計劃，而課程學習成效成績報告則每三年呈交，以評核課程學習成效的成果及反思以求改進。完成的課程學習成效成績報告將是相關課程每六年一次的課程檢討中，自我評估文件中的一環。

R4.5 為方便推行新制度，教與學促進中心為各學院及核心課程事務處提供專業的發展支援服務，包括：(i) 舉行綜合會議讓課程總監熟悉新的課程學習成效評估計劃以及課程學習成效成績報告；及(ii) 為課程小組提供以學院為本的支援服務，解釋如何推行及撰寫課程學習成效評估計劃和課程學習成效成績報告。

建議五 – [R5]

鑑於港大對這些在更寬廣課程下的活動甚為重視，評審小組建議，為使正規學習機會與非正規學習機會盡量配合得當，充分發揮其價值，港大應盡快制定一個可涵蓋學術、聯課及課外活動的理念架構，以便有效掌握、記錄、監察、評估及提升學生在不同範疇的成就 (第 **4.8** 段)。

R5.1 港大正著手制訂一個網上個人檔案系統，以表揚學生在學術、聯課及課外學習活動方面的成就，為配合此計劃，學生資訊系統督導委員會已設立網上個人檔案專題小組，並邀請協理副校長（教學）率領此計劃。由協理副校長（教學）領導的專題小組，負責研究本港及海外大學的最佳做法、列出港大的需要，以及就港大的要求和資源條件評核市場方案。

R5.2 港大在制訂網上個人檔案系統的同時，亦著手設立這方面的教師實踐共同體以匯聚十所學院和其他部門的代表，包括教與學促進中心、何耀棣體驗學習中心、資訊科技服務及科創習新等，也召集學生成立學生實踐共同體以更進一步整合有關網上個人檔案系統的意見。此兩個實踐共同體皆由協理副校長（教學）擔任主席並就有關網上個人檔案系統的事宜提供意見，包括範圍及要求、可行平台、推行方針和先導計劃等。

R5.3 專題小組就網上個人檔案系統與實踐共同體進行磋商，並完成了以下事項：

(a) 盤點校內所有相關發展；

(b) 審核本港及國際大學採用的網上個人檔案系統的有關資料、方針和做法；

(c) 訂定港大在功能及技術方面的需要；

(d) 詳細審視三個可行的網上個人檔案系統方案（即兩個現有市場方案及一個自行開發的方案），以及每個方案在成本和時間方面的利弊；

(e) 分別在護理課程的實習科目以及內外全科醫學士課程轄下的人文醫學課程推行兩項先導計劃，計劃的結果有助了解在開發一個能設合不同需要的綜合系統時可能出現的問題；及

(f) 制訂計劃以分階段推行有關系統。

R5.4 學生資訊系統督導委員會在仔細考慮專題小組的結果及建議後，同意由校內自行開發一個切合實際需要並同時兼顧成本和時間因素的系統。開發過程進展良好，並已完成系統原型，而新系統預計將由二零一八年起分階段推行。

<div style="border:1px solid black; padding:10px;">

建議六 – [R6]

評審小組建議，港大應擴闊有關學習環境國際化的策略，以便處理課程內容及教學方法的事宜 (第7.42段)。

提議考慮範疇

有關顧及文化背景因素而選用適當學科素材的概念似乎知之甚少，亦未受廣泛採用。評審小組認為，要加強"在校國際化"，就須以較宏觀的角度處理課程國際化事宜 (第7.29段)。

在港大修讀修課式研究生課程的國際學生越來越多，評審小組鼓勵港大對此善加利用，以進一步推動"在校國際化"，以及提升學生在課堂及校園內的國際體驗 (第6.13段)。

評審小組認為，港大在協助非本地學生融入校內社羣方面，日見成功，但尚未能完善處理非本地學生融入課堂的事宜；港大應研究調整教學方法，以豐富所有學生的學習體驗 (第 7.40 段)。

</div>

在校國際化

R6.1　　國際化向是港大策略發展的重要焦點，也是《2016-2025 發展願景》中「3+1 Is」策略主題之一。港大一直招攬世界各地的頂尖學生和教職員，課程設計參照國際標準，於全球具競爭力。港大為本科生和研究課程研究生就海外和內地的學習機會訂立清晰目標，而港大亦有策略地挑選世界著名大學合作開設聯合和雙學位課程。

R6.2　　港大並無忽略「在校國際化」的重要性，致力為學生提供充滿活力的國際化學習環境，並進一步開拓學生和教職員的多樣性。港大在二零一六年五月就校內的國際化學習體驗進行專題檢討，檢討的各項建議更加強了學生的學習機會，亦改善了學生支援服務。例如，境外學習規劃及拓展處推出了一站式的資訊中心提供所有非交換性質的海外學習機會和服務。此外，「境外學習規劃及拓展體驗獎」展示了學生的作品和反思，首屆獎項已在二零一七年四月舉行的「學生學習節」中頒發。境外學習規劃及拓展處亦招募了學生大使推動參與和體驗。

R6.3　　根據評審小組的意見，港大已提高教職員對文化差異的包容度和敏感度、重整本科課程及修課式研究生課程及其教學方法，以及善用策略令本地和非本地學生更融洽相處，從而擴展「在校國際化」的概念。

R6.4　為應對跨文化敏感度與教學方法、顧及多元文化的學生需要，以及加強非本地學生融入課堂等事宜，教與學促進中心一直非常積極舉行與此等範疇有關的教員發展講座、研討會和實踐共同體活動。教與學促進中心亦與核心課程事務處及應用英語中心的同事合辦活動，透過跨文化的小組工作推動本地、內地和國際學生共融。此外，教與學促進中心亦舉辦了數次「參與交談」活動，活動詳情和部份網上資源見**附錄 F**。上述部門將繼續研究如何進一步將國際化的發展策略融入各學院的本科課程和修課式研究生課程科目中。

R6.5　就教與學的學術探究而言，港大同仁一向積極投入不同項目以進一步推動「在校國際化」的發展，包括由教資會資助名為「培養教師教員專業能力，提升院校教與學國際化」的大規模跨院校項目、兩項有關「加強本地與非本地學生在課堂上進行有意義的跨文化交流」及「跨文化學習體驗問卷調查：建立有關國際化及跨文化能力的校內評估工具」的教學發展補助金項目，以及由 Universitas 21 與港大共同資助的港大及加拿大英屬哥倫比亞大學 Diastemas 聯合技術轉移項目等。Diastemas 項目旨在建立一個國際化及有關同儕評審的平台，讓本科生參與討論課程內容，港大牙醫學院和教育學院現正採用新的 Diastemas 平台。教學發展補助金的指引表明「課程國際化」是優先資助的範疇之一。

R6.6　除了「全球議題」和「中國文化、國家與社會」這兩個探索範疇外，核心課程事務處亦率先推行了不同的措施和項目以豐富國際化的學習環境，包括：

(a)　為科目（「科學與科技」和「人文學科」兩個探索範疇轄下科目）加上國際化標誌以方便學生即時辨識，此兩個探索範疇亦將增添註釋以說明全球化／國際化的重要性，而港大亦已要求學科導師在科目簡介和在適合的評估項目中加入國際化議題。

(b)　「核心課程^{附加活動}」這項連繫四個探索範疇的聯課活動先導計劃已在二零一七至二零一八學年推出，為每屆的本科一年級學生舉辦聯課活動，以期每屆四千名學生當中不少會在港大修讀期間繼續參與該等活動。此項目在二零一七年九月開始，迄今的合作夥伴包括通識教育部、生物科學學院、非政府機構 Bloom 及港大美術博物館等。

(c) 考慮增設「全球學科群組」以增強具主題性的核心跨學科副修課程及學科群組。

(d) 正著手在港成立「核心學習夥伴」，為配合現代就業社群需要提供具備環球視野的校外顧問服務。

(e) 籌劃中的「環球博雅教育設計實驗」計劃將聯繫世界各提供相近核心課程的大學，促進合作機會及聯辦活動，並已邀請中國內地、新加坡、英國、瑞典和荷蘭等地大學參加，不同類型的「環球博雅教育設計實驗」活動亦即將舉辦。

R6.7 港大各學院已制訂個別策略促進課程國際化，鼓勵教師將國際視野融入課程和教學實踐中。例如，一項名為「牙醫業界的環球公民」的網上項目，將牙醫學士課程二年級學生與海外大學連繫起來，以促進跨文化溝通及建立專業人脈網絡。港大社會科學學院利用先進科技為學院的修課式研究生課程提供網上講座、研討會及工作坊，讓不同院校的學生能夠透過虛擬的方式參與互動及實時的學習和討論。而就讀學位教師教育文憑課程主修經濟學的學生與倫敦大學學院（University College London）的學生，在兩所大學的導師的指導下組成上課／研習小組，並透過網上平台參與同儕評審及專業對話。

R6.8 港大努力不懈持續發展及提升轄下課程，培育具備環球思維的思想家及領袖。就此方面，港大規定各學院必須制訂學院個別的教與學策略以配合「3+1 Is」策略主題，而策略主題的首個英文字母「I」就代表了「國際化」（Internationalisation）。此外，港大各學院亦必須在每個本科課程檢討的過程中，回應如何已經或將會把「3+1 Is」策略主題納入相關課程。

R6.9 透過港大同仁通力合作，校內涵蓋環球及跨文化視野的科目總數自二零一五年底的上一份核證報告以來增加了近百分之五十（現有合共約八百個本科課程及修課式研究生課程科目涵蓋上述視野）。

本地生與非本地生共融

R6.10 本地生與非本地生共融是本港所有大學長久面對的議題。評審小組確認港大鼓勵非本地生融入校內社群的努力日見成功，令人鼓舞。整體

來說，港大尤其是學生發展及資源中心一直孜孜不倦推行各種措施，促進課堂內外及舍堂共融，例證如下：

(a) 自二零一六至二零一七學年起，港大將八月初舉行的迎新與介紹活動增至兩天，讓學業諮詢成為港大與新生之間初步對話的一部份，並開拓更多以英語進行的跨越文化界限的迎新活動的可能性。

(b) 學生發展及資源中心舉辦的「非本地學生迎新活動」，是一項為期六星期包含逾一百項活動的大型活動，繼續為新入學的非本地學生提供全面的介紹和接待、加強接觸跨文化的機會以及促進本地與非本地學生共融。此項活動有助非本地學生適應新環境，並提供平台讓他們結交新朋友及連繫不同的社群。這些迎新活動在每年的八月和九月及一月和二月舉行，合辦單位包括國際事務處、中國事務處、通識教育部以及香港大學學生會、研究生會、國際學會及其他學生小組等。

(c) 聖約翰學院於年內推行重要改革，將收錄非本地學生的比率從百分之二十增加至百分之四十，而所有非本地宿生均必須出席迎新活動，迎新活動亦因此改為完全以英語進行。

(d) 學生發展及資源中心的旗艦活動「連繫友儕」將來自不同學院、國家和文化背景的本科一年級學生組成小組，鼓勵本地與非本地學生共融。學生發展及資源中心會招募近三十名本地與非本地學生擔任學生介紹導師，協助新生適應新的生活和學習環境，連繫香港及港大社群。

(e) 學生認為與不同文化背景的同學合作，對他們有所裨益，並歡迎學校將學生安排到相似的小組下工作。有鑑於此，港大鼓勵課程小組協助同學組成跨文化小組進行合作（例如每個小組包括最少一名香港學生、一名國內學生和一名國際學生），經濟及工商管理學院正是這項倡議的鼎力支持者。

(f) 學生發展及資源中心舉辦的兩項友儕導師活動，即「日常廣東話活動」（與漢語中心合辦）及「友儕英語活動」（與應用英語中心合辦），鼓勵本地及非本地生透過語言練習平台互相學習並進行文

化與學問交流，藉此促進學生共融。兩項活動皆為導師和受輔導者提供機會交換角色及責任，並加強認同作為港大家庭一員的身份。兩項活動均廣受學生讚譽。

(g) 港大特別為本地與非本地生設立一項為期六天的跨文化顧問活動，讓他們透過資料蒐集、實地考察及數據分析，共同研究處理真實的營商挑戰。參與的學生對此活動給予高度評價，認為此活動有效加強跨文化了解。

(h) 學生事務長與各舍堂舍監及宿生會衷誠合作推動本地與非本地宿生共融，各舍堂舉辦的所有高桌晚宴皆有供應清真食物及素食。

(i) 港大管理層在二零一七年五月成立了一個小組檢討大學宿舍舍堂教育及文化事宜，並由港大副校長（教學）擔任小組主席。檢討小組建議多項措施促進多元化、包容和共融，包括在各樓層均安排本地與非本地宿生入住的良好做法、分配房間時為一年級本地與非本地宿生進行配對，以及在所有舍堂刊物及主要活動中使用英語等。此檢討報告在二零一七年十月獲港大高級管理層全面支持，並將於諮詢期結束後在二零一八年三月呈交港大教務委員會。

(j) 港大與主要持份者合辦社交網絡環節和職業博覽會，讓本地與非本地學生在不同環境下定期練習拓展人脈的技巧。「家庭分享計劃」原為一項專為非本地本科生而設的非住宿接待家庭計劃，旨在協助非本地本科生適應香港的生活方式及促進學生與接待家庭之間的文化交流。此項計劃經修改後已演變成為一項名為「相聚晉餐」的新計劃，並設立了「本地美食友伴」這新角色，讓本地生家庭參與計劃成為非本地學生的美食友伴。此項計劃旨在透過本地接待家庭提供家常美食促進並加強文化交流。

(k) 港大為旨在鼓勵本地與非本地學生共融的服務學習項目提供資助和諮詢服務，例如百週年社會服務基金和香港大學一九八四年畢業生社會共融基金等。港大將「育成服務」重組成為一項新的支援架構，即「支援學生小組／項目」，並已在二零一七年實施。這項新架構為三個核心領域的學生小組及項目提供支援，即創業與社會創新、精神健康與特殊教育需要，以及服務項目與社區服務。

修課式研究生學習體驗國際化

R6.11　以上不少措施和活動同樣應用於本科生和修課式研究生。除了受惠於多元的教職員和學生背景外，學生也可從港大和各學院提供的課堂以外學習機會中得到裨益，進行學術交流、實習、實地考察、研究生實習及實習課等。為反映國際化的重要性，港大已檢討了修課式研究生課程的教育目標，以涵蓋修課式研究生課程在環球層面所需的知識及技能（見上文 R1.2 及**附錄 C**）。

R6.12　港大致力招募及挽留來自世界各地的傑出學者，這些優秀人才為港大課程注入國際視野，並為學生帶來課堂上及校園內的國際體驗。港大極力鼓勵學生參加在校園舉行的國際會議、論壇及研討會，例如，新聞及傳媒研究中心與國際傳媒機構建立夥伴關係，通過實習方式為學生創造校園內的體驗學習機會。港大社會學系現正為二零一七至二零一八學年制訂全球與比較犯罪學修課式研究生學科，此學科的先導階段包括二零一八年三月格拉斯哥大學教員到訪、及為兩所大學的修課式研究生而設的聯合講座，讓他們透過錄像技術簡報工作，以及展示有關比較方法的「研究方法實驗室」等。多所學院已作安排將不同背景的修課式研究生組成小組進行課堂活動及合作，藉此豐富他們的國際體驗。牙醫學院已為修課式研究生設立聚集處作為討論和社交場地，學院的非本地修課式研究生亦有機會與本地本科生交流。如上述 R6.9 所述，過去兩年港大針對國際視野的科目總數有顯著增幅。

R6.13　港大各學院已對修課式研究生加強宣傳學生發展及資源中心提供的學生支援服務，尤其是中心專為修課式研究生而設的多項服務，例如，中心為修課式研究生舉辦一連串研討會和活動，包括跨文化溝通／文化情報工作坊、跨文化顧問作業以及禮儀工作坊。中心亦特別為修課式研究生舉辦職業博覽會，讓他們與僱主和專業人士會面並建立關係。此外，中心與經濟及工商管理學院轄下工商管理學碩士就業處合作，在二零一六年十一月為研究生舉辦了研究生職業博覽會，以提升他們在正式的商業環境下建立人脈的技巧。中心亦與港大研究生會及校內其他國際學生組織合作，為非本地學生舉辦人際網絡拓展活動。中心亦吸引了更多修課式研究生擔任催化角色，如「家庭分享計劃」的東道主和「日常廣東話活動」及「友儕英語活動」的導師（見上文 R6.10 的(f)段和(j)段）。

R6.14　　　　下文S6.1至S6.5將闡述更多有關支援修課式研究生學習體驗的措施。

提議考慮範疇一 – [S1]

評審小組注意到，港大屬意委任其校外主考為課程檢討小組的校外成員。該等校外主考／校外成員所評論的課程提升工作，有可能正是本身所提倡的。有見及此，評審小組鼓勵港大考慮委任獨立性較高的校外成員 (第 **3.3** 段)。

S1.1　　　　港大認真考慮了評審小組的意見，在本科課程和修課式研究生課程檢討首個實施期完結後檢討其指引。新指引在二零一六年十一月起實施，表明檢討小組的校外委員不應為相關課程近期的校外主考（見**附錄G**）。

提議考慮範疇二 – [S2]

與評審小組會面的學生建議，校方可進一步改善核心課程，在科目設計上顧及沒有相關學術背景的學生(例如非理科學生修讀科學科目)；以及在醫科和牙醫科學生的時間表騰出時間，以鼓勵他們充分參與核心課程 (第 **5.9** 段)。

S2.1　　　　核心課程的理念旨在協助學生開拓視野，並發展才智、社交及創新才能以應對現今社會瞬息萬變的複雜環境。學生若要予以實行，必須走出他們的才智舒適區，並發展出連繫四個探索範疇之間以及核心課程與主修科目之間的方法。港大深信在充足的支援下，所有本科生必定能夠在所有核心課程中取得佳績。因此核心課程委員會密切關注課程建議書的設計，確保各學院的學生皆能理解有關資料。委員會亦委任了超過三十名來自不同學院不同年級的本科生擔任核心課程學生大使，讓他們提供改進核心課程體驗的意見、建議新意念以及代表核心課程與各持份者會面，包括訪問代表團、師生諮詢委員會、探索範疇籌劃成員以及最為重要的學生。

S2.2　　　　鑑於評審小組的回應，核心課程事務處已詳細分析有關數據，並確定最需要關注為「科學與科技」這個探索範疇。所有在這個探索範疇內的課程建議書均需經過工作小組以及核心課程委員會審查，確保非主修學生也能理解有關內容。此外，核心課程委員會透過課程檢討，知悉並監察不同學院學生的表現。來年春季學期，核心課程總監和探索範疇召集人將與學生進行焦點小組訪談，並與「科學與科技」的教員

進行討論，以了解他們的意見、監察情況並處理任何特定需要關注的事宜。新成立的核心課程研究小組亦將深入研究有關議題（見下列 S2.3）。

S2.3　核心課程事務處與教與學促進中心將針對不同的探索範疇，合辦一個工作坊，協助教師在訂立學習成效、制訂教學方法及進行評估時，與核心課程跨學科及跨學院的理念一致。核心課程研究小組在二零一七年九月舉行的首次會議上，討論了一系列的問題和數據，並就學生評價教與學問卷、學生學習體驗問卷以及其他數據來源進行深入分析。核心課程事務處正聯同各探索範疇召集人策劃有關跨學科及跨學院核心課程的研討會。

S2.4　李嘉誠醫學院已重組轄下內外全科醫學士課程，並在二零一六至二零一七學年起實施，讓三年級學生能夠計劃他們個人的「豐盛學年」，這「豐盛學年」的安排令他們得以在三年級完結前完成核心課程。此外，牙醫學院已檢討上課時間表，確保一年級和二年級牙醫學士學生在星期三下午和星期六均能修讀核心課程科目，並已為學生預留每星期一至兩節時間參加核心課程導修課。核心課程事務處將繼續與香港大學暑期學院合作，在暑假開辦一套核心課程，協助包括醫學院和牙醫學院等學生完成核心課程。迄今收到的學生回應證實了這些安排具有成效。

提議考慮範疇三 – **[S3]**
截至目前為止，未有任何機制可助學生或港大得知個別研究課程研究生是否已達到相關的教育目標，儘管大學設有自由參加的研討會，協助學生了解有關指標。評審小組鼓勵港大處理有關問題 **(第 6.3 段)。**

S3.1　正如上文 R1.2 所述，港大已為研究院研究課程的八個教育目標分別訂立了院校學習成效。鑑於評審小組的意見，港大研究學院已設立「成就卡」以監察學生達到研究院研究課程教育目標的進度（見附錄 **H**）。現行的「成就卡」已考慮了研究課程委員會的意見，以及港大教育學院和醫學院在二零一七年試驗實施「成就卡」後的回饋。港大研究學院正與資訊科技服務合作開發網上「成就卡」並將在二零一八年推行。

提議考慮範疇四 – [S4]

一如修課課程，研究院研究課程的學術標準，並非確切言明，而是含蓄不顯(參見上文第 2.2 段)。港大通過教職員的經驗及專長、所錄取學生的質素、校外主考的報告，以及與世界頂級研究學府的聯繫，使其所制定和維持的高學術標準得以保證。正如修課課程，評審小組認為，明確闡述預期的學術標準，不論對外或對內都有好處，因此鼓勵港大予以實行 (第 6.4 段)。

S4.1 　　　正如上文 R1.1 至 R1.3 所提及，港大的學術標準已在修訂過的抱負與使命宣言以及研究院研究課程的教育目標中清楚闡述。

提議考慮範疇五 – [S5]

與評審小組會面的修課課程研究生並不知道港大設有師生諮詢委員會。評審小組鼓勵港大推廣這種採集意見的方式，並回應修課課程研究生所提的意見 (第 6.16 段)。

S5.1 　　　港大各學院已從不同途徑，包括迎新活動、網頁、學生手冊及其他刊物，通知修課式研究生設有的回饋渠道（如師生諮詢委員會、學生評價教與學問卷和修課式研究生學習體驗問卷等）。為進一步促進與學生的溝通，港大各學院亦已採用如微信和面書等社交媒體，學院院長亦定期舉行公開論壇與學生會面，其他活動包括與學院管理層舉行非正式會議、實習課分享環節、茶聚及送別派對等。

S5.2 　　　港大各學院深知回饋在質素保證／提升質素機制中的重要性，故極力鼓勵學生提供正式與非正式的回饋，藉此持續改善課程和學生支援服務。為向學生展示回饋在改善課程環的運作，港大已提升了網上學生評價教與學問卷系統，系統現可展示教師對學生評價教與學問卷評分的回應，以及在聽取學生回饋後不同科目所作的改進。

提議考慮範疇六 – [S6]

評審小組鼓勵港大找出更多方法，採用及適當調整現時在本科生課程全面推行的增益措施，豐富修課式研究生課程的學習體驗 (第6.17段)。

評審小組發現較少證據顯示港大有系統地採取措施以特設的聯課／課外活動提升修課式研究生課程的體驗(見上文第 6.17 段)。評審小組在此重申有關港大或許可找出更多方法，採用及適當調整現時在本科生課程全面推行的增益措施，提升修課式研究生課程的學習體驗的建議 (第 7.9 段)。

S6.1　R6.11 至 R6.14 分別陳述了為促進修課式研究生的學習體驗國際化而推行的措施。為更準確了解他們的需要和面對的挑戰，港大已將兩條特定的開放式問題納入修課式研究生學習體驗問卷中，並考慮根據他們的建議以作改善。港大已就二零一六至二零一七學年修課式研究生學習體驗問卷的學生書面意見，輔以文字探勘的技巧作出全面的質性分析。分析結果已向各學院發布並交教與學質素委員會審議。

S6.2　分析報告顯示修課式研究生面對的最大挑戰是時間管理。就這點而言，教與學質素委員會已鼓勵港大教師考慮在適當時採用更多網上資源、線上溝通渠道以及網上學習方式以輔助教與學。對於全日制學生希望在準備事業上獲取更多意見，學生發展及資源中心已為修課式研究生舉辦了職業博覽會，並推廣各種有用資源供他們參考（見 R6.13）。香港科技園實習計劃和香港大學職業博覽分別在二零一六年四月及二零一七年四月舉行，修課式研究生、研究課程研究生及本科生均踴躍出席。修課式研究生課程的兼職教師多為知名的業界人士，教與學質素委員會為提高此類兼職教師的教學質素，已邀請教與學促進中心與各學院的相關部門合作，舉辦歡迎聚會，讓全職與兼職教師一同分享教學方法、實踐和經驗。

S6.3　學生發展及資源中心已就研究生數據進行了網上調查，以了解學生的需要和期望，以發展及規劃學生資源。港大為持續改善學生支援服務，將對二零一六至二零一七學年的調查結果進行分析。

S6.4　港大與校內各學院將進一步研究這些報告的結果，以制訂回應學生所需的行動方案。部份措施現已推行，如舉辦修課式研究生課程總監與行政人員的集思廣益會議，研究不同方法進一步加強學生學習體驗的方法與學生支援服務、學院為本的迎新活動與非本地學生的支援、職業講座、職業博覽、環球公民計劃、專業準備活動、實習計劃，以及為工程學院修課式研究生課程的總結性學習項目進入了成都舉行的「挑戰杯」決賽所提供的支援等。

S6.5　港大將會設立一個包括本科課程和修課式研究生課程總監的實踐共同體，藉此分享評估和提供回饋的經驗。港大深知提升修課式研究生學習體驗的重要性，並將繼續努力採用和擴展不同的措施和活動以豐富學生的學習經驗。

S7.1　港大以研究為基礎的教與學環境提倡探問為本的學習。不少科目皆以研究主導並集中於數據分析、研究項目、研究報告和論文所需的研究技巧和方法。港大建築學院、牙醫學院、教育學院、李嘉誠醫學院和社會科學學院均採用問題為本的學習方針以設計及提供專業課程，而這種學習方針本身亦以探問為本。港大各學院一直竭力加強現有科目內容，並開辦新科目以注入探問為本的元素，作為持續完善課程工作的一部份。

S7.2　總結性學習體驗為港大所有本科課程的畢業要求，此體驗乃以探問為本。在二零一七年五月，港大為總結性學習科目進行了專題檢討，而檢討小組亦作出數項建議，以在本科加強教學與研究的關係，包括為每項課程設立雙軌總結性學習科目和體驗，其一以研究為本，另以實踐為本；再者，提倡在修讀早期已把理論與應用融合。

S7.3　「本科生研究獎助計劃」是港大一項享負盛名的計劃，旨在提升學生學習體驗，並孕育新一代的研究人才和學者。此項計劃為學術成績優異的本科生提供機會，在具有豐富研究往績與培訓研究課程研究生經驗的學者引領和指導下從事研究。港大一直致力拓展此項計劃以讓更多學生受惠，並已邀請各學院鼓勵學生參加。過去三年此項計劃所頒發的學生實習獎項數目較二零一四至二零一五學年的數字有所增長。新的夥伴大學包括普林斯頓大學和新加坡國立大學。為向本科生和整體港大社群進一步推廣研究學習體驗，港大自二零一五至二零一六學年每年均舉行為期一星期的「本科生研究獎助計劃海報發表會」，讓研究實習獎項得獎者發表研究結果和分享經驗。

S7.4　為配合學院培育本科生進行科研的策略，港大理學院推行「海外研究計劃」和「暑期研究計劃」以支持學生遠赴海外大學或在港大的實驗室從事研究。港大理學院亦一直舉辦「本科生科研學術研討會」，讓學生發表他們的畢業習作，同時提供機會讓學生磨練發表技巧並分享他們的研究結果，會上並頒發獎項予出色的發表習作。

S7.5　港大將與列斯大學（University of Leeds）和倫敦大學學院（University College London）合作在二零一八年首次推出「Laidlaw 本科生研究及領袖計劃」，提升學生研究技巧和領導才能，以協助他們追尋現修學科以外的學術和專業志向。此項具有名望的獎學金計劃支持優秀的二年級及三年級學生接受由 Common Purpose 提供的領袖訓練，以及在三間大學的專業研究人員指導下於暑假和寒假期間進行八至十星期的研究實習。

S7.6　港大各學院一直持續開辦更多有關尖端研究的科目，例子如下：

(a) 理學院自二零一五至二零一六學年起開辦「SCNC3111 Frontiers of Science Honours Seminar Course」，由不同學系的教授主講並與學生討論他們的最新研究，涉及的題目範圍廣泛，涵蓋生物科學、化學、地球科學、物理學，以及數學和統計及精算學。此課程開拓並豐富了學生對主修科目內外的科學知識、孕育教授與學生以小組形式進行的智識討論，並讓學生觀察如何進行研究及留意通往科學發明的思考過程和途徑。

(b) 建築學院愈來愈注重將研究方法與結果融入教學之中，以及採用學術期刊作為參考資料。學院亦致力通過新科技及像地理信息系統、建築信息模型、電腦輔助設計、保育科學，以及房地產和建築業採用的最新經驗數據分析工具等促進研究和教學。

(c) 經濟及工商管理學院在計劃二零一九至二零二二年三年間的新科目時，將繼續把金融科技、創新和創業納入發展重點。

(d) 李嘉誠醫學院將在二零一八至二零一九學年為轄下的內外全科醫學士課程學生，提供一個試驗性質的基本研究技巧與方法學科，以在他們開始三年級「豐盛學年」的研究實習前豐富他們的研究知識。此外，有關研究道德的主題已被納入二零一七至二零一八學年的內外全科醫學士一年級、二年級及三年級課程，藉此建立學生在設計臨床試驗建議書和同意書方面的知識和實際經驗。除了學院為本的研究實習計劃外，港大亦在二零一六至二零一七學年檢討生物醫學學士課程的教學內容後，為有關課程設立了校內研究實習計劃。

S7.7　　房地產及建設系透過向同儕、業界和公眾展示學生的研究結果推動本科生研究。二零一六年六月，學系首次舉辦了本科生論文展覽活動，透過海報及短片展示測量學理學士課程和建築文物保護文學士課程學生的精選作品。

S7.8　　教與學促進中心與科創習新合作，開辦了題為「大學教學」的高等教育教與學大型公開網上課程（MOOC）入門，分享經過研究證實有效的教學和指導設計策略、有效的教學例子，以及教學獎項得主和著名研究人員的獨家專訪。

S7.9　　教與學促進中心將繼續舉辦教員發展計劃以及一系列講座、研討會和實踐共同體活動，講解教學與研究之間的關係，並協助教員訂立平衡教學與研究活動的實用策略。教與學促進中心亦支持各學院透過定期活動，讓更多同事將研究融入教學之中。

簡稱

港大	香港大學
質保局	質素保證局
「3+1 Is」	代表「國際化」、「創新」和「跨範疇」匯聚發揮「影響力」
教資會	大學教育資助委員會

THE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG

Quality Assurance Council Audit – Summary of Implementation Progress of the Action Plan

I.   Recommendations

	Audit findings	Action	Responsible party	Expected deliverables	Timeline	Implementation Progress
		as per the University's Action Plan and further details submitted to QAC in July 2016 and February 2017 respectively				
	The Setting and Maintaining Academic Standards					
R1	The Audit Panel recommends that HKU articulate explicitly and promulgate its overarching strategic approach to setting the academic standards of its awards (para. 2.12 of the Audit Report).	The University will review its Vision, Mission and Educational Aims (for undergraduate, taught postgraduate and research postgraduate curricula) with a view to articulating and promulgating its strategic approach to setting the academic standards of its awards.	Senate and its committees	Refined Vision, Mission and Educational Aims as applicable after the review, and promulgation of the revised documents	By 2016-17	Completed • The review was completed in 2016-17. The refined Vision, Mission and Educational Aims for Ug, TPg and RPg curricula state explicitly that the academic standards of the University's awards are benchmarked against the highest international standards.
	The Quality of Learning Opportunities					
R2	Given that Senate is the principal authority responsible for all academic matters, the	The University will review the terms of reference of the Senate and its committees so as to	Senate and its committees	(a) Formulation of a system to enhance the Senate's	(a) By 2016-17	(a): completed • All Senate T&L committees are required to report to Senate with effect from the 2017-18 academic

	Audit Panel recommends that Senate's capacity for exercising oversight be enhanced by reviewing the terms of reference for Senate and its sub-committees to ensure that Senate is appropriately and regularly briefed on the outcomes of the University's quality assurance processes and enhancement initiatives (para. 3.7).	ensure that the Senate is appropriately and regularly briefed on the outcomes of the University's quality assurance processes and enhancement initiatives.		capacity for exercising oversight (b) Full implementation of the new system	 (b) By 2017-18	year by way of submission of an annual report. (b): ongoing
	Student Achievement					
R3	The Audit Panel recommends that the University facilitate students' understanding of grade descriptors contained in the Course Information Template of the Student Information System and through advice from teachers	The University will promote students' understanding of grade descriptors and highlight the importance of the requirement for teachers to explain to students at the beginning of each course grade descriptors by way of: (a) making an emphasis	(a) Senate and its	(a) Revised	(a) By	(a): completed

and academic advisors (para. 4.4).	to this effect in the University Assessment Policy;	committees	University Assessment Policy	2016-17	• The requirement to explain to students assessment criteria and grade descriptors at the beginning of each course is highlighted in the University Assessment Policy (paragraph 5.3 thereof).
	(b) sending an annual reminder to teachers and academic advisors to draw their attention to the importance of: i) explaining to students the level of performance expected inclusive of engaging in dialogues around exemplars; and ii) the provision of timely feedback to students on assessment;	(b) Faculties (with support from the Centre for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning (CETL) as necessary)	(b) Annual reminders to teaching staff as a standing practice	(b) From 2016-17	(b): ongoing • As an established practice, Vice-President and Pro-Vice-Chancellor (T&L) (VP/T&L) has sent an e-mail reminder to teachers since 2016-17.
	(c) reiterating the importance of the aspects outlined in (b) above in staff development workshops, seminars and Community of Practice (CoP) events	(c) CETL	(c) Highlights in CETL staff development workshops, seminars and CoP events; and updated website on grade	(c) From 2016-17	(c): ongoing • CETL has organised staff development workshops and seminars that reiterate the importance of clear and explicit grade descriptors. • CETL's website has been enriched. • Associated with the launch of the

	organised by CETL; and further enhancing CETL's website on grade descriptors; and		descriptors		student-led Teaching Feedback Award in 2017, CETL held a workshop to explain to students the importance of constructive and timely feedback from teachers. (*vide* <u>Appendix D</u>)
	(d) explaining to students in Common Core briefing sessions how grade descriptors work so as to establish a culture to facilitate deeper understanding and reflections; and working on grade descriptors in Tutors' Workshops so as to enable tutors to remind students in tutorials.	(d) Common Core (CC) Office	(d) Explanation of grade descriptors for incorporation into CC student briefing sessions; and tutors' reminders to students	(d) From 2016-17	(d): ongoing • Grade descriptors have been explained in all CC briefing sessions for students, and tutors' orientation workshops. • Grade descriptors are clearly indicated in the syllabi of all CC courses. • Explanations about grading standards have been added to CC FAQs and CC Teacher Support site. • A digital platform for faculty-student and peer-to-peer feedback is being developed.
R4	The Audit Panel considers that the proposed six-year roll out period is unnecessarily conservative, and therefore recommends that the University expedite	The University has set up a working group to review the PLO Achievement Portfolio, with a view to: • modifying it to become more effective and fit-for-purpose; and	VP/T&L assisted by CETL	(a) Setting up of a working group • Review of the PLO Achievement Portfolio • Enhancement of professional support	(a) 2015-16	(a) & (b): completed; (c): ongoing • A working group (WG), chaired by VP/T&L, was set up to review the PLO Achievement Portfolio. • A draft template, which was modified from the PLO Achievement Portfolio and with reference to international best practice, was considered and

	the implementation of the PLO Achievement Portfolio Project to ensure that all staff and students benefit as soon as possible from the positive outcomes identified through the pilot scheme (para. 4.7).	• implementing it with a shorter cycle (tentatively three-yearly).		(b) Formulation of University policy (c) Implementation of the new system • Formulation of a template • Development of guidelines • Professional support from CETL	(b) By 2016-17 (c) From 2017-18	recommended by WG. • A revised template, comprising a PLO Assessment Plan (PLOAP) and a PLO Achievement Report (PLOAR) and the associated guidelines, was endorsed by TLQC for implementation from 2017-18. The new system runs on a 3-year cycle. • CETL offers development workshops and Faculty-based briefings for programme coordinators and other interested colleagues.
R5	Given the significance accorded to these aspects of the broader curriculum, the Audit Panel recommends that, to maximise the alignment and value of formal and informal learning opportunities, the University expedite the development of a conceptual framework capable of encompassing	The University has set up a focus group led by the Associate Vice-President (Teaching & Learning) (AVP/T&L) to evaluate various solutions in the market according to the directions and requirements specified by the Community of Practice (CoP) on E-portfolio. The focus group will report to the SIS Steering Committee chaired by VP/T&L.	AVP/T&L in consultation with stakeholders	(a) Setting up of a focus group • Evaluation of market options • Study of a University-wide e-portfolio solution • Report to the SIS Steering Committee on its findings and recommendations (b) Evaluation of market options	(a) 2015-16 (b) By 2016-17	(a), (b) & (c): completed; (d): on track • A Focus Group on e-Portfolio was set up under the SIS Steering Committee with AVP/T&L as Chairman. • The Focus Group, in consultation with the CoPs on e-portfolio, studied the practices of local and overseas universities, mapped the University's requirements, and evaluated market solutions with pros and cons, and the respective resource requirements and timelines. • Among the three finalists on e-portfolio solutions and on the

academic, co- and extra-curricular learning activities, so that student achievement across the spectrum can be meaningfully captured, documented, monitored, evaluated and enhanced (para. 4.8).			in consultation with stakeholders		Focus Group's recommendation, the SIS Steering Committee decided to adopt the in-house solution, which is considered to be most fit-for-purpose.
			(c) Piloting a model of e-portfolio in two academic departments	(c) By 2016-17	(c) The pilots on the practicum courses in the nursing curriculum, and the medical humanities programme under MBBS were completed.
			(d) Development and implementation of the new system in phases • Two pilot projects for experimentation in 2016-17 • An implementation plan with cost and resource requirement • Development of an e-portfolio system for implementation in phases from 2017-18	(d) From 2017-18	(d) The system is being developed in-house. Good progress is being made, and a prototype has been developed. A new system is expected to be implemented in phases from 2018.

Audit Theme: Global Engagements: Strategies and Current Developments					
R6	The Audit Panel recommends that the University broaden its strategy for the internationalisation of the student learning environment to address both curriculum content and pedagogical practice (para. 7.42). Suggested areas for consideration: The concept of culturally contextualising disciplinary material outside internationally focused courses seems to be little understood and not widely implemented. The Audit Panel considers that "internationalisation at home" would be strengthened by a broader view of	(a) Staff development programmes, seminars, workshops and CoP events will be offered to address inter-cultural sensitivity and pedagogical practice with a view to promoting "internationalisation at home", catering for a culturally diverse student body, and enhancing integration of non-local students in the classroom. (b) CETL will actively engage the relevant stakeholders through Faculty-based and CC-based workshops, and: • in consultation with Faculties, explore how internationalisation can be further	(a) CETL (and in collaboration with other offices as necessary) (b) CETL in collaboration with Faculties, CC Office and General Education Unit (GEU)	(a) Staff development programmes, seminars, workshops and CoP events addressing internationalisation will be offered at University and Faculty levels. (b) Increase in the number of disciplinary, CC and General Education courses embedding international perspectives into the curricula and pedagogical	(a) From 2016-17 (b) From 2016-17	(a) & (b): ongoing • Staff development seminars, workshops and Join-the-Conversation events have been offered to address inter-cultural sensitivity and pedagogical practice with a view to promoting internationalisation at home, catering for a culturally diverse student body, and enhancing integration of non-local students in the classroom. • Online briefings and other resources are available to engage staff discourse on internationalisation of T&L. • Internationalisation at home is the theme of the CETL newsletter, *Teaching and Learning Connections,* Issue 3 in 2016. • A vox pop video of students talking about their perspectives on internationalisation has been produced, which is under evaluation. • A UGC-funded project and two TDG projects are well under way to study issues relating to the internationalisation of T&L at the University and beyond.

			practice		• The new Diastemas platform is being used by the Faculties of Dentistry and Education to support internationalisation at home. (*vide* Appendix F)
internationalising the curriculum (para. 7.29). The Audit Panel encourages the University to leverage the greater proportion of international students studying at TPg level further to enhance "internationalisation at home", the in-class and on-campus international experience (para. 6.13). The Audit Panel considers that HKU is increasingly successful in effecting the social integration of non-local students, but that it has not yet adequately addressed integration in the classroom, in the sense of adapting teaching methods to enrich the learning	embedded into disciplinary courses in Ug and TPg curricula, for example, through incorporating international themes in curriculum design and development in line with the University's T&L Strategy; and • in consultation with the CC Office and GEU, study the feasibility of enhancing the global dimension of CC courses (apart from the two Areas of Inquiry (AoIs) of Global Issues, and China: Culture, State and Society) and General Education courses.				• As a pilot for CC courses, the CC Office has badged courses with an internationalisation icon so that students can immediately recognise them. The introduction of a new Transdisciplinary Cluster/Minor, viz. Global Cluster, is being considered. • The CC Office has initiated a number of programmes and activities to enhance the student learning experience outside the classroom to nurture the cultural sensitivity of students and promote the integration of local and non-local students. • The number of courses with global and intercultural perspectives embedded into the curricula and pedagogical practice has increased by 50% since the time of the Audit.

experience for all students (para. 7.40).	(c) Integration of local and non-local students will be further strengthened through residential education, student activities and initiatives, and other student support. For instance, a new initiative, viz. weekly Cantonese and Putonghua sessions, will be piloted in the 2016-17 academic year to build closer bonds between local and non-local students.	(c) Centre of Development and Resources for Students (CEDARS) in collaboration with GEU, student bodies, and residential colleges/ halls	(c) New and expanded activities to enhance the integration of local and non-local students	(c) From 2016-17	(c): ongoing • CETL has run events involving the CC Office and the Centre for Applied English Studies to promote integration among local, mainland and international students through intercultural group work. • New activities are introduced, including social networking sessions, intercultural communication/cultural intelligence workshops etc. • Expanded activities include Weeks of Welcome, Peer Connect, informal "dining nights", Survival Cantonese, Peer English Tutoring, incubation service, family sharing programme etc.
	(d) TPg student learning experience will be enhanced by offering more opportunities for in-class and on-campus international experiences.	(d) Faculties in collaboration with CEDARS and GEU	(d) Increased participation of TPg students in on-campus international and cultural experiences	(d) From 2016-17	(d): ongoing • Many Faculties offer overseas exchange, internships and field study opportunities for Ug as well as TPg students. • Arrangements have been made to group TPg students from diverse backgrounds together for in-class activities and collaborative work. • Faculties have enhanced the publicity to TPg students of CEDARS's services, some of which

					are tailor-made for TPg students, such as intercultural communication/cultural intelligence workshops. • To encourage TPg students' participation, the Family Sharing Programme was revamped and has evolved to include "Eat To-Gather" where TPg students can take part as a food-mate to non-local students. This facilitates and enhances cultural exchange in the homely meals offered by local host families. • TPg students are recruited to be student tutors in the Survival Cantonese and Peer English Tutoring programmes. • Career support is strengthened, e.g. career fairs for TPg students such as Hong Kong Science and Technology Park Career Expo, Professional Preparation Programme etc.
		(e) TPg Educational Aims (EAs) will be reviewed to determine if inter-cultural understanding and skills should be included.	(e) Senate and its committees	(e) Review of TPg EAs regarding inter-cultural understanding and skills	(e) By 2016-17	(e): completed • TPg EAs 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 articulate explicitly the global dimensions of the knowledge and skills required.

II.   Affirmation

	Audit findings	Action	Responsible party	Expected Deliverables	Timeline	Implementation Progress
		as per the University's Action Plan and further details submitted to QAC in July 2016 and February 2017 respectively				
	Student Achievement					
A1	The Audit Panel affirms the significant efforts the University is now making to acquire further direct evidence of individual student achievements via the PLO Achievement Portfolio Project (para. 4.7).	See R4				See R4

III.   Suggested areas for consideration

	Audit findings	Action	Responsible party	Expected deliverables	Timeline	Implementation Progress
		as per the University's Action Plan and further details submitted to QAC in July 2016 and February 2017 respectively				
	The Quality of Learning Opportunities					
S1	The Audit Panel noted that the University prefers to appoint its external examiners as external members of curriculum review panels. Given that these external examiners/external members may find themselves commenting on curriculum enhancements that they themselves have promoted, the Audit Panel encourages the University to consider using external members with a higher degree of independence (para. 3.3).	This suggestion will be considered when the guidelines for curriculum reviews are reviewed.	Senate and its committees	Revised guidelines after the review	By 2016-17	Completed • After a detailed review, the guidelines for curriculum reviews were revised after the first cycle of implementation. The new sets of guidelines, implemented since November 2016, specify that the external member on the review panel should not be a recent external examiner for the curriculum.

			Quality Enhancement			
S2	Students whom the Audit Panel met suggested that the University could further enhance the Common Core Curriculum provision by giving more thought to course design for students without a relevant academic background (for example, non-scientists taking science courses); and by freeing up the timetable to encourage the full participation of Medical and Dentistry students (para. 5.9).	(a) The CC Curriculum Committee will review how students from different backgrounds studying the same course can be catered for.	(a) CC Curriculum Committee	(a) i) Outcome of review ii) Implementation of new arrangements, as applicable	(a) i) By summer 2017 ii) From 2017-18	(a): ongoing • It was emerged from the data on different AoIs that students' major concerns lay in the STL (Scientific & Technological Literacy) AoI. All course proposals in this AoI need to be vetted by a working group and the CC Curriculum Committee to ensure that they are accessible by non-majors. A CC Research Group has been set up to conduct more in-depth analyses of the data from various feedback channels. • AoI-specific workshops will be arranged, in partnership with CETL, to help instructors align more clearly learning outcomes, teaching methods and assessments with the interdisciplinary and cross-Faculty principles of the CC Curriculum.
		(b) VP/T&L will explore with the Faculties of Medicine and Dentistry the feasibility of freeing up timetables for students to	(b) VP/T&L and Faculties of Medicine and Dentistry	(b) i) Outcome of feasibility study ii) Implementation of new arrangements, as applicable	(b) i) By 2016-17 ii) From 2017-18	(b): completed • The Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine has re-organised its MBBS curriculum for implementation from 2016-17, in that Year 3 is designed as a personalised "Enrichment Year", and that students will be able to fulfil the CC requirement by the

		participate fully in Common Core courses.				end of Year 3. The Faculty of Dentistry has ensured that the timetables for Years 1 and 2 students are free on Wednesday afternoons and Saturdays to allow them to take CC courses, and has ring-fenced 1-2 sessions per week for BDS I and II students for CC tutorials. Recent feedback from students confirmed that these measures are effective. • A suite of CC courses is offered in summer.
Postgraduate Provision					
S3	To date there are no mechanisms available whereby either students or the University can establish whether individual RPg students have achieved their EAs though optional workshops are available to help students do so. The Audit Panel encourages the University to	(a) One set of ILOs will be developed for each of the eight EAs for RPg curricula. (b) Based on the ILOs developed in (a) above, a system will be developed to assess students' attainment of every ILO and EA, which includes the	(a) Graduate School (GS) and Board of Graduate Studies (BoGS) (b) GS and BoGS	(a) Development of ILOs (b) Development of a system to assess students' attainment of ILOs and EAs	(a) By 2016-17 (b) By 2016-17	(a): completed • The Policy Board of Postgraduate Education endorsed in March 2017, on the recommendation of the BoGS, a refined set of EAs for RPg curricula, and ILOs for each of the eight EAs (*vide* Appendix C). (b): completed • Mechanisms have been developed, in the form of an "Achievement Card", to monitor students' attainment of the eight EAs and ILOs. The finalised Achievement Card has incorporated comments from

	address this matter (*para.* 6.3).	design of an EA "Achievement Card" for each student.				BoGS and feedback collected in the pilot run in S3(c) below (*vide* <u>Appendix H</u>).
		(c) A pilot run will be launched on the assessment system for a few selected Faculties on the 2017 new cohort of RPgs.	(c) GS and Faculties	(c) Conduct of a pilot run	(c) By 2017-18	(c): completed • A pilot run on one Faculty in the Humanities discipline (Faculty of Education) and one Faculty in the Science discipline (Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine) was completed in June 2017.
		(d) Full implementation will be carried out on the 2018 new cohort.	(d) GS and Faculties	(d) Full implementation of the new system on the 2018 cohort	(d) By 2018-19	(d): ongoing • GS is working with ITS to develop an online Achievement Card for implementation in 2018.
S4	Academic standards for RPg programmes, as for taught programmes (see paragraph 2.2 above), are implicit rather than explicit. The setting and maintenance of high standards is assured through	See R1. Also, clear reference to grade descriptors (e.g. "Pass" and "Fail" for GS courses) will be made so that students understand what is expected of them in their assessment.	GS and BoGS	See R1. Promulgation of assessment standards to supervisors, course teachers and students.	By 2016-17	Completed • See R1 for articulation of academic standards. • Clear reference to grade descriptors has been developed (*vide* R3.5).

	the experience and expertise of staff, the calibre of incoming students, reports from external examiners, and associations with top research institutes worldwide. As with taught programmes, the Audit Panel considers there would be external and internal benefit in explicitly articulating expected academic standards, and it encourages the University to do so (para. 6.4).					
S5	TPg students whom the Audit Panel met were unaware of the existence of Staff Student Consultative	Departments will be reminded annually to promote to students the various channels through which the latter can provide feedback, and in	Faculties	Information from Faculties and Departments on how the promotion has enhanced their response to TPg student feedback.	By 2016-17	Completed • All Faculties have made diligent efforts in further promoting Staff-Student Consultative Committees and other communication channels through student booklets, websites etc.

	Committees. The Audit Panel encourages the University to promote this means of gathering and responding to TPg student feedback (para. 6.16).	particular Staff Student Consultative Committee (SSCC) meetings.			
S6	The Audit Panel encourages the University to identify additional ways in which the TPg learning experience could be enhanced by adopting and adapting the enrichment initiatives now operating across Ug programmes (para. 6.17). The Audit Panel found much less evidence of systematic efforts to enhance the TPg	(a) Surveys will continue to be regularly conducted to understand TPg students' learning experience for ongoing enhancement. (b) On the basis of the survey results, Faculties and CEDARS will consider how student support	(a) Teaching & Learning Evaluation and Measurement Unit (b) CEDARS in collaboration with Faculties	(a) Survey results on graduating TPg cohorts (b) Ongoing enhancement of support services for TPg students	(a) From 2016-17 (b) From 2017-18	(a): ongoing • CEDARS conducts annually a survey of student profiles in planning its student support services. • Two specific questions have been added to SLEQ-TPg to gauge feedback from TPg students on their needs and challenges from the 2016-17 academic year. • Findings from SLEQ-TPg for 2016-17 set out the difficulties and challenges faced by TPg students, with suggestions for improvement. (b): ongoing • The findings for 2016-17 were shared among all Faculties, and discussed by TLQC. • Initially, the following measures have been/will be undertaken to

	experience through appropriately tailored co-/extra-curricular activities (see paragraph 6.17 above) and reiterates here the suggestion that the University might identify additional ways in which the TPg learning experience could be enhanced by adopting and adapting the enrichment initiatives now operating across Ug programmes (para. 7.9).	services can be enhanced for full-time, part-time, local and non-local TPg students.				address the findings: ➢ teachers are encouraged to consider using more online resources and e-communications to supplement teaching and learning, where appropriate; ➢ a CoP involving programme directors of Ug and TPg curricula/programmes will be set up to share experience in assessment and provision of feedback; ➢ CETL will arrange welcoming events for part-time teachers in cognate disciplines to share T&L experience; and ➢ CEDARS's career talks and events are open to both Ug and TPg students (see R6 above), and promotion among TPg students would be further enhanced to ensure their awareness of these resources and functions.
Audit Theme: Enhancing the Student Learning Experience						
S7	The Audit Panel encourages the University to continue its efforts	(a) A focused review of capstone courses has been scheduled.	(a) Teaching & Learning Quality Committee	(a) Availability of the recommendations of the review	(a) By 2016-17	(a): completed • A focused review of capstone courses was conducted in May 2017 as planned.

to strengthen the teaching-research nexus at Ug level (para. 7.8).	(b) The number of awards under the Undergraduate Research Fellowship Programme (URFP) will be increased, with the outcome being further promoted through poster presentations.	(b) VP/T&L in collaboration with University Research Committee	(b) Enhanced promotion of URFP, with an increased number of awards and student participation	(b) From 2016-17	(b) & (c): ongoing • Faculties have taken different measures to further promote URFP: an annual URFP poster session has been organised since 2015-16 for recipients of research internship awards to present research findings and share experiences. The number of awards for internships has registered an increase in the recent three years.
	(c) Faculties, with the support of CETL, will continue to develop more courses with contents on cutting-edge research.	(c) Faculties with CETL support	(c) Tracking of Faculty progress by CETL	(c) From 2017-18	• CETL will continue to support Faculties in developing courses with contents on cutting-edge research.
	(d) Students will be provided with more inquiry-based learning opportunities.	(d) Faculties with support from CEDARS, GEU, Gallant Ho Experiential Learning Centre, Office of International Student	(d) More inquiry-based learning opportunities will be offered to students through student exchange and	(d) Ongoing	(d): ongoing • An inaugural Laidlaw Undergraduate Research and Leadership Programme will be launched in 2018 in partnership with the University of Leeds and University College London to equip students with research and leadership skills.

| | | | Exchange, China Affairs Office, HKU Horizons Office and Technology Transfer Office | other T&L activities such as the Entrepreneurship Commons, the Entrepreneurship Academy, the DreamCatchers initiative etc. | | A number of Faculties which offer professional curricula, such as Architecture, Dentistry, Education and Medicine, adopt Problem-based Learning, which is an inquiry-based approach to learning. Initiatives have been taken by various Faculties to incorporate more inquiry-based learning into their courses and activities. With growing activities in the formal curriculum, the Entrepreneurship Academy, DreamCatchers, i-Dendron etc., opportunities and co-working space for entrepreneurship initiatives have increased considerably. |

November 2017

THE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG

Plan for the Use of the Teaching Development and Language Enhancement Grant in the 2016 - 19 Triennium

A.   Strategic Plan and Priorities

The University's overarching development in teaching and learning in the next triennium will focus on:

(a)   implementing the strategies in the University's new Vision document to achieve the institutional goals on teaching and learning under the strategic themes of 3+1 Is (viz. Internationalisation, Innovation, Interdisciplinarity to create Impact), as outlined in paragraphs 2 (a) to (d) below;

(b)   addressing the recommendations and suggestions in the QAC's Audit Report – we are glad to receive the QAC's appreciation of our work in upholding "high academic standards through a variety of effective mechanisms" and "widespread commitment to the quality of learning opportunities", and will formulate an action plan to address the Audit Panel's recommendations, particularly the development of a framework to capture student achievement across the spectrum, and broadening of our strategy for internationalisation of the student learning environment; and

(c)   undertaking reviews of all 2012 undergraduate curricula – 2016 marked the graduation of the first cohorts of 4-year undergraduate curricula. It is timely for the University to evaluate the efficacy of all the curricula and various curriculum components.

To achieve the above, the key enablers are further strengthening of quality assurance and enhancement mechanisms and professional development programmes, continuous enhancement of the student learning experience, and recognition and promotion of good practices.

2.   Guided by the University's strategic developments, the priorities for teaching development in the next triennium are presented below under the 3+1 Is framework:

(a)   Internationalisation

We will further develop our curricula and our vibrant, cosmopolitan campus to nurture globally-minded thinkers and leaders, and provide space and opportunity for students to gain meaningful learning experiences outside Hong Kong. Priorities will be given to initiatives that will:

- promote diversity awareness and empowerment, for example, through further internationalising the curriculum by incorporating international perspectives or global relevance into the curriculum;
- extend opportunities for cross-cultural encounters amongst students;
- deepen multicultural components of campus life;

- enhance the biliterate and multilingual competencies of graduates, including the introduction of more non-credit bearing language courses; and
- increase opportunities for students to gain learning experiences in mainland China and overseas.

(b) <u>Innovation</u>

We will develop innovative and forward-thinking talents to enable them to tackle global challenges. Priorities will be given to initiatives that will:

- make full use of technologies to support and enhance teaching and learning, including the use of flipped classrooms, learning analytics, technology supported assessment, and gamification;
- increase opportunities for students to gain inquiry-based learning or research experience;
- explore an innovative approach in curriculum design and development, or pedagogical innovations that will impact on student learning;
- partner with innovative organisations to create opportunities for students to gain exposure to practical and real-life experience in both commercial and non-commercial sectors; and
- create opportunities for students to explore new ideas and pursue joint projects; empower students, whether individually or in groups, to design and implement their own innovative on- and off-campus learning programmes.

(c) <u>Interdisciplinarity</u>

We will produce graduates who are able to adapt swiftly, seamlessly and effectively to unpredictable situations through exploration of ideas and thoughts across different disciplinary studies. We will take forward our pioneering undergraduate Common Core Curriculum to deepen still further students' exposure to interdisciplinary modes of teaching and learning in the next triennium. Furthermore, priorities will be given to initiatives that will:

- create new space in the curriculum from which interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary activities can emerge; and
- develop interdisciplinary curricula and programmes.

(d) <u>Impact</u>

For many years we have created opportunities for students and staff to make a difference locally, regionally and globally. We are now seeking to take our efforts on all fronts to the next stage so that every student is provided with ample opportunities for personal development, improved language skills and meaningful experience outside their comfort zone. In this regard, we will:

- develop an e-portfolio framework for capturing students' learning journeys in both formal and co-curricular activities;
- evaluate the impact of our undergraduate curriculum on students through various institutional surveys and curriculum reviews;
- facilitate internships, work placements, experiential learning and service work locally and all over the world; and

- further embed social responsibility into our curriculum to ensure that our students can better serve society and meet its growing needs.

Our staff development programmes will be developed and enhanced in line with the above priorities.

3.   In terms of language enhancement, the University is firmly committed to providing high-quality language enhancement programmes with a view to helping students enhance their English and Chinese language competencies so as to enable them to maximize academic success and become effective communicators, which will in turn facilitate their multicultural understanding and support their future studies and employment. English and Chinese language education has been and continues to be an integral component of the new curriculum and academic studies. Recognising the need to cater for a greater diversity of student body, new language courses have been developed in this triennium to meet the demand for the language requirements of the new curriculum. The next triennium will be a time for review and consolidation of these credit-bearing courses. We have recently conducted a focussed review of the English language enhancement courses, arising from which recommendations are made on further enhancement of students' language proficiency. Initiatives in the next triennium will include:

(a)   revamping the language enhancement courses to cater to the needs of students in different disciplines;

(b)   strengthening self-access facilities and support for students;

(c)   piloting an English writing centre to enhance students' English writing skills to meet their academic and career needs;

(d)   exploring the integration of digital media in the assessment of language and communication;

(e)   reinforcing the linkage between language learning and culture appreciation;

(f)   implementing flipped classrooms or blended learning to enhance student learning;

(g)   providing peer tutoring Cantonese and Putonghua classes to enhance the integration of local and non-local students on campus; and

(h)   developing a database of common errors made by international students in the Chinese language.

B.   Collaboration

4.   HKU has vibrant engagement and collaboration in teaching and learning with partners in higher education around the globe including Universitas 21 (U21), the Association of Pacific Rim Universities (APRU), and the Network for Enhancing Teaching and Learning in Research Intensive Universities (NETL). We have been promoting the TDG-funded Teaching Exchange Fellowship Scheme (TEFS) to support teachers in spending up to one semester for academic exchange and in collaborative teaching development activities/projects at renowned overseas universities.

5.   In the next triennium, we plan to enhance collaboration with world renowned universities through increasing the number of joint and dual degrees with partner

institutions. Locally, we will actively organise and participate in activities for sharing of good T&L practice, such as the upcoming event on sharing by UGC Teaching Award recipients next January.

6.   The UGC's Funding Scheme on T&L related proposals to be launched in July 2016 is timely in encouraging and supporting collaborative activities across institutions. Some preliminary thoughts inclusive of the following are being considered and explored with other local institutions:

(a)   the sharing of contents of Common Core/general education courses;

(b)   the setting up of an Asian consortium on technology-enriched learning to explore various T&L enhancement, initially about content sharing at three levels: micro-modules, course and pedagogical showcases;

(c)   the setting up of an Innovation in English Language Education Unit, which provides an umbrella for discussion, advising and researching teaching and learning initiatives with expertise from English language teachers in different institutions; and

(d)   the establishment of a support and development centre for English language assessment.

We believe that more creative ideas will emerge in the coming months upon the UGC's formal launch of the T&L funding scheme.

C.   Allocation of Funds

7.   The University plans to follow largely the 25%/75% split to allocate the Grant respectively for teaching development and language enhancement, noting that the two areas are in fact closely entwined. The actual allocation will be reviewed annually depending on the implementation of our strategic priorities.

8.   The allocation of the language enhancement grant for Chinese and English languages will be in accordance with the annual budget plans on related activities. A ballpark estimate will be around a 35%/65% split for Chinese and English. With regard to the teaching development grant, the bulk will be to support teaching exchanges under the TEFS, and teaching development projects under the Teaching Development Grant (TDG) scheme. To better coordinate, consolidate and maximize the systemic impact of our TD initiatives and activities, TDGs will continue to be awarded centrally for projects that are in line with institutional priorities (see Section A).

9.   The University's TDG scheme allocates grants according to the following criteria:

(a)   satisfying the objective(s) of the TDG and T&L enhancement;

(b)   appropriateness of the budget proposal;

(c)   innovations of the project/activity;

(d)   scope of application (i.e. cross-institutional, University/Faculty-wide, cross/inter-disciplinary, programme-based);

(e)   preference for collaborative activities across Faculties/institutions;

(f) adequacy of provisions made for project assessment and dissemination;

(g) the parties/community to be benefited by the project/activity;

(h) the impact of the project deliverables and their alignment with the institutional goals and priority;

(i) the scholarship of T&L; and

(j) track record of participants in proposed project/activity.

10. The TEFS aims to enhance the scholarship of teaching at the University through enabling academic staff members to share experience and to collaborate on teaching and curriculum development initiatives at reputable universities where excellent pedagogical practices or curriculum innovation are being implemented. Awards will be made having regard to the merits of the proposal, evidence to the applicant's/the visiting scholar's previous contributions to teaching and learning and curriculum design, and comments from the Head of Department and the Dean of the Faculty. Priority will be given to proposals that can clearly articulate their impact on and alignment with the University's or Faculty's strategic objectives and academic direction and/or enhance the quality of teaching and learning at the University.

11. In terms of accountability, the Senate Teaching and Learning Quality Committee (TLQC) is charged with promoting high quality teaching throughout the University, and oversees, *inter alia*, the quality assurance and enhancement of T&L environments and the allocation and administration of the two schemes. While the bulk of TDG and TEF funding is designated for systemic University and Faculty-level innovations, the TDG scheme also supports departmental and individual initiatives that are aligned with the goals of the institutional T&L strategies. It is expected that developments at all levels can be synthesized and consolidated to maximize the effectiveness of outcomes.

12. The Centre for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning (CETL) provides professional advice and input to Principal Investigators (PIs) at various stages of proposal design, project evaluation and outcomes dissemination, and facilitates project collaborations. Members of the TLQC provide feedback on proposals, review project progress and evaluate final reports and project outcomes.

13. TDG grant holders are required to submit annual (progress) reports to the TLQC to:

(a) describe and evaluate the progress in implementing approved projects/activities vis-à-vis declared objectives, target timelines and advancing the institutional/Faculty's teaching and learning objectives;

(b) provide action plans and updated timetables to address any delays and/or problems encountered; and

(c) evaluate the success and effectiveness of projects/activities completed during the year.

14. All grant holders of TDG and TEFS are required to submit a final report to the TLQC upon completion of the project which is reviewed by CETL or TLQC members following the evaluation mechanism set out in paragraph 18 below.

15.   The Committee on Chinese Language Enhancement Programmes and Committee on English Language Enhancement Programmes, sub-committees of the Curriculum Development Committee, oversee the quality of language enhancement activities. They receive regular reports respectively from the School of Chinese and the Centre for Applied English Studies on the progress of achievements and feedback from students and external examiners on various language enhancement activities.

D.   Expected Key Deliverables and Timeline

16.   Key deliverables for the 2016-2019 triennium include:

Internationalisation
(a)   increased provision of non-credit bearing courses in different languages to enhance the biliterate and multilingual competencies of graduates (ongoing from 2016-17);

(b)   increased opportunities for students to participate in learning activities outside Hong Kong (50% of undergraduate students will have at least one Mainland and one international experience by 2018-19);

(c)   enhanced internationalisation on campus - greater integration between local and non-local students (ongoing); enriched cultural sensitivity and diversity (ongoing); an increased number of courses in the curriculum addressing international themes or global issues (from 2016-17); and new staff development programmes to address inter-cultural sensitivity and pedagogical practice with a view to promoting "internationalisation at home", catering for a culturally diverse student body, and enhancing integration of non-local students in the classroom (from 2016-17);

Innovation
(d)   enhanced use of technology to support learning, in line with the e-learning strategy document (ongoing);

(e)   enhanced opportunities for students to participate in inquiry-based learning activities (ongoing);

(f)   promotion of innovation and entrepreneurship initiatives and activities to facilitate students to explore new ideas and pursue self-initiated projects on- and off-campus (e.g. a new innovation and entrepreneurship centre is being conceptualised) (from 2016-17);

Interdisciplinarity
(g)   students' further exposure to interdisciplinary modes of teaching and learning in the Common Core Curriculum, with the possibility of introducing new Common Core Interdisciplinary Minors (from 2017-18);

(h)   increased the range of interdisciplinary programmes or activities beyond the Common Core Curriculum (from 2016-17);

Impact
(i)   completion of review of all four-year undergraduate curricula, and continued development of these curricula in the light of the review findings; refining the enabling curriculum structure, as applicable (by 2018-19);

(j)   implementation of an e-portfolio initiative in phases to capture students' whole person development and learning journeys in the formal curriculum and the co-curriculum (by 2017-18);

(k)   the availability of a TDG database for sharing and dissemination of TDG projects and their findings (by 2016-17);

Language enhancement
(l)   improved English language enhancement courses on offer (ongoing, from 2016-17);

(m)   enhanced self-access facilities and support for language enhancement (ongoing);

(n)   an English writing centre providing one-to-one English writing support to students will be piloted and its effectiveness evaluated (by 2018-19); and

(o)   the provision of Cantonese and Putonghua classes to non-speakers through peer tutoring (from 2016-17).

E.   Evaluation

17.   Various feedback mechanisms are in place to solicit input from students and other stakeholders to evaluate the quality and impact of these funded activities on student learning.   Student Evaluation of Teaching and Learning (SETL) and Student Learning Experience Questionnaire (SLEQ) are two major mechanisms for the University to gauge and analyse students' feedback on courses offered and on the overall university experience. Focussed group reviews are also conducted on specific areas.

18.   With regard to TDGs, systematic and regular reporting and review processes are applicable to both formative and summative evaluations of project deliverables. Peer reviewers assess, for advice and recommendation to the TLQC, whether the project has delivered the outcomes as promised in the original proposal and if shortfalls are identified, suggestions are given to the PI on how to achieve the outcomes. A summary of all TDG reports and their evaluation by peers is circulated annually to the TLQC for perusal and endorsement. Unsatisfactory reports are deliberated by the TLQC for follow up action; these reports contribute to the track record of the PI and will affect his/her future applications for TDGs.

19.   To maximize the impact and quality of TDG outcomes, CETL provides an additional source of ongoing formative input through its regular seminars for PIs of similar projects to promote synergistic sharing and use of resources, and to nurture the scholarship of T&L within the University.

F.   Sharing of Good Practices

20.   Our CETL works across the University to enhance the quality of T&L and student learning experience through enhanced pedagogy, assessment and curriculum design, in ways that are consonant with the University's T&L strategy and priorities. In the 2016-19 triennium, CETL will continue to support the dissemination of features of good practice in these aspects through its mandatory professional development programmes, and its voluntary seminars, workshops and Community of Practice (CoP) events.

21.   Some initiatives and plans of the CETL are highlighted below:

(a)   the launch of The Foundations of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education on MOOC;

(b)   the launch of a new Professional Certificate in Learning Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (in collaboration with the Higher Education Academy in the UK), aiming at supporting mid-career academic staff in T&L leadership;

(c)   organising seminars and workshops focusing on: standards-based assessment (developing and explaining grade descriptors and giving timely and meaningful feedback on learning), teaching and learning opportunities in internationalisation, encouraging the teaching-research nexus, experiential learning and residential education; and

(d)   offering a number of Join-the-Conversation events, centring on internationalisation at home, which will draw out and celebrate wise practices in this area.

22.   The Technology-Enriched Learning Initiative (TELI) will continue to offer online learning modules to facilitate the work of teachers and curriculum planners, for example, the "Scale Out Teaching, Scale Up Learning" series. Face-to-face workshops will supplement the learning experience in two key topics: (i) educational video production; and (ii) video analytics. CoPs in e-portfolio, advanced learning analytics, blended learning and learning management system are gaining traction, and more teachers will participate. TELI will also contribute actively to local and international e-learning symposia and conferences. Pedagogical showcases and e-learning news and trends worldwide will be posted online on websites and social media channels.

23.   With regard to the sharing of TDG project outcomes, the reporting requirements for TDG projects require that good practices arising from the outcomes are disseminated, with the support of CETL. Besides seminars and workshops, the following have been the platforms for the dissemination of project deliverables and good practices within the Faculties, the University and the sector:

(a)   a publicly accessible TDG website (http://tl.hku.hk/staff/teaching-development-grants/tdg-projects/);

(b)   learning and instructional resources; and

(c)   publications, including international refereed journals and curriculum resources.

24.   To further enhance the synergy and dissemination, we are building a TDG database to facilitate the retrieval and sharing of TDG ideas and findings. TDG holders across the University can identify colleagues working on similar topics and meet to discuss experiences, update progress and get feedback on future plans. This dissemination model ensures that Faculties are kept well informed of each other's T&L initiatives and activities.

June 29, 2016

THE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG

<u>Vision and Mission</u>

Vision

The University of Hong Kong, Asia's Global University, delivers impact through internationalisation, innovation and interdisciplinarity. It attracts and nurtures global scholars through excellence in research, teaching and learning, and knowledge exchange. It makes a positive social contribution through global presence, regional significance and engagement with the rest of China.

Mission

The University of Hong Kong will endeavor:

(a) To advance constantly the bounds of scholarship, building upon its proud traditions and strengths

(b) To provide a comprehensive education, benchmarked against the highest international standards, designed to develop fully the intellectual and personal strengths of its students, while extending lifelong learning opportunities for the community

(c) To produce graduates of distinction committed to academic/professional excellence, critical intellectual inquiry and lifelong learning, who are communicative and innovative, ethically and culturally aware, and capable of tackling the unfamiliar with confidence

(d) To develop a collegial, flexible, pluralistic and supportive intellectual environment that inspires and attracts, retains and nurtures scholars, students and staff of the highest calibre in a culture that fosters creativity, learning and freedom of thought, enquiry and expression

(e) To provide a safe, healthy and sustainable workplace to support and advance teaching, learning and research at the University

(f) To engage in innovative, high-impact and leading-edge research within and across disciplines

(g) To be fully accountable for the effective management of public and private resources bestowed upon the institution and act in partnership with the community over the generation, dissemination and application of knowledge

(h) To serve as a focal point of intellectual and academic endeavour in Hong Kong, China and Asia and act as a gateway and forum for scholarship with the rest of the world

October 2017

THE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG

Educational Aims and Institutional Learning Outcomes for Undergraduate Curricula

Benchmarked against the highest international standards, the 4-year undergraduate curriculum at HKU is designed to enable our students to develop their capabilities in:

Aim 1: Pursuit of academic/professional excellence, critical intellectual inquiry and life-long learning

- Develop in-depth knowledge of specialist disciplines and professions
- Maintain highest standards of intellectual rigor and academic integrity
- Critique and apply received knowledge from multiple perspectives
- Sustain intellectual curiosity and enthusiasm for learning

Aim 2: Tackling novel situations and ill-defined problems

- Respond positively to unanticipated situations and problems
- Identify and define problems in unfamiliar situations
- Generate and evaluate innovative solutions to problem

Aim 3: Critical self-reflection, greater understanding of others, and upholding personal and professional ethics

- Maintain highest standards of personal integrity and ethical practice in academic, social and professional settings
- Heighten awareness of personal strengths and weaknesses
- Respect individual differences and preferences

Aim 4: Intercultural communication, and global citizenship

- Heighten awareness of own culture and other cultures
- Develop cultural sensitivity and interpersonal skills for engagement with people of diverse cultures
- Perform social responsibilities as a member of the global community

Aim 5: Communication and collaboration

- Communicate effectively in academic, professional and social settings, making appropriate use of available technology
- Work with others and make constructive contributions

Aim 6: Leadership and advocacy for the improvement of the human condition

- Play a leading role in improving the well-being of fellow citizens and humankind
- Uphold the core values of a democratic society: human rights, justice, equality and freedom of speech
- Participate actively in promoting the local and global social, economic and environmental sustainability

July 2017

THE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG

<u>Educational Aims and Institutional Learning Outcomes for Taught Postgraduate Curricula</u>

Benchmarked against the highest international standards, the taught postgraduate curricula at HKU are designed to enable our students to develop their capabilities in:

<u>Aim 1</u>: **Critical intellectual enquiry and acquiring up-to-date knowledge and research skills in a discipline/profession**

- Critically review, consolidate and extend knowledge, skills and practices and thinking in a discipline/profession
- Critically evaluate new knowledge and research skills of specialist disciplines and professions from a range of global sources
- Demonstrate enhanced analytical skills

<u>Aim 2</u>: **Application of knowledge and research skills to practice or theoretical exploration, demonstrating originality and creativity**

- Apply disciplinary knowledge to practice or theoretical exploration creatively
- Employ research skills in practice or theoretical exploration in an original way
- Demonstrate critical awareness of the appropriate application of knowledge and research skills to practice or theoretical exploration
- Apply knowledge and skills in a broad range of professional work activities, drawing on relevant local, regional and international experience

<u>Aim 3</u>: **Tackling novel situations and ill-defined problems**

- Respond positively to unanticipated situations and problems
- Identify and define problems in unfamiliar situations
- Generate and evaluate innovative solutions to problems
- Deal with complex issues and make informed judgements in novel situations

<u>Aim 4</u>: **Collaboration and communication of disciplinary knowledge to specialists and the general public**

- Work with others in a constructive manner to complete tasks
- Negotiate with others in making a decision
- Communicate ideas professionally, making appropriate use of available technology
- Effectively communicate disciplinary knowledge with key stakeholders locally, regionally and internationally

Aim 5: Awareness of and adherence to personal and professional ethics

- Maintain highest standards of personal integrity and ethical practice in academic and professional settings
- Demonstrate critical awareness of global best practice in personal and professional ethics

Aim 6: Enhancement of leadership and advocacy skills in a profession

- Play a leading role in professional settings
- Articulate ideas effectively and motivate others to action
- Address critical issues and make contribution to change and development in the profession
- Attain familiarity with global best practice in the profession

(This educational aim applies only to professional curricula.)

July 2017

THE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG

Educational Aims and Institutional Learning Outcomes for Research Postgraduate Curricula

Benchmarked against the highest international standards, the RPG curricula at HKU are designed to enable students to develop their capabilities to:

(a)   engage in critical intellectual enquiry
- *Critically evaluate information and ideas from multiple perspectives*
- *Integrate knowledge at the forefront of a particular field*

(b)   demonstrate a thorough understanding of research methodologies and techniques at an advanced level
- *Develop, design and implement research projects competently and independently*

(c)   conduct innovative, high-impact and leading edge research
- *Engage in original research that takes a new technological, methodological, or theoretical approach*

(d)   provide novel solutions to complex problems
- *Identify and define emerging problems*
- *Offer innovative and original solutions to problems and issues in novel situations*

(e)   demonstrate adherence to personal and professional ethics
- *Maintain the highest standards of personal and academic integrity*
- *Understand complex ethical and professional issues*

(f)   demonstrate leadership and advocacy skills
- *Articulate analyses and propose solutions in response to social issues*
- *Communicate and disseminate research findings effectively in the academic community and to stakeholders in society*

(g)   work with others and make constructive contributions
- *Engage in intellectual exchange with researchers from other disciplines to address important research issues*
- *Collaborate effectively with researchers from different cultures*

(h)   monitor, review and reflect on one's own work and competencies, and change and adapt in the light of new demands
- *Evaluate contribution of one's own work to the field*
- *Demonstrate flexibility to accommodate new knowledge and perspectives*

Graduate School
November 1, 2017

THE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG

<u>Staff Development Activities</u>
<u>with a Special Focus on Grade Descriptors and Feedback</u>

I. **Professional Development Programmes**
   <u>Feedback</u>
   One of the modules of the professional teaching and learning certificate course for all new academic staff members reviews the principles of both giving and receiving feedback (http://www.cetl.hku.hk/professional-certificate-tl/). The course also considers course evaluations as feedback and explores the reasons why students might perceive themselves as not receiving sufficient feedback during a course. Framing feedback for spoken and written situations is reviewed and practised. Also, one of the modules of the teaching and learning certificate course for research postgraduate students serving as teaching assistants introduces common misunderstandings about feedback and the principles of good feedback practices (http://www.cetl.hku.hk/certificate-courses/). Participants take part in role-play scenarios to provide written and verbal feedback for each other.

   <u>Grade descriptors</u>
   The assessment module of the professional teaching and learning certificate course was designed to deepen academic staff's understanding in assessment. This module is an interactive course, which introduces new teachers at HKU to different terminologies and approaches used in assessment, as well as the University Assessment Policy. The facilitator also demonstrates the importance of rubrics and grade descriptors by assessing the new teachers through creative assignments, enabling teachers to experience the student perspective on assessment. Also, in the assessment and feedback module of the teaching and learning certificate course for research postgraduate students, participants learn about the University Assessment Policy, different assessment approaches and the use of holistic/analytic rubrics. In their preparation to undertake teaching demonstrations, participant-observers are required to assess their peers' teaching demonstration by integrating the learned skills of grading with rubrics and feedback.

II. **Workshops, Seminars and Events**
    A number of workshops have been held for staff across Faculties to directly focus on grade descriptors and understanding the advantages of communicating clear learning outcomes. Other workshops are related to grade descriptors, assessment, learning outcomes and the provision of feedback. Details are listed below:

Date	Title of workshop	Speakers / Facilitators	No. of participants
May 4, 2016	Assessing and Providing Evidence of Generic Skills	1 speaker (HKU teacher)	62
June 8, 2016	Join-the-Conversation: Assessment and Feedback in Experiential Learning	3 speakers (1 teacher and 2 academic staff) 3 facilitators (All HKU teachers)	47
July 8, 2016	Assessing with ePortfolios	2 speakers (1 HKU teacher and Prof. Gavin T. L. Brown, Director, Quantitative Data Analysis and Research Unit, Faculty of Education and Social Work, University of Auckland) 1 facilitator (HKU teacher)	52
February 29, 2017	Design of CLOs, PLOs and Mapped Assessments - How Can this Improve Learning in my Course?	1 speaker and 1 facilitator (HKU teachers)	64
March 9, 2017	Identifying and Assessing the Student Learning Outcomes in Residential College System	1 speaker (Prof. Haydn Chen, Vice Rector (Student Affairs), University of Macau) 1 facilitator (HKU teacher)	30
May 19, 2017	Provision of Personalized Feedback at Scale Using Learning Analytics	1 speaker (Dr. Abelardo Pardo, Associate Professor, University of Sydney) 2 facilitators (Both HKU teachers)	45

Date	Title of workshop	Speakers / Facilitators	No. of participants
June 9, 2017	Student-led Teaching Feedback Award (TFA) Workshop (for Student Union and Student Faculty Representatives)	1 speaker (HKU teacher)	25

In addition, focused support has been offered for specific Faculties, as follows:

Date	Title of workshop	Speakers	Targeted Unit
March 2, 2016	Clear Goals and Standards Workshop for the Business Retreat	1 speaker (HKU teacher)	Faculty of Business and Economics
March 2, 2016	Feedback Workshop for the Business Retreat	1 speaker (HKU teacher)	Faculty of Business and Economics
May 20, 2016	Designing My Course Using an Outcomes Based Approach – What to look out for?	1 speaker (HKU teacher)	Division of Speech and Hearing Sciences, Faculty of Education
May 25, 2016	Standards-based Assessment (SBA) in OBASL	2 speakers (Both HKU teachers)	Institute of Human Performance

III. Web Resources

CETL provides a range of online materials to enhance academic staff's assessment literacy. Links to the CETL webpages relating to grade descriptors are as follows:
http://www.cetl.hku.hk/grade-descriptors/

http://ar.cetl.hku.hk/assgradstand.htm

IV. Student Vox Pop Video

CETL has been active in seeking student feedback on the assessment they experience at HKU, and produced a 'vox pop' video (currently under evaluation).

V. Teaching and Learning Research Project

There is a project entitled "Assessment Resources for Experiential Learning at HKU" funded by the Teaching Development Grant that addresses the challenge of devising appropriate assessment for experiential learning programmes, as well as collecting evidence of programme effectiveness. Over 30 exemplary teachers at HKU and

other research-intensive universities will be interviewed to explore practices in the assessment of experiential learning. The project findings will be disseminated via CETL's webpages, as well as through seminars, conference presentations and scholarly publications. It is anticipated that the project will contribute to teachers' ability to devise appropriate and diverse assessments for experiential learning activities, set benchmarks on assessment quality, raise awareness on assessment-related issues, and pool ideas to tackle some of the issues.

CETL
October 2017

THE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG

PROGRAMME LEARNING OUTCOME ASSESSMENT PLAN (PLOAP)

Programme details	
Programme title	
Degree title	
School / Dept.	
Faculty	
Academic year	

Contact details	
Name	
Position	
E-mail	
Telephone	

1. Please provide a brief summary of the direct evidence of student learning that is to be used to document students' achievement of their Programme Learning Outcomes. In this summary, please comment on the types of course-level assessment and sampling mechanism that will be used across the programme. Please see guidance notes 2 (a) and (b) below for assistance.

2. In respect of each Programme Learning Outcome (e.g. "apply theoretical knowledge to practice and real life situations, demonstrating an awareness of limitations of existing theories and practices in exercise and health"), please:

    a. List the course-level assessments that are to be used to measure achievement of each PLO.

	Programme Learning Outcomes	Course-level Assessments
PLO1		1. 2. 3.
PLO2		4. 5.
PLO3		6.
etc.		

b. Provide rubrics for the different levels of achievement (e.g. excellent, good, satisfactory and unsatisfactory) for each of the course-level assessment(s) used to measure achievement of each PLO in (a) above.

		Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
PLO1	Course-level Assessment 1				
	Course-level Assessment 2				
	Course-level Assessment 3				
PLO2	Course-level Assessment 4				
	Course-level Assessment 5				
PLO3	Course-level Assessment 6				
etc.					

Programme Learning Outcome Assessment Plan (PLOAP)

Guidance Notes

1. **Purpose and Process**
    (a)   The purpose of the Programme Learning Outcome Assessment Plan (PLOAP) is to ensure that every academic programme can demonstrate the use of direct evidence of student learning for gauging students' achievement of the Programme Learning Outcomes (PLOs) of the programme.
    (b)   With few exceptions*, a PLOAP must be created for every existing Ug and TPg programmes and the CC curriculum by the end of this academic year (2017/18). In future, a PLOAP will be created for every new academic programme soon after its establishment.
    (c)   Approval of PLOAPs is the responsibility of the relevant FTLQC; in the case of the CC curriculum, approval is the responsibility of the CCC.
    (d)   A copy of the relevant Programme Learning Outcome Assessment Plan (PLOAP) should be included when a Programme Learning Outcome Achievement Report (PLOAR) is submitted.

2. **Selecting Evidence**
    (a)   Direct evidence used to assess students' achievement of the PLOs may take various forms. Some programmes have well-developed capstone experiences that encompass most, and if not all, PLOs, whilst there are some programmes in which the capstone experiences do not encompass most PLOs. In the latter case, the curriculum teams may need to include other course(s), along with capstone experiences, in the form of a programme portfolio compiled by the curriculum team comprising samples of student work in a number of courses (e.g. assignments, examination scripts, in-class activities, projects, presentations, performances, videos, fieldwork, and so on) related to specific PLOs, a combination of the capstone experience and a few courses.
    (b)   In selecting direct evidence of student learning, the curriculum team should decide on:
        (i)   the course-level assessment items (i.e. assignments, examination scripts etc.) which most directly address student achievement of Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) (and in turn the PLOs, as CLOs are mapped to PLOs); and
        (ii) sampling of the assessment items (e.g. drawing samples of student work of high quality, medium quality and low quality, or drawing random samples of student work within or across cohorts).

3. **CETL Support for the PLO Achievement Scheme**
    The Centre for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning (CETL) will offer workshop support to programme teams across the University to help them understand the new PLO Achievement Scheme. Workshops will take the form of:
    (a)   Introductory sessions in AY2017-2018 on the new documentary requirements in relation to the PLO Achievement Scheme (PLOAPs and PLOARs)
    (b)   Tailored workshops thereafter, on request, for Faculties and the Common Core Office to assist them with creating these documents.

CETL Staff Liaison	e-mail address	Faculty
Prof. Grahame T Bilbow	gbilbow@hku.hk	Social Sciences Architecture
Dr Luke Fryer	fryer@hku.hk	Arts Law
Dr Cecilia Chan	cecilia.chan@cetl.hku.hk	Business and Economics Science Engineering
Dr Susan Bridges	sbridges@hku.hk	Education Medicine Dentistry
Dr. Tracy Zou	tracyzou@hku.hku	Common Core Office

---

*   Only externally accredited programmes are exempted from the requirement to create a PLOAP.

References:

"PLO Achievement Portfolio" formulated by Professor Mike Prosser for HKU with reference to international experiences from the accreditation of universities as applied in the USA (Appendix 2.21 of the Institutional Submission to Quality Assurance Council for the 2015 audit at http://intraweb.hku.hk/reserved_1/tlearn/qac2015/HKU-IS_2015(internal).pdf)

Electronic resource on "Outcome-based approaches to student learning" by CETL of HKU at http://www.cetl.hku.hk/obasl/

"Guidelines for Developing and Assessing Student Learning Outcomes for Undergraduate Majors" by UCLA at http://www.learningoutcomes.ucla.edu/docs/UCLAGuidelines2015UpdateNotations.pdf

"Developing a Programme Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan" by Hong Kong Polytechnic University at https://www.polyu.edu.hk/obe/07_4_files/PolyU_PLOAP_Guide.pdf

November 28, 2017

THE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG

PROGRAMME LEARNING OUTCOME ACHIEVEMENT REPORT (PLOAR)

Programme details	
Programme title	
Degree title	
School / Dept.	
Faculty	
Academic year	

Contact details	
Name	
Position	
E-mail	
Telephone	

1. Please report on the distribution of students' achievement of each of their Programme Learning Outcomes on the basis of the direct evidence outlined in the Programme Learning Outcome Assessment Plan (PLOAP).

	Excellent %	Good %	Satisfactory %	Unsatisfactory %
PLO1				
PLO2				
PLO3				
etc.				

2. Please include extracts from the External Examiner's report on student achievement of *specific* programme learning outcomes.

3. For each Programme Learning Outcome, please reflect on the findings/comments in (1) and (2) above, make overall comments about students' achievement on the basis of the selected evidence, especially where student achievement is lower or higher than expected, and make suggestions for changes to the programme (or courses) to help students better achieve the PLOs. The curriculum team is expected to engage students, Faculty members and other stakeholders in the reflection process. The following questions should be asked:

    - *from samples of student work* - which PLOs are best achieved?
    - *from samples of student work* - which PLOs are worst achieved?
    - *from samples of student work* - what are the implications for programme design, teaching and learning?
    - *from External Examiner's report* – what are the strengths and weaknesses of the PLOs?
    - *from External Examiner's report* – what are the areas in the PLOs judged to be in need of improvement?

	Overall comments and suggestions for changes
PLO1	
PLO2	
PLO3	
etc.	

4. Please indicate below any actions and initiatives you plan in response to the External Examiner's comments in (2) and your comments in (3). Include any amendments you plan to make, eg supporting/ scaffolding assessment items, revising assessment rubrics, revisiting PLOs (and thereby the PLOAP), and so on.

Planned action/initiative	Planned dissemination to students, Faculty members, and other stakeholders.	Timeline	Responsible party for follow up

Programme Learning Outcome Achievement Report (PLOAR)

Guidance Notes

1. **Purpose and Process**
   (a) The purpose of a Programme Learning Outcome Achievement Report (PLOAR) is to report on students' achievement of the Programme Learning Outcomes of the programme on which they are enrolled, on the basis of direct evidence of their learning, supported, where appropriate by External Examiners' comments.
   (b) The attached PLOAR reports on students' achievement of their programme learning outcomes and (a) identifies those PLOs students are achieving well; (b) identifies those PLOs students are not achieving so well; and (c) suggests changes to the programme, such as changes to the design of the programme or individual courses, to help students better achieve their PLOs.
   (c) A PLOAR must be completed for each programme at least every three years, in such a way that at least two such reports will be available for each curriculum review, which runs on a six-year cycle. With few exceptions*, a PLOAR must be available for every Ug and TPg programme and the CC curriculum by 2020-21, or when a curriculum review is due, whichever is the earlier.
   (d) Consideration and endorsement of PLOARs is the responsibility of the relevant FTLQC; in the case of the CC curriculum, this is the responsibility of the CCC Committee.

2. **Providing Evidence**
   (a) Direct evidence takes the form of the selected assessment items listed in the Programme Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan (PLOAP) created by the curriculum team, e.g. a capstone experience, a programme portfolio compiled by the curriculum team comprising samples of student work in a number of courses (e.g. assignments, examination scripts, in-class activities, projects, presentations, performances, videos, fieldwork, and so on) related to specific PLOs, a combination of the capstone experience and a few courses.
   (b) A copy of the relevant Programme Learning Outcome Assessment Plan (PLOAP) should be attached to this PLOAR.

3. **CETL Support**
   The Centre for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning (CETL) will offer workshop support to programme teams across the University to help them understand the new PLO Achievement Scheme. Workshops will take the form of:
   (a) Introductory sessions in AY2017-2018 on the new documentary requirements in relation to the PLO Achievement Scheme (PLOAPs and PLOARs)
   (b) Tailored workshops thereafter, on request, for Faculties and the Common Core Office to assist them with creating these documents.

CETL Staff Liaison	e-mail address	Faculty
Prof. Grahame T Bilbow	gbilbow@hku.hk	Social Sciences Architecture
Dr Luke Fryer	fryer@hku.hk	Arts Law
Dr Cecilia Chan	cecilia.chan@cetl.hku.hk	Business and Economics Science Engineering
Dr Susan Bridges	sbridges@hku.hk	Education Medicine Dentistry
Dr. Tracy Zou	tracyzou@hku.hku	Common Core Office

_____
* Only externally accredited programmes are exempted from the requirement to create a PLOAR.

References:

"PLO Achievement Portfolio" formulated by Professor Mike Prosser for HKU with reference to international experiences from the accreditation of universities as applied in the USA (Appendix 2.21 of the Institutional Submission to Quality Assurance Council for the 2015 audit at http://intraweb.hku.hk/reserved_1/tlearn/qac2015/HKU-IS_2015(internal).pdf)

Electronic resource on "Outcome-based approaches to student learning" by CETL of HKU at http://www.cetl.hku.hk/obasl/

"Guidelines for Developing and Assessing Student Learning Outcomes for Undergraduate Majors" by UCLA at http://www.learningoutcomes.ucla.edu/docs/UCLAGuidelines2015UpdateNotations.pdf

"Developing a Programme Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan" by Hong Kong Polytechnic University at https://www.polyu.edu.hk/obe/07_4_files/PolyU_PLOAP_Guide.pdf

November 28, 2017

THE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG

Professional Activities Related to Internationalisation at Home

I. Workshops, Seminars and Events

Workshops and Seminars
CETL organised two workshops with the Centre for Applied English Studies (CAES) and the Common Core Office on designing intercultural groupwork (with over 70 participants). The input collected from participants at the workshops and the literature review resulted in a two-page guideline on effective intercultural groupwork to be disseminated to colleagues in HKU in 2017-18. A briefing note consisting of the guideline and case examples from HKU and beyond will also be published and circulated in 2017-18.

Details of the two workshops are as follows:

Date	Title of workshop	Facilitators	No. of participants
May 10, 2017	Designing Effective Intercultural Groupwork in CAES	3 facilitators (All HKU teachers)	50
May 15, 2017	What Works? Intercultural Groupwork in the Common Core	2 facilitators (Both HKU teachers)	23

Join-the-Conversation Events
Join-the-Conversation events (JTCs) facilitate a cross-disciplinary dialogue on teaching and learning enhancement and are generally well received. Five JTCs focused on internationalisation at home were organised from January to December 2016:

January 29, 2016	Join-the-Conversation: Learning Benefits of Internationalisation	3 panelists (2 HKU teachers and 1 academic staff) 3 discussants (2 HKU teachers and Professor Dai Hounsell, Professor Emeritus, University of Edinburgh)	32

March 22, 2016	Join-the-Conversation: Curriculum Internationalisation in the Common Core	4 panelists and 3 discussants (All HKU teachers)	28
April 20, 2016	Join-the-Conversation: Enriching International Learning Experiences in your Course: What can Digital and Virtual Learning do for you?	1 panelist and 1 discussant (Both HKU teachers)	48
June 8, 2016	Join-the-Conversation: Assessment and Feedback in Experiential Learning	3 panelists (1 HKU teacher and 2 academic staff) 3 discussants (All HKU teachers)	47
June 24, 2016	Join-the-Conversation: Community of Practice – Aspects of Internationalisation	3 panelists (1 HKU teacher, Prof. Betty Leask, Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning), La Trobe University, and Dr. Steve Woodfield, Associate Professor, Kingston University London) 3 discussants (2 HKU teachers and Prof. Dai Hounsell, Professor Emeritus, University of Edinburgh)	71

For 2017-18, four JTCs (one each quarter) are planned on the theme of internationalisation of teaching and learning through a UGC-funded project (2016-19) on internationalising teaching and learning. Other JTCs are also possible based on emergent topics.

II.   **CETL Newsletter: Teaching and Learning Connections**

The *Teaching and Learning Connections* newsletter provides another channel to disseminate good teaching and learning practices, in addition to the many other

opportunities CETL provides, such as programmes, workshops and seminars. Since January 2016, five issues of *Teaching and Learning Connections* have been published. Internationalisation at home is the theme of Issue 3 in 2016. This e-newsletter can be accessed at http://www.cetl.hku.hk/teaching-learning-cop/issue-03/.

III.   Briefings and other online resources

CETL has created an online resource that supports community of practice engagement with academic staff across HKU. Discussions about internationalisation of teaching and learning are hosted, and a number of briefings stimulate discussion. The resources created by the Centre in terms of internationalisation can be accessed at http://www.cetl.hku.hk/teaching-learning-cop/internationalisation-tl/

Some online support is also provided for enhancing the integration of local, mainland and international students, which can be accessed here: http://www.cetl.hku.hk/engaging-local-and-non-local-students/

IV.   Teaching and Learning Research Projects

Teaching Development Grant Project
An 18-month project entitled "Enhancing Meaningful Intercultural Interactions among Local and Non-local Students in Classroom" funded by the Teaching Development Grant started in September 2017. This collaborative project is being undertaken by Dr. Tracy Zou and Prof. Grahame Bilbow from CETL and Associate Deans (Teaching and Learning) from four Faculties - Architecture, Law, Science and Social Sciences, with the aim of collecting good practices and formulating new strategies for enhancing intercultural interactions in classroom settings.

Large scale UGC-funded Teaching and Learning Project
A three-year UGC-funded project, entitled "Internationalising Teaching and Learning in Hong Kong Higher Education through Building Professional Capacity", started in July 2017. This collaborative project is being undertaken by Dr. Tracy Zou, Prof. Grahame Bilbow, and Dr. Susan Bridges from CETL, and colleagues from HKU, HKUST, HKBU and Shanghai Jiao Tong University. This cross-institutional project (HKD 3.6m) will facilitate internationalisation of teaching and learning through a community of practice approach. The themes cover developing students' global citizenship and intercultural competence, leveraging diversity in teaching and learning, designing and supporting student mobility and study abroad programmes, and inter-institutional collaboration and virtual mobility.

The Diastemas Project
The new Diastemas platform (funded by Universitas 21 and HKU, and now published on open access (Github) as a joint HKU-UBC technology transfer initiative), is now being used by the Faculties of Dentistry and Education at HKU to support internationalisation at home, engaging undergraduates with curriculum content in an international peer review environment.

V.   **Student Vox Pop Video**

CETL has been active in seeking student feedback on the international learning experience they have at HKU, and produced a 'vox pop' video (currently under evaluation).

CETL
October 2017

THE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG

Guidelines for review of undergraduate curricula

For quality assurance and enhancement purposes, curriculum reviews for undergraduate (Ug) curricula are conducted on a six-year cycle with external input for international benchmarking of academic standards. This document serves as general guidelines for conducting curriculum reviews for Ug curricula. Individual curricula can draw up guidelines over and above those outlined in this document to suit specific needs of the disciplines and professions.

I.   **Enhancement-led approach**

2.   The rationale for curriculum reviews is that, through self-reflection and peer review, it will be possible to identify strengths which can be built upon and aspects that can be improved. The aim is to encourage evidence-based reflection and to foster a culture of continuous improvement.

3.   The curriculum team is expected to reflect upon their degree curriculum and to produce a self-evaluation document, which draws upon evaluation evidence to identify the strengths of their curriculum and actions which might be taken to enhance it.

4.   The process of reflection is aided by peer review conducted by a review panel which consists of internal and external members of the University. The role of the panel is to examine the relevant documentation, to hold discussions with the curriculum team and to help the curriculum team to identify areas of strength and weaknesses. The process of peer review is intended to be collegial rather than adversarial, and the ultimate goal is enhancement of the curriculum.

5.   Reviews and audits commonly take an approach of 'fitness for purpose'. All curricula and programmes adopt an outcomes-based approach to student learning (OBASL), with clearly defined Programme Learning Outcomes that are aligned with the University's Educational Aims and individual Course Learning Outcomes. The task, for both the self-evaluation document and the peer review process, is to examine elements of the curriculum for consistency and/or alignment with the intended learning outcomes at various levels for the purposes of benchmarking against comparable curricula offered by top international universities, and more generally to consider improvements to the structure and content of the curriculum. The achievement of optimal consistency of curriculum elements maximises the chances of students achieving the desired outcomes.

6.   Throughout this document the following set of six elements of a curriculum will be referred to.

- Aim of curriculum and alignment with University vision and mission (*aims*)
- Learning outcomes and alignment with University educational aims (*learning outcomes*)
- Overall curriculum design and underlying principles (*curriculum design and clarity of structure*)
- Content as manifested in courses covered (*content*)

- Pedagogy, including approach and methods of teaching and learning, learning activities and experiences, and the underlying rationale (*pedagogy*)
- Assessment, including assessment modes, practices and standards (*assessment*).

II.   The review process

7.   A typical review process should consist of the following:

- Nomination of review panel (see section VII)

- Submission by curriculum team of self-evaluation document (see section VIII)

- Meetings between the review panel and staff, students and graduates of the curriculum (see section IX)

- Production of report by review panel (see section X)

- Briefing meeting between representative(s) of review panel and curriculum team to discuss the recommendations of the review panel and to hold preliminary discussions of an action plan by the curriculum team in response to the recommendations (see section XI)

- Production of response and action plan by the curriculum team (see section XIII)

- Discussion and endorsement of action plan by the Faculty Board via FTLQC and the Teaching and Learning Quality Committee (TLQC) (see section XV)

- Progress report produced by curriculum team (see section XIV)

- Monitoring of progress by Faculty Board via FTLQC and TLQC (see section XV).

III.   Responsible body

8.   Reviews of Ug curricula are conducted under the auspices of the TLQC.

IV.   Coordination between external and internal reviews

9.   If a curriculum is already subject to external review, such as for accreditation, the accreditation exercise will be accepted as meeting University requirements *provided that the external review covers all aspects of curriculum reviews required by the University.* Should there be aspects not covered, a smaller scale internal review that supplements the accreditation review will be conducted to fill the gaps.   External members may be involved on the basis of need.

10.   Relevant Faculties should present the case to the TLQC providing evidence for the aspects covered in the external review for consideration by the TLQC.   The Faculty should submit a copy of the external review/accreditation report to the Chairman of the TLQC for reference and record.

11.   Both external and internal reviews are expected to make full use of the evaluation data available within the University.

V. Unit for review

12.   The unit for review will normally be a curriculum leading to the award of an undergraduate degree, or a double/joint/off-campus degree.   Flexibility may be allowed, upon mutual agreement between the Faculty and the TLQC, so as to cater for individual curriculum/programme needs.

VI. Frequency and timing

13.   Each curriculum should be reviewed at least once every six years.   New curricula should be reviewed within three years of the first cohort completing the curriculum. Thereafter reviews should take place within a cycle of six years or less.

VII. Review panel

14.   For each curriculum review, the TLQC will set up a review panel comprising at least three members, including a senior professoriate staff from a cognate discipline, a member of the TLQC nominated by the Chairman and a member external to the University normally at the rank of Professor in the relevant discipline.   The TLQC Chairman will appoint one of the two internal members as Chairman.   The relevant Faculty will be invited to give a few nominations for the external member, who should not be a recent external examiner for the curriculum, for consideration by the Chairman of the TLQC. The Faculty should be responsible for the logistical arrangements for the visit of the external member, and extending hospitality to him/her during his/her visit.   The size of the panel may increase, as necessary, to cater for multi-disciplinary curricula and sub-panels may be set up to focus on different disciplines within a curriculum.   All panel members should be independent of the curriculum under review and they are required to declare possible conflict of interest, if any, before the review.

VIII. Self-evaluation document

15.   A self-evaluation document will be prepared by the curriculum team following the guidelines in this section.   The self-evaluation document should show evidence of self-reflection by the curriculum team. The panel will review whether the curriculum team is capable of utilising evaluation evidence to identify strengths to build upon and aspects for improvement.   A template is provided at Appendix A.

Aspects of teaching and learning

16.   The self-evaluation document should have specific sections which address each of the six elements of teaching and learning:

- Aims
- Learning outcomes
- Curriculum design
- Content
- Pedagogy
- Assessment

Evidence and use of evidence

17.   Evidence to support statements of self-evaluation should cover the full length of the curriculum, e.g. four years for standard four-year curricula.   The sources from which evidence is normally expected to be cited are listed below.   Further evidence from outside these sources should also be cited, if available.   How the curriculum team has made use of the evidence to strengthen the curriculum should also be addressed.

- Student intake quality and enrolments by major discipline and by year of study
- Student evaluation of teaching and learning (SETL) data, in an appropriate aggregated form
- Outcomes of staff-student consultative committee meetings
- Curriculum-level questionnaire (SLEQ(Ug))
- Other qualitative feedback from students
- External examiners' reports
- Student awards and scholarships and other recognition and evidence of student achievements
- Graduate surveys and other forms of feedback from graduates
- Employer surveys and other forms of feedback from external stakeholders

18.   Results of these forms of evaluation are normally included in the self-evaluation document as appendices.   The sections of the document for the elements of teaching and learning, referred to in paragraph 16, can make reference to appropriate evidence within these appendices.

Reflection and action plan

19.   For each section referring to the six curriculum elements, the self-evaluation document should include the reflections of the curriculum team on the strengths of the curriculum and its achievements, and areas for improvement.   The conclusion of the document should be an action plan to address these areas with a timeframe, and a summary of the team's evaluation of the achievement of the Programme Learning Outcomes.

Length of self-evaluation document

20.   Self-evaluation documents should be succinct and concise but informative.   The main text of the submission should normally not exceed 6,000 words, not including appendices which should mainly be relevant evaluation evidence.   Flexibility can be allowed as needs arise corresponding to the number of disciplines in a curriculum, in consultation with the Chairman of the TLQC.

Timeline for production of self-evaluation document

21.   The self-evaluation document, in hard and soft copy, should be sent to the Curriculum Development and Quality Assurance Section of the Registry at least one month prior to the review meetings. The document will then be forwarded to the review panel, who may request additional information from the curriculum team, if they deem necessary.

IX.   Review meetings

22.   As part of the review process, arrangements will be made for the review panel to meet with the following personnel related to the curriculum under review:

- curriculum directors, course coordinators and teaching staff
- students
- alumni
- external stakeholders including employers, where possible and appropriate

23.   The meetings with students and alumni serve to provide an opportunity for current and past students to be actively involved in the review and to provide additional feedback which provides greater insights to the panel.

24.   The meetings with teachers are expected to conform to the principles of peer review, that is, being collegial and enhancement-led.   They provide an opportunity for the review panel to seek clarification on the self-evaluation document and to explore and discuss with teachers strengths which might be built upon and potential improvements.

25.   In addition to the meetings listed above, the review panel normally holds two meetings on their own.   The first is an initial meeting to decide on areas of questioning and further information to be sought, and possibly potential improvements that the panel wish to explore with teaching staff.   The second is a meeting to discuss the report of the review panel. As external members often leave shortly after the meetings, it would be desirable for a draft of the main points to be included in the report.   Secretarial assistance will be provided to review panels by the Curriculum Development and Quality Assurance Section of the Registry, subject to availability of resources.

X.   Report from review panel

26.   The review panel will report their conclusions on identified strengths and recommendations in a short report.   The report will normally contain sections dealing with each of the six curriculum elements below and may also include sections dealing with other relevant aspects.

- Aims
- Learning outcomes
- Curriculum design
- Content
- Pedagogy
- Assessment

27.   The review panel will be expected to report their conclusions with the following specifications:

Commendations indicate strengths or examples of good practice.

Affirmations recognise improvements in train or proposed in the action plan, arising from the reflection by the curriculum team.

Recommendations indicate improvements that are expected to be made.

Areas for consideration indicate issues which are somewhat equivocal, possibly because the review panel may be uncertain of their feasibility or whether alternative actions may be more effective. This section is optional.

Review panels are not normally expected to make recommendations concerning resource allocation.

28. A template for the report of the review panel is at <u>Appendix B</u>.

XI. Briefing for curriculum team

29. A briefing meeting is normally held between one or more members of the review panel and the curriculum team to provide an opportunity for:

- the review panel to elaborate on its recommendations
- the curriculum team to seek clarification where necessary
- the curriculum team to raise any difficulties they might have in meeting any recommendations, or to suggest any alternative strategies
- a discussion of the formulation of an action plan.

XII. Submission of report

30. The review report, endorsed by the review panel, should be sent to the curriculum team.

31. The curriculum team may be given a period of up to two weeks to suggest any factual corrections. It should be stressed that their input at this stage is strictly limited to suggesting factual corrections and not commenting on recommendations.

XIII. Action plan

32. The curriculum team will be expected to respond within two months to the report with a revised action plan to address the areas of strength and improvement identified by the review panel (see template at <u>Appendix C</u>). The action plan, with clear deliverables and implementation timeline, will be expected to make specific responses which address in turn each of the affirmations, recommendations, and areas for consideration, if applicable, of the review panel.

XIV. Implementation

33. Implementation of the revised action plan should be monitored through triennial progress reports. These progress reports should be short reports detailing progress on each action item included in the action plan.

XV. Monitoring

34. For monitoring purposes, the review reports of Ug curricula and the relevant curriculum team responses, endorsed by the relevant Faculty Boards via their FTLQCs, should be submitted to the TLQC for endorsement. The progress of implementation of the

action plan will be reported to the Faculty Board and the TLQC after three years from the review. The TLQC is the ultimate quality assurance body and is charged with the authority to invite Faculties to clarify progress (or the lack of progress) made in action plans.

XVI. Timetable

35. The following is an indicative timetable for the main steps in the review process. The times for the stages are shown relative to the review meetings (R).

R－semester	Nomination of review panel
R－1 month	Submission by curriculum team of self-evaluation document
R	Meetings between the review panel and staff, students and graduates of programme
R + 5 weeks	Production of report by review panel
R + 7 weeks	Opportunity for curriculum team to point out factual errors in report
R + 2 months	Meeting between representative(s) of review panel and curriculum team to discuss the recommendations of the review panel and to hold preliminary discussions of an action plan by the curriculum team in response to the recommendations, if necessary
R + 4 months	Production of response and action plan by the curriculum team
Scheduled meeting following submission	Receipt and discussion of action plan by Faculty Board via FTLQC
R+6 months	Discussion and endorsement of action by TLQC
R + 3 years	Progress report produced by curriculum team
Scheduled meeting following submission	Monitoring of progress by Faculty Board via FTLQC
R+3.5 years	Monitoring of progress by TLQC
R + 6 years	Subsequent review cycle

XVII. Focused Review

36. Common learning experiences are provided to all HKU undergraduates throughout their University studies so as to enable them to acquire common attributes that they are expected to have acquired upon graduation. These experiences are designed to develop students' generic and intellectual capabilities, and to cultivate the core moral values and dispositions essential to become engaged global citizens. The TLQC has conducted

focused reviews of these key components since 2014-15, including Common Core Curriculum, First year experience and academic induction, Global learning experience, English language enhancement courses and Experiential learning. Focused reviews of Capstone experience and Enabling curriculum structure have been scheduled for 2016-17. The purpose of these "focused reviews" is to check whether there are any mismatches between the intended curriculum and the enacted curriculum, and the modifications that need to be made to address the gaps.   These reviews will necessarily vary somewhat in the review procedures as well as in scale, and will be centrally co-ordinated as they cut across all undergraduate curricula.   Further focused reviews may be conducted by the TLQC, as it deems necessary.

XVIII. Review of review processes

37.   Upon completing the first cycle of reviews in 2020-21, the review process itself will be reviewed under the auspices of the TLQC. The review will consider the effectiveness of the overall requirement to review curricula and that of the review procedures and the accompanying evaluation processes.

2 March 2009
Amended   September 2009
               August 2015
               September 2016

Template for self-evaluation document

Table of contents

Brief overview of programme

Aims

For this and the following five sections, the curriculum team records its reflections on the curriculum element. Statements need to be backed by evidence cross-referenced to the appendices.

Learning outcomes

Curriculum design

Content

Pedagogy

Assessment

Please make reference to the University Assessment Policy
(http://intraweb.hku.hk/reserved_1/cdqa/doc/University_Assessment_Policy.pdf)

Conclusion and action plan

This section should include an overall evaluation of the achievement of Programme Learning Outcomes.

Appendices

Please attach copies of the evidence listed in paragraph 17 of the guidelines.

Template for report of review panel

Introductory overview

General comments on standards, quality and commitment of staff.

Aims

For this and the following five sections the review panel will explain its conclusions. Where appropriate commendations, affirmations, areas for consideration and recommendations will be indicated and numbered e.g. (commendation 1), (affirmation 1), (areas for consideration 1) and (recommendation 1) etc.

Learning outcomes

Curriculum design

Content

Pedagogy

Assessment

Conclusion

Summary of commendations

1.

2.

Summary of affirmations

1.

2.

Summary of areas for consideration

1.

2.

Summary of recommendations

1.

2.

The Review Report should be signed and endorsed via circulation by the Review Panel.

Template for Action Plan

Ref	Review findings	Actions	Expected deliverables	Timeline
A1.				
A2.				
...				
AC1.				
AC2.				
...				
R1				
R2				
...				

THE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG

Guidelines for review of taught postgraduate curricula

For quality assurance and enhancement purposes, curriculum reviews for taught postgraduate (TPg) curricula are conducted on a six-year cycle with external input for international benchmarking of academic standards.   This document serves as general guidelines for conducting curriculum reviews for TPg curricula.   Individual curricula can draw up guidelines over and above those outlined in this document to suit specific needs of the disciplines and professions.

I.   Enhancement-led approach

2.   The rationale for curriculum reviews is that, through self-reflection and peer review, it will be possible to identify strengths that can be built upon and aspects that can be improved.   The aim is to encourage evidence-based reflection and to foster a culture of continuous improvement.

3.   The curriculum team is expected to reflect upon their degree curriculum and to produce a self-evaluation document, which draws upon evaluation evidence to identify the strengths of their curriculum and actions which might be taken to enhance it.

4.   The process of reflection is aided by peer review conducted by a review panel which consists of internal and external members of the University.   The role of the panel is to examine the relevant documentation, to hold discussions with the curriculum team and to help the team to identify areas of strength and weaknesses.   The process of peer review is intended to be collegial rather than adversarial, and the ultimate goal is enhancement of the curriculum.

5.   Reviews and audits commonly take an approach of 'fitness for purpose'.   All curricula and programmes adopt an outcomes-based approach to student learning (OBASL), with clearly defined Programme Learning Outcomes that are aligned with the University's Educational Aims and individual Course Learning Outcomes.   The task, for both the self-evaluation document and the peer review process, is to examine elements of the curriculum for consistency and/or alignment with the intended learning outcomes at various levels for the purposes of benchmarking against comparable curricula offered by top international universities, and more generally to consider improvements to the structure and content of the curriculum.   The achievement of optimal consistency of curriculum elements maximises the chances of students achieving the desired outcomes.

6.   Throughout this document the following set of six elements of a curriculum will be referred to.

- Aim of curriculum and alignment with University vision and mission (*aims*)
- Learning outcomes and alignment with University educational aims (*learning outcomes*)
- Overall curriculum design and underlying principles (*curriculum design*)
- Content as manifested in courses covered (*content*)

- Pedagogy, including approach and methods of teaching and learning, learning activities and experiences, and the underlying rationale (*pedagogy*)
- Assessment, including assessment modes, practices and standards (*assessment*).

7.   The guidelines in this document have been drawn up to ensure that standards of good practice are met throughout the University.   These guidelines are flexible enough to allow each Faculty to operationalise them in a manner which suits the specific needs of disciplines and professions.

II.   The review process

8.   A typical review process should consist of the following:

- Nomination of review panel (see section VII)

- Submission by curriculum team of self-evaluation document (see section VIII)

- Meetings between the review panel and staff, students and graduates of the curriculum (see section IX)

- Production of report by review panel (see section X)

- Briefing meeting between representative(s) of review panel and curriculum team to discuss the recommendations of the review panel and to hold preliminary discussions of an action plan by the curriculum team in response to the recommendations (see section XI)

- Production of response and action plan by the curriculum team (see section XIII)

- Discussion and endorsement of action plan by the Faculty Board via FTLQC and   the Teaching and Learning Quality Committee (TLQC) (see section XV)

- Progress report produced by curriculum team (see section XIV)

- Monitoring of progress by the Faculty Board via FTLQC and TLQC (see section XV).

III.   Responsible body

9.   Reviews of TPg curricula are undertaken by Faculties, under the auspices of the Faculty Board.

10.   Faculties should indicate how they wish to conduct the review of the various TPg curricula on offer, with justification, for endorsement by the TLQC.   A tentative schedule for review should be provided to the TLQC at the beginning of each cycle. The proposed arrangements for each review, including the review timeline (c.f. Section XVI), the review panel and a tentative review programme, should be presented to the TLQC two months before the scheduled review meetings for endorsement.

IV. Coordination between external and internal reviews

11.   If a curriculum is already subject to external review, such as for accreditation, the accreditation exercise will be accepted as meeting University requirements *provided that the external review covers all aspects of curriculum review required by the University*. Should there be aspects not covered, a smaller scale internal review that supplements the accreditation review will be conducted to fill the gaps.   External members may be involved on the basis of need.

12.   Relevant Faculties should present the case to the TLQC providing evidence for the aspects covered in the external review for consideration by the TLQC.   The Faculty should submit a copy of the external review/accreditation report, to the Chairman of the TLQC for reference and record.

13.   Both external and internal reviews are expected to make full use of the evaluation data available within the University.

V. Unit for review

14.   The unit for review will normally be a curriculum leading to the award of a single/joint/off-campus degree or a professional or academic qualification.   Combining more than one award in a review is permissible and may well be desirable for TPg programmes in related subjects or when awards are articulated.

VI. Frequency and timing

15.   Each curriculum should be reviewed at least once every six years.   The cycle may be reduced to suit accreditation requirements.   New curricula should be reviewed within three years of the first cohort completing the curriculum.   Thereafter reviews should take place within a cycle of six years or less.

16.   Faculties will be expected to submit a timetable for TPg curriculum reviews normally occurring within a six year cycle.   The length of the cycle may be modified with justification, such as to coincide with external examiners' visit or external accreditation schedule.

VII. Review panel

17.   For each curriculum review, the Faculty should constitute a review panel comprising at least three members, including a member external to the University who is normally at the rank of Professor in the relevant discipline but not a recent external examiner for the curriculum.   The panel chairman should be a senior professoriate staff from a cognate discipline.   There can be flexibility in the composition of the review panel to reflect the enrolment size and the nature of the discipline/profession.   All panel members should be independent of the curriculum under review and they are required to declare possible conflict of interest, if any, before the review.   The Faculty Board will be responsible for the appointment of panel members and the chairman of the panel.

VIII. Self-evaluation document

18.   A self-evaluation document will be prepared by the curriculum team following the guidelines in this section.   The self-evaluation document should show evidence of self-reflection by the curriculum team. The panel will review whether the curriculum team is capable of utilising evaluation evidence to identify strengths to build upon and aspects for improvement. A template is provided at Appendix A.

Aspects of teaching and learning

19.   The self-evaluation document should have specific sections which address each of the six elements of teaching and learning:

- Aims
- Learning outcomes
- Curriculum design
- Content
- Pedagogy
- Assessment

Evidence and use of evidence

20.   Evidence to support statements of self-evaluation should cover the full length of the curriculum.   The sources from which evidence is normally expected to be cited are listed below.   Further evidence from outside these sources should also be cited, if available.   How the curriculum team has made use of the evidence to strengthen the curriculum should also be addressed.

- Student intake quality and enrolments by specialisation (if applicable) and by year of study
- Student evaluation of teaching and learning (SETL) data, in an appropriate aggregated form
- Outcomes of staff-student consultative committee meetings
- Curriculum-level questionnaire (SLEQ(TPg))
- Other qualitative feedback from students
- External examiners' reports
- Student awards and scholarships and other recognition and evidence of student achievements
- Graduate surveys and other forms of feedback from graduates
- Employer surveys and other forms of feedback from external stakeholders

21.   Results of these forms of evaluation are normally included in the self-evaluation document as appendices. The sections of the document on the elements of teaching and learning, listed in paragraph 20, can make reference to appropriate evidence within these appendices.

Reflection and action plan

22.   For each section referring to the six curriculum elements, the self-evaluation document should include the reflections of the curriculum team on the strengths of the curriculum and its achievements, and areas for improvement.   The conclusion of the

document should be an action plan to address these areas within a specified timeframe, and a summary of the team's evaluation of the achievement of the Programme Learning Outcomes.

Length of self-evaluation document

23.	Self-evaluation documents should be succinct and concise but informative. The main text of the submission should normally not exceed 6,000 words, not including appendices which should mainly be relevant evaluation evidence. Flexibility can be allowed as needs arise corresponding to the number of disciplines in a curriculum, in consultation with the Chairman of the TLQC.

Timeline for production of self-evaluation document

24.	The self-evaluation document, in hard and soft copy, should be sent to the Faculty Office, at least one month prior to the review meetings. The document will then be forwarded to the review panel, who may request additional information from the curriculum team, if they deem necessary.

## IX.	Review meetings

25.	As part of the review process, arrangements will be made for the review panel to meet with the following personnel related to the curriculum under review:

- curriculum directors, course coordinators and teaching staff
- students
- alumni
- external stakeholders including employers, where possible and appropriate.

26.	The meetings with students and alumni serve to provide an opportunity for current and past students to be actively involved in the review and to provide additional feedback to enable the panel to gain further insights about the curriculum under review.

27.	The meetings with teachers are expected to conform to the principles of peer review, that is, being collegial and enhancement-led. They provide an opportunity for the review panel to seek clarification on the self-evaluation document and to explore and discuss with teachers strengths which might be built upon and potential improvements.

28.	In addition to the meetings listed above, the review panel normally holds two meetings on their own. The first is an initial meeting to decide on areas of questioning and further information to be sought, and possibly potential improvements that the panel wish to explore with teaching staff. The second is a meeting to discuss the report of the review panel. As external members often leave shortly after the meetings, it would be desirable for a draft of the main points to be included in the report. Secretarial assistance is normally provided by the Faculty to a review panel.

## X.	Report from review panel

29.	The review panel will report their conclusions on identified strengths and recommendations in a short report. The report will normally contain sections dealing

with each of the six curriculum elements below and may also include sections dealing with other relevant aspects.

- Aims
- Learning outcomes
- Curriculum design
- Content
- Pedagogy
- Assessment

30.   The review panel will be expected to report their conclusions with the following specifications:

Commendations indicate strengths or examples of good practice.

Affirmations recognise improvements in train or proposed in the action plan, arising from the reflection by the curriculum team.

Recommendations indicate improvements that are expected to be made.

Areas for consideration indicate issues which are somewhat equivocal, possibly because the review panel may be uncertain of their feasibility or whether alternative actions may be more effective.   This section is optional.

31.   Review panels are not normally expected to make recommendations concerning resource allocation.   However, the deliberations of the panel need to be cognizant of the fact that most TPg programmes are self-financing and that enrolments tend to be market-driven.

32.   A template for the report of the review panel is at <u>Appendix B</u>.

XI.   Briefing for curriculum team

33.   A briefing meeting is normally held between one or more members of the review panel and the curriculum team to provide an opportunity for:

- the review panel to elaborate on its recommendations

- the curriculum team to seek clarification where necessary

- the curriculum team to raise any difficulties they might have in meeting any recommendations, or to suggest any alternative strategies

- a discussion of the formulation of an action plan.

XII.   Submission of report

34.   The review report, endorsed by the review panel, should be sent to the curriculum team.

35.   The curriculum team may be given a period of up to two weeks to suggest any factual corrections.   It should be stressed that their input at this stage is strictly limited to suggesting factual corrections and not commenting on recommendations.

XIII. Action plan

36. The curriculum team will be expected to respond within two months to the report with a revised action plan to address the areas of strength and improvement identified by the review panel (see template at Appendix C). The action plan, with clear deliverables and implementation timeline, will be expected to make specific responses which address in turn each of the affirmations, recommendations, and areas for consideration, if applicable, of the review panel.

XIV. Implementation

37. Implementation of the revised action plan should be monitored through triennial progress reports. These progress reports should be short reports detailing progress on each action item included in the action plan.

38. Faculties will be invited to draw up a timeline for conducting reviews of their TPg curricula and for submitting monitoring progress.

XV. Monitoring

39. For TPg curricula, the review reports and curriculum teams' responses should be submitted to Faculty Board via FTLQC and TLQC for endorsement. The progress of implementation of the action plan will be reported to the Faculty Board and the TLQC after three years from the review. The TLQC is the ultimate quality assurance body and is charged with the authority to invite Faculties to clarify progress (or the lack of progress) made in action plans.

XVI. Timetable

40. The following is an indicative timetable for the main steps in the review process. Faculties may wish to set specific time limits for stages. The times for the stages are shown relative to the review meetings (R).

R − semester	Nomination of review panel
R − 1 month	Submission by curriculum team of self-evaluation document
R	Meetings between the review panel and staff, students and graduates of programme
R + 5 weeks	Production of report by review panel
R + 7 weeks	Opportunity for curriculum team to point out factual errors in report
R + 2 months	Meeting between representative(s) of review panel and curriculum team to discuss the recommendations of the review panel and to hold preliminary discussions of an action plan by the curriculum team in response to the recommendations, if necessary
R + 4 months	Production of response and revised action plan by the curriculum

	team
Scheduled meeting following submission	Receipt and discussion of revised action plan by Faculty Board via FTLQC
R + 6 months	Discussion of the report and endorsement of action by TLQC
R + 3 years	Progress report produced by curriculum team
Scheduled meeting following submission	Monitoring of progress by Faculty Board via FTLQC
R + 3.5 years	Monitoring of progress by TLQC
R + 6 years	Subsequent review cycle

XVII. Review of review processes

41.   After a complete cycle of TPg reviews, the review process itself will be reviewed under the auspices of the TLQC.   The review will consider:

- the effectiveness of each Faculty's procedures and the accompanying evaluation process

- the effectiveness of the overall requirement to review curricula.

2 March 2009
Amended   September 2009
                September 2016

Template for self-evaluation document

Table of contents

Brief overview of programme

Aims

For this and the following five sections, the curriculum team records its reflections on the curriculum element. Statements need to be backed by evidence cross-referenced to the appendices.

Learning outcomes

Curriculum design

Content

Pedagogy

Assessment

Please make reference to the University Assessment Policy
(http://intraweb.hku.hk/reserved_1/cdqa/doc/University_Assessment_Policy.pdf)

Conclusion and action plan

This section should include an overall evaluation of the achievement of Programme Learning Outcomes.

Appendices

Please attach copies of the evidence listed in paragraph 20 of the guidelines.

Template for report of review panel

Introductory overview

General comments on standards, quality and commitment of staff.

Aims

For this and the following five sections the review panel will explain its conclusions. Where appropriate commendations, affirmations, areas for consideration and recommendations will be indicated and numbered e.g. (commendation 1), (affirmation 1), (areas for consideration 1) and (recommendation 1) etc.

Learning outcomes

Curriculum design

Content

Pedagogy

Assessment

Conclusion

Summary of commendations

1.

2.

Summary of affirmations

1.

2.

Summary of areas for consideration

1.

2.

Summary of recommendations

1.

2.

The Review Report should be signed and endorsed via circulation by the Review Panel.

Template for Action Plan

Ref	Review findings	Actions	Expected deliverables	Timeline
A1.				
A2.				
...				
AC1.				
AC2.				
...				
R1				
R2				
...				

THE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG

Achievement Card of Research Postgraduate Students

Why do we need an Achievement Card (AC)?
This is part of the mechanism for quality assurance of teaching and learning of the Research Postgraduate Programme at the University. The setup of the AC is a response to address comments from the QAC audit panel. It is intended to inform the University of the areas in which RPg students are doing well and those in which they may need improvement.

Supervisors and their RPg students are encouraged to discuss the educational aims and learning outcomes at the beginning of the study period. The AC, which is formative in nature and **not** a form of assessment, will help to document to what extent the RPg students have achieved the intended learning outcomes/educational aims over the course of their study period. It is important to note that achievement of all the education aims as indicated by the RPg and his/her supervisor does not warrant passing of the thesis examination.

What is in the AC?
The eight educational aims and the corresponding institutional learning outcomes, all of which are expected to be achieved within an RPg student's study period, are listed in the AC. Supervisors and their RPg students will together determine whether each of the educational aims (as well as the corresponding learning outcomes) is **discussed** (i.e. *both the supervisors and RPg students having discussed the item and developed an awareness of the expectations or targets to be achieved at a later stage*), **achieved**, or **not applicable** in terms of the students' research progress at the time of completing the AC. If the option of "Achieved" is chosen, an estimated percentage achieved for that EA/ILO (%) and relevant evidence (*as exemplified by the suggested methods of measuring each learning outcome under the bulleted points in the AC*) are expected to be provided.

When will the supervisor and his/her RPgs complete the AC over the course of the study period?
The AC is to be completed twice for MPhil students and three times for PhD students, and the timeframe for completion is shown below:

	MPhil programmes	**3-yr PhD programmes**	**4-yr PhD programmes**
Phase 1	*3 months prior to confirmation*	*by Year 1*	*by Year 1*
Phase 2	*within the last 3 months of the final year*	*by Year 2*	*Year 2 – by the end of Year 3*
Phase 3	*/*	*within the last 6 months of the final year*	*within the last 6 months of the final year*

How long does the completion of the AC take?
The supervisor and the RPg student will together agree on the options for the listed items in the AC. The AC will take about 20 to 30 minutes to complete.

What will happen to the data in the AC?
The DRPC will review the data contained in the AC and submit reports to the FHDC for consideration. The FHDC will then consider all reports from the DPRC and submit summaries of reports to the Board of Graduate Studies.

Graduate School
July 19, 2017

ACHIEVEMENT CARD

Documenting Attainment of RPG Educational Aims and Institutional Learning Outcomes

Faculty: **Department/ Centre/ Division**:

Student number: **Date of registration**:

Time of completing the Achievement Card

MPhil programmes	☐ Phase 1 (i.e. *3 months prior to confirmation*)	☐ Phase 2 (i.e. *within the last 3 months of the final year*)	
3-yr PhD programmes	☐ Phase 1 (i.e. *by Year 1*)	☐ Phase 2 (i.e. *by Year 2*)	☐ Phase 3 (i.e. *within the last 6 months of the final year*)
4-yr PhD programmes	☐ Phase 1 (i.e. *by Year 1*)	☐ Phase 2 (i.e. *Year 2 – by the end of Year 3*)	☐ Phase 3 (i.e. *within the last 6 months of the final year*)

Educational Aims and Institutional Learning Outcomes (*with suggested methods of measuring each learning outcome in italics*)	Discussed	Achieved (with an estimated percentage achieved and with evidence)	Not Applicable at the Current Stage
(a) Engage in critical intellectual enquiry • Critically evaluate information and ideas received from multiple perspectives *e.g. Complete a thorough and critical (publishable) literature review for the thesis* • Integrate knowledge at the forefront of a particular field *e.g. Design a study for the thesis that applies existing theoretical knowledge to new areas in the field*	☐	☐ **Estimated percentage achieved:** _____ **Evidence:**	☐
(b) Demonstrate a thorough understanding of research methodologies and techniques at an advanced level • Develop, design and implement research projects competently and independently *e.g. Develop and conduct a methodologically rigorous study or propose a new conceptual framework*	☐	☐ **Estimated percentage achieved:** _____ **Evidence:**	☐

Educational Aims and Institutional Learning Outcomes (*with suggested methods of measuring each learning outcome in italics*)	Discussed	Achieved (with an estimated percentage achieved and with evidence)	Not Applicable at the Current Stage

(c) Conduct innovative, high-impact and leading edge research
• Engage in original research that takes a new technological, methodological, or theoretical approach
    e.g. Explain the originality and contribution of one's own work in the specific field
    e.g. Carry out research that generates new knowledge leading to further advancement and academic enquiry in the field
	☐	☐
		
		Estimated percentage achieved: _____
		
		Evidence:
			☐

(d) Provide novel solutions to complex problems
• Identify and define emerging problems
    e.g. Formulate feasible research questions to address issues arising from unexplored contexts
• Offer innovative and original solutions to problems and issues in novel situations
    e.g. Make original contributions to the field by developing or modifying theoretical or analytical perspectives
	☐	☐
		
		Estimated percentage achieved: _____
		
		Evidence:
			☐

(e) Demonstrate adherence to personal and professional ethics
• Maintain the highest standards of personal and academic integrity
    e.g. Satisfy all (Institutional + Faculty) ethical research requirements
• Understand complex ethical and professional issues
    e.g. Uphold appropriate ethical research practices and acknowledge attribution & co-authorship accurately in reporting research findings
	☐	☐
		
		Estimated percentage achieved: _____
		
		Evidence:
			☐

Educational Aims and Institutional Learning Outcomes (*with suggested methods of measuring each learning outcome in italics*)	Discussed	Achieved (with an estimated percentage achieved and with evidence)	Not Applicable at the Current Stage
(f) Demonstrate leadership and advocacy skills • Articulate analyses and propose solutions in response to social issues 　*e.g. Relate new information or theoretical perspectives clearly to existing views in the field* • Communicate and disseminate research findings in the form of conference presentation and publication for researchers and other stakeholders in the community 　*e.g. Disseminate research findings in conference presentations and publications for researchers and other stakeholders in the community*	☐	☐ **Estimated percentage achieved: _____** **Evidence:**	☐
(g) Work with others and make constructive contributions • Engage in intellectual exchange with researchers from other disciplines to address important research issues 　*e.g. Maintain a local and/or overseas network(s) of colleagues for the purpose of investigating issues of a research topic (e.g. in a lab, during field-work or in other collaborative research activities)* • Collaborate effectively in researchers from different cultures 　*e.g. Engage in communicating with diverse stakeholders in the discipline & within the wider global academic community through different forms of collaboration*	☐	☐ **Estimated percentage achieved: _____** **Evidence:**	☐
(h) Monitor, review and reflect on one's own work and competencies, and change and adapt in the light of new demands • Evaluate contribution of one's own work to the field 　*e.g. Recognize the strengths and limitations of one's findings to a research area* • Demonstrate flexibility to accommodate new knowledge and perspectives 　*e.g. Adjust one's own research in view of the latest developments in the field*	☐	☐ **Estimated percentage achieved: _____** **Evidence:**	☐

Graduate School
July 19, 2017