THE HONG KONG POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY
香港理工大學

Quality Assurance Council (QAC) Audit of PolyU **2010**

Progress Report

Submitted to

University Grants Committee

December 2012

Abbreviations and Acronyms

AA	Academic Advisor
APC	Academic Planning Committee
APQAC	Academic Planning and Quality Assurance Committee of CPCE
ARBP	Annual Report and Business Plan
CPCE	College of Professional and Continuing Education
DA	Departmental Assessment
DAA	Departmental Academic Advisor
DR	Departmental Review
HKCC	Hong Kong Community College
IELTS	International English Language Testing System
KPI	Key performance indicator
LOAP	Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan
LTC	Learning and Teaching Committee
NAU	Non-academic units
PEC	President's Executive Committee
PI	Performance indicator
PolyU	The Hong Kong Polytechnic University
QA	Quality assurance
QAC	Quality Assurance Council of the University Grants Committee
QAC(AD)	Quality Assurance Committee (Academic Departments)
QAC(NAU)	Quality Assurance Committee (Non-academic Units)
SM	Supplementary Material
SME	Senior Management Executive
SPEED	School of Professional Education and Executive Development
WGOBE	Working Group on Outcome-Based Education

The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

Progress Report on QAC Audit of PolyU

December 2012

Introduction

The Hong Kong Polytechnic University (PolyU) thanks the Quality Assurance Council (QAC) for its audit of the quality of teaching and learning at PolyU. As a university fully committed to providing quality professional education to our students, we are gratified by the Audit Panel's confirmation that we have a long tradition and a strong culture of quality assurance (QA), and that our QA processes are robust and well-embedded. We are particularly pleased by the Panel's conclusion that our professionally-oriented programmes "demonstrate high quality education and benefit the graduates from these programmes".

We believe that the true value of the Audit lies in the opportunity it affords us to critically review our QA practices for continual quality improvement. We are therefore most thankful to the Audit Panel for their expert comments and useful advice, which have stimulated us to re-examine our current policies, procedures, and practices from a fresh perspective, and explore ways to further enhance the quality of student learning. We have taken the Audit findings seriously, and developed action plans to rigorously follow up on the affirmations and recommendations of the Panel. We are pleased to report that significant progress has been made in addressing all of the areas of concern raised by the Panel in the Audit Report.

This progress report is divided into four parts, as follows:

- Summary of progress on addressing QAC's recommendations and affirmations
- Detailed report on progress in addressing QAC's recommendations
- Detailed report on progress in addressing QAC's affirmations
- Supplementary Materials.

Summary of Progress on Addressing QAC's Recommendations and Affirmations

The progress we have made in the 18-month period to address the recommendations and affirmations of the QAC's audit of PolyU is summarised respectively in Tables 1 and 2 below.

Table 1: Summary of progress on addressing QAC's recommendations

	Recommendations	Follow-up Actions
R1	Review role and relationships of University Senate and quality assurance committees in relation to CPCE's Academic Board and quality assurance committee	• A revised governance and QA framework for CPCE approved by Senate in December 2011; implementation arrangements approved by Senate in June 2012 • CPCE Academic Board renamed as CPCE College Board and designated as one of the Boards/Committees of Senate • CPCE Academic Planning and Quality Assurance Committee (APQAC) abolished; responsibilities of the former APQAC transferred to the newly established CPCE College Board and College Learning and Teaching Committee • Academic planning and QA in CPCE to be subject to the oversight of PolyU's Academic Planning Committee (APC) and Quality Assurance Committee (Academic Departments) (QAC(AD))
R2	Further develop and deepen the culture of critical self-review	• Departments to continue to provide a critical self-evaluation of their performance in the annual planning and reporting exercise, and produce a Self-Evaluation Document as basis for the six-yearly Departmental Review (DR) • A proposal to implement an Annual Operation Plan (AOP) system to replace the Annual Business Plan and Annual QA Report systems for academic departments approved by QAC(AD) in November 2012 • The PolyU QA Handbook amended to make it mandatory for departments to include, in the departmental response to the DR Report, improvement plans to follow up on the recommendations of the DR Panel; progress to be monitored by the respective Faculty/School/College Deans

R3	Clarify the roles and responsibilities of the CPCE Council relative to the University Council	• CPCE College Board designated as one of the Boards/Committees of Senate, thereby putting CPCE under direct oversight of the University's Council and Senate
		• Additional members of University Council appointed concurrently as external members of CPCE College Council to establish stronger link and oversight
		• CPCE matters to be included in President's report to University Council as and when appropriate
R4	Develop an institution-wide strategy for benchmarking key aspects of operations, including academic programmes	• Current strategies for benchmarking of academic departments and programmes reinforced by putting greater emphasis on benchmarking in the DR exercise, and making more explicit the criteria for appointment of DAA and selecting partners or cognate programmes for benchmarking purposes
		• Establishment of a new International Advisory Board and Faculty/School Advisory Committees to provide additional mechanisms for benchmarking at the University and faculty/school levels
		• Staff appointment and promotion system revised to require inputs from external referees from renowned overseas institutions to benchmark the quality of academic staff
		• Greater emphasis put on systematic benchmarking of the quality of CPCE programmes and curriculum, with external Academic Advisors appointed to facilitate this
		• Benchmarking of academic support units enhanced by appointment of external experts in the Departmental Assessment (DA) exercise

R5	Review the performance indicators (PIs) currently in use	• New institutional Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan (LOAP) for 2012/13 – 2014/15 approved by Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC) in March 2012
		• A task force set up to review and propose a revised set of PIs for QAC(AD)'s deliberation; the revised set of PIs to be linked appropriately with the evaluation of teaching for the Performance Reward Scheme
		• A revised Annual Report and Business Plan (ARBP) system set up for non-academic units (NAU)
		• All NAUs required to develop an appropriate set of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) that aligns with the University mission and reflects the outcomes and impact of the work expected of the unit
R6	Design and implement a comprehensive, integrated approach to fostering and assessing the achievement of desired graduate attributes	• An Integrated Plan for fostering the development of desired graduate attributes approved by LTC in March 2012 and circulated to departments for reference and action
		• Institutional LOAP for 2012/13 – 2014/15 approved by LTC; much progress made in planning for its implementation
R7	Implement a requirement for external input into the development and approval of all programmes	• External input to programme development and approval already a requirement for all programmes offered by departments at PolyU
		• Requirement for mandatory appointment of an external expert to the validation panel added
		• External input to programme development and approval in CPCE strengthened through involvement of CPCE Advisory Committee and external Academic Advisors in the processes

R8	Ensure reliable and consistent monitoring of equivalence in standards across all programmes and locations	• QA system and processes already in place to ensure and monitor equivalence in standards across all programmes offered (both locally and overseas) by departments at PolyU • CPCE QA framework aligned as fully as possible with the University's generic QA framework to enhance consistency in policies and practices
R9	Explore strategies other than surveys to collect student feedback	• Survey of current PolyU practices and international best practices in collecting student feedback conducted • Open forum organised in May 2012 to foster discussion and share good practices among departments and staff • All departments required to establish a Student-Staff Consultative Group for undergraduate programmes • Guidelines on collecting and using student feedback endorsed by LTC in October 2012 for further dissemination to departments/staff for information and action

Table 2: Summary of progress on QAC's affirmations

	Affirmations	Follow-up Actions
A1	Introduce a new management structure	• New management structure implemented as planned • Working Group set up to review the committee structures of Senate, Committees and Consultative/Advisory Groups of the President in June 2010; proposed revisions to the structure approved by Senate in June 2011
A2	Strengthen Annual Programme Review by the inclusion of student learning outcomes data	• All departments implemented their programme LOAPs and incorporated the outcomes assessment results in the Annual Programme Review Report as planned

		• Submission of Annual Programme Review Report via the department's Annual QA Report temporarily suspended, as a result of QAC(AD)'s decision to review and streamline the QA processes
		• A new Annual Operation Plan system approved by QAC(AD) in November 2012
A3	Give attention in programme development to emergent trends in the disciplines and professions as well as region-specific content that will prepare students and graduates for professional practice beyond Hong Kong	• A new International Advisory Board established at the University level • Faculty/School Advisory Committees established • Specific strategies formulated in the University's new Strategic Plan to better prepare students for professional practice beyond Hong Kong • A new Office of Careers and Placement Services established
A4	Develop assessment processes that are consistent with objectives and intended learning outcomes	• Reinforcement of the efforts to emphasize and promote the adoption of assessment practices that are aligned with intended learning outcomes through Faulty/School/ College Deans, Heads of Departments, and the Faculty and Departmental LTCs • Workshops and professional support activities for PolyU staff on assessment organized by the Educational Development Centre

Progress on Addressing QAC's Recommendations

R1   *<u>Recommendation 1</u>*

The QAC recommends that PolyU review the role and relationships of the Senate and the University quality assurance committees relative to the Academic Board and quality assurance committees in CPCE to ensure equivalence and appropriate oversight of those programmes delivered within CPCE for which the University grants a University award.

R1.1   We fully accept this recommendation from the QAC Audit Panel, and have conducted a systematic review of the governance and QA framework of the College of Professional and Continuing Education (CPCE) vis-à-vis other PolyU

departments. A proposal for a revised governance structure and QA framework for CPCE was endorsed by the President's Executive Committee (PEC) and subsequently approved by Senate at its 73rd meeting held on 15 December 2011 [SM1]. Arising from this revised framework, the composition and terms of reference of some Senate Committees and the CPCE College Board were reviewed. A comprehensive set of implementation arrangements was approved by Senate [SM2] at its 75th meeting held on 7 June 2012, for implementation with effect from September 2012.

R1.2   Under the new framework, the former CPCE Academic Board has been renamed the CPCE College Board, and is designated as one of the Boards/Committees of Senate. The new CPCE College Board assumes roles and responsibilities similar to those of other Faculty/School Boards at PolyU, and oversees all academic matters within the College, including QA and programme planning and validation.

R1.3   To align with the structure and processes adopted by other faculties and schools, and to avoid confusion with the University quality assurance committees, the former CPCE Academic Planning and Quality Assurance Committee (APQAC) was abolished, with its responsibilities transferred to the newly established CPCE College Board and the College Learning and Teaching Committee. Academic planning and QA in CPCE is now subject to the oversight of the University's Academic Planning Committee (APC) and Quality Assurance Committee for Academic Departments (QAC(AD)).

R2   *Recommendation 2*

The QAC recommends that PolyU further develop and deepen its culture of critical self-review to ensure there is consistency in the University's commitment to continuous improvement within all parts of the institution.

R2.1   Critical self-review for continual quality improvement has always been the underlying spirit of PolyU's QA framework. We continue to require every academic department and support unit to provide a critical self-evaluation of its performance in the annual business/operation planning exercise, and to produce a Self-Evaluation Document as the basis for the six-yearly Departmental Review (DR) exercise for academic departments or Departmental Assessment (DA) exercise for non-academic units.

R2.2   Subsequent to the QAC Audit, we have reviewed the Annual Business Plan, Annual QA Report and Departmental Staffing Plan systems for academic departments in order to examine ways of streamlining the QA processes and strengthening the culture of critical self-review. A proposal to implement an Annual Operation Plan (AOP) for academic departments, in place of the Annual Business Plan and Annual QA Report, was approved by QAC(AD) at its 24th meeting in November 2012. Under the new AOP system, departments will

continue to be required to plan their activities and manpower based on a critical self-review of performance in the previous year.

R2.3   We have also conducted an interim review of the first cycle of the DR exercise, which has been completed for about half of the academic departments. To reinforce the culture of continual improvement, we have made it mandatory for departments to include, in the departmental response to the DR Report, improvement plans to follow up on the recommendations of the DR Panel. Progress made by departments in enacting their improvement plans will be monitored by the respective Faculty/School/College Deans, and be reviewed in the next DR exercise. A template for Faculty/School Report to QAC(AD) on the DR exercise has been drawn up and approved by QAC(AD) to facilitate this process [SM3] for implementation with effect from the 2012/13 academic year.

R3   *Recommendation 3*

The QAC recommends that PolyU clarify the roles and responsibilities of the CPCE Council relative to the University Council and explore the implications for academic governance in the CPCE as a whole.

R3.1   CPCE is a fully-owned affiliate of PolyU set up to provide professional and continuing education at the post-secondary level on a self-financed basis. With the revisions to the governance structure and QA framework of CPCE described in our response to R1 above, the CPCE College Board is now designated as one of the Boards/Committees of Senate with effect from September 2012, thereby placing CPCE under the direct oversight of the University Council and Senate.

R3.2   The terms of reference, composition and membership of the CPCE College Council are shown in SM4. To establish a stronger link and oversight of the work of CPCE by the University Council, two members of the University Council have been appointed by the President to serve concurrently as external members of the CPCE College Council. In addition, a number of PolyU senior staff members sit on the CPCE College Council, three of whom are also members of the PolyU Council.

R3.3   Furthermore, with the implementation of the new governance and QA framework, CPCE matters will be included in the President's report to the University Council for information and discussion/approval as and when appropriate.

R4   *Recommendation 4*

The QAC recommends that PolyU develop an institution-wide strategy to ensure that key aspects of the University's operations including all academic programmes and those offered through CPCE, are benchmarked against carefully chosen local and international peer programmes and institutions.

R4.1   We already have in place an institution-wide strategy for benchmarking our academic departments and programmes at PolyU via the following mechanisms and processes in our Generic QA Framework:

- Departmental Academic Advisor (DAA) system

- Departmental Review (DR) exercise

- Programme planning, validation, monitoring, and review processes.

In addition, many of our programmes have also sought and obtained accreditation from relevant statutory boards and/or professional bodies.

R4.2   Through these processes, input and feedback are systematically solicited from renowned academics from reputable local and/or overseas institutions, as well as representatives from industry and professional bodies, to ensure that the quality and standard of our academic programmes and graduates are comparable to cognate programmes, both locally and internationally. We will continue these efforts.

R4.3   However, we concur with the QAC's recommendation regarding the need to choose carefully the programmes, departments and/or institutions against which to benchmark our operations and programmes. QAC(AD), at its meeting held on 13 September 2012, decided that greater emphasis should be given to the benchmarking function in the DR exercise. More specifically, it was agreed that:

- The general criteria for selecting benchmarking partners in the DR exercise should include the international ranking of the cognate programme, the department or the institution as a whole, the academic and/or research strength of the (external) department concerned, and any other special justifications for making the choice. The programmes and institutions selected for benchmarking should generally be of high academic and professional standing;

- If cognate programmes are to be selected for benchmarking purposes, not more than three such programmes of peer institutions should be involved;

- The essential parameters to be measured against the benchmarked institutions include departmental planning, organization structure, academic programmes, quality of students, students' learning experience and outcomes, and student support/infrastructure.

The guidelines on the Departmental Review system for academic departments in the PolyU QA Handbook have been amended accordingly [SM5], and disseminated to all departments for information and action.

R4.4   We have also taken the following actions to further enhance the mechanisms for benchmarking the quality of our programme and staff:

- Establishing a new International Advisory Board at the University level to contribute international perspectives to the strategic priorities and

development initiatives at PolyU [SM6];

- Setting up of new Faculty/School Advisory Committees to advise faculties/ schools on their planning and development, and to benchmark their work [SM7];

- Revising our Staff Appointment and Promotion System to require input from external referees from renowned overseas institutions in the staff appointment and promotion processes to benchmark the quality of our staff.

R4.5 With the implementation of the revised governance structure and QA framework for CPCE in September 2012, CPCE is required to follow programme planning, approval and review processes identical to those adopted by the University for all its programmes leading to a PolyU SPEED award, with external inputs systematically sought to benchmark the quality of the curriculum and the programme. In line with the QA system of other faculties and schools, an Academic Advisor (AA) system has been set up in CPCE, where academics from other reputable universities will be appointed on a broad discipline basis to oversee the programmes and other academic-related activities within the broad discipline of the College. Both the Hong Kong Community College (HKCC) and the School for Professional Education and Executive Development (SPEED) – the two educational units under CPCE – will be subject to a six-yearly DR process.

R4.6 We also take note of the need to benchmark the operations of our academic support units against local/international best practices. Under the revised framework for the DA exercise for non-academic units approved by the Quality Assurance Committee (Non-academic Units) (QAC(NAU)) in August 2011, the DA Panel will include at least one external member from a counterpart unit in a higher-education institute within or outside Hong Kong, when deemed appropriate by the overseeing SME.

R4.7 In addition, all academic support units are recommended, under the revised Annual Report and Business Plan (ARBP) system (see R5.5 below for details), to develop their internal quality benchmarks through identifying and reviewing available international benchmarks for appropriate adoption/adaptation. In fact, some of our academic support units such as the Information Technology Services Office and the Facility Management Office have been conducting benchmarking regularly, making use of benchmarking sources that include, for example, the EDUCAUSE Core Data and Student Satisfaction Surveys, the Tertiary Education Facilities Management Association data, etc.

R5   *Recommendation 5*

The QAC recommends that PolyU review the performance indicators (PIs) currently in use to ensure that these are aligned with the desired outcomes of teaching and learning plans as well as the University's expectations of individual functional and academic units.

R5.1   To enable the University to assess its effectiveness in achieving the intended learning outcomes, starting from 2009/10, we piloted a two-tier institutional Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan (LOAP) to collect data on and evidence of students' achievement of the institutional student learning outcomes to inform continual quality improvement.

R5.2   Departments and programmes have also been required, since 2009/10, to implement a programme LOAP that is aligned with the desired programme learning outcomes, and to make use of the data and evidence collected for the annual programme review.

R5.3   Based on the experience gained from the pilot noted in R5.1, a new institutional LOAP for the 4-year undergraduate degree programmes for the 2012/13 – 2014/15 triennium has been developed and approved at a joint meeting of the University's Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC) and the Working Group on Outcome-Based Education (WGOBE) held on 9 March 2012 [SM8]. A broad range of outcomes assessment data, which are aligned with the revised set of desired graduate attributes espoused in PolyU's new Strategic Plan for 2012/13 – 2017/18, will be collected via the following assessment activities:

- Course-embedded assessments in the Discipline-Specific Requirement and General University Requirement subjects under the 4-year undergraduate curriculum
- Graduating students' performance in IELTS
- Collegiate Learning Assessment
- Graduate Employment Survey
- Students' Self-Assessment of All-Rounded Development
- Revised Alumni Survey
- First Year Experience Survey
- Student Exit Survey
- Employer Survey conducted by the Education Bureau.

The learning outcomes assessment data collected will be reviewed by the University, in conjunction with the PIs for academic departments, to assess the institutional effectiveness in achieving the intended learning outcomes, and to guide evidence-based improvements.

R5.4   We have also undertaken to review the existing set of quantitative PIs for academic departments. A task force was formed under QAC(AD), with the mandate to propose a new set of PIs that is aligned with the desired graduate

attributes and outcomes of PolyU. It is expected that the proposal will be submitted to QAC(AD) for deliberation and endorsement by the end of December, 2012. The revised PIs, when approved, will be linked with the evaluation of teaching for the annual Performance Reward Scheme for staff.

R5.5   With regard to academic support units, a revised ARBP system has been established to replace the Annual Business Plan and Annual QA Report systems for non-academic departments (NAU). Under the revised ARBP system, all NAUs are required to develop an appropriate set of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) that is consistent with the mission of the University and reflects the outcomes and impacts of the work expected by the University of the functional unit. The unit-specific KPIs have been endorsed by the respective overseeing SMEs and were implemented with effect from May 2012. [See also R4.7 above]

R5.6   All NAUs are required to report and critically review their performance and progress with regard to the unit-specific KPIs in their ARBP. The set of KPIs will also be the key instrument for assessing the performance of the unit concerned in the 6-yearly DA exercise.

R6   *Recommendation 6*

The QAC recommends that PolyU design and implement a comprehensive, integrated approach to fostering and assessing the achievement of the desired attributes sought for the graduates of the University.

R6.1   In response to this recommendation, we have developed, in consultation with academic departments and relevant academic support units, an integrated plan for fostering the development of the desired graduate attributes of the new 4-year undergraduate curriculum (Integrated Plan), with reference to the updated university mission and desired graduate attributes. The Integrated Plan was endorsed by LTC and WGOBE at their joint meeting held on 9 March 2012 [SM9].

R6.2   The Integrated Plan gives an overview of how PolyU plans to nurture competent professionals who are critical thinkers, effective communicators, innovative problem solvers, lifelong learners and ethical leaders through the formal and informal curriculum. It has been circulated to academic departments and academic support units for action. Academic departments were asked to ensure that, for each of the programmes they host, the graduate attributes are appropriately addressed in the curricular and co-curricular activities as suggested in the Integrated Plan. At the same time, academic support units were asked to make explicit reference to the desired graduate attributes when planning and reporting activities in their respective ARBP.

R6.3   As noted in R5.3 above, we have developed a new institutional LOAP for the 2012/13 – 2014/15 triennium to assess the achievement of the desired graduate attributes of PolyU. The institutional LOAP has been circulated to academic departments and relevant support units for follow-up. Considerable progress has been made in planning for its implementation:

- The Alumni Survey has been revised to align with the updated institutional learning outcomes. Additionally, the institutional and departmental administration of the Alumni Survey has been combined to reduce redundancy and avoid over-burdening alumni with multiple surveys. The revised survey questionnaire and administration procedures were endorsed by LTC in August 2012. The first administration of the revised Alumni Survey for undergraduate programmes was conducted in November 2012;

- A plan for administering the Collegiate Learning Assessment as a direct measure of the generic institutional learning outcomes has been drawn up. An advisory committee is being set up to deliberate and recommend on the implementation details;

- A new First Year Experience Survey has been developed to research students' experience and engagement patterns during their first year of study at PolyU. It is intended to be administered annually as part of the institutional LOAP. The survey questionnaire and the administration procedures were endorsed by LTC in October 2012 for pilot implementation in the 2012-13 academic year;

- A new Student Exit Survey is now being developed.

R7   *Recommendation 7*

The QAC recommends that PolyU implement a requirement for external input into the development and approval of all programmes leading to a University award whether or not a given programme is subject to professional accreditation.

R7.1   All programmes offered at PolyU have included external inputs in the programme planning, validation and approval processes, irrespective of whether accreditations by professional or statutory bodies were being sought. The only exceptions are some of the programmes offered by CPCE that are not subject to professional accreditation.

R7.2   To strengthen the requirement for external input into the programme validation process, QAC(AD) agreed, at its 23rd Meeting held on 13 September 2012, to require the appointment of an external expert to the validation panel, and stipulate this as a University-wide policy. The Guidelines and Regulations for Programme Planning, Validation and Management have been amended accordingly and

disseminated to all departments for information and implementation.

R7.3   As noted in our response to R1 above, Senate approved a revised governance and QA framework for CPCE in December 2011. This stipulates that CPCE should follow the same systems and processes prescribed by the University in the planning, approval and review for all of its undergraduate programmes leading to a PolyU SPEED award. Henceforth, the support of the CPCE Advisory Committee (with external experts as members) is required for the approval of initial programme planning proposals, whereas the involvement of external Academic Advisors is required in the validation of these programmes.

R7.4   CPCE, upon the approval of Senate in December 2011, has also introduced an Academic Advisor (AA) system at the college level on a broad academic discipline basis. The system aims to appoint high calibre external academic advisors to advise CPCE on issues related to QA systems, staffing and resources, academic programmes, teaching, learning and assessment, research, consultancy and community service, and other relevant areas such as academic standards, programme development and validation. The AAs will also provide input to facilitate international benchmarking of CPCE against peer programmes and institutions. Eight CPCE AAs have been appointed.

R8   *Recommendation 8*

The QAC recommends that PolyU ensure reliable and consistent monitoring of equivalence in standards across all programmes and locations.

R8.1   In order to ensure equivalence in standards, all programmes offered by faculties/departments leading to a PolyU award (including those offered overseas) are required to follow the same QA framework and adopt the QA processes and good practices required by the University. These include: Departmental Advisory Committee, Departmental Academic Advisor system, accreditation by statutory/professional bodies, and programme planning and validation approval processes.

R8.2   With Senate's decision at its 73th meeting held on 15 December 2011 that all undergraduate programmes offered by CPCE leading to PolyU SPEED awards should follow the same programme planning, validation and review processes as prescribed by the University and followed by all faculties/schools, and that an Academic Advisor system be set up on a broad discipline basis at CPCE, we believe that the issue of consistency in practice with respect to QA of academic programmes of PolyU and those of CPCE has been addressed.

R8.3   To ensure consistency in the appointment of DAAs, and to optimise their contribution to the benchmarking of the quality and standard of our programmes, QAC(AD) agreed at its 23rd meeting held on 13 September 2012 that

Faculty/School/College Deans should report regularly to the Committee on the DAA appointments made. At the same time, the appointment criteria for DAA would be modified to emphasize the benchmarking function, and to include "the standard of cognate study programmes in the DAA's current institution" as a factor for considering his/her suitability for appointment. The PolyU QA Handbook has been updated accordingly to reflect this modification [SM10].

R9   *Recommendation 9*

The QAC recommends that PolyU explore strategies other than surveys to collect student feedback and institute reliable and systematic mechanisms to inform the students of improvements made as a result of their input through all feedback channels.

R9.1   At a joint meeting of the Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC) and the Working Group on Outcome-Based Education (WGOBE) held in September 2011, it was decided that a series of activities would be undertaken to explore and promote good practices in collecting and using student feedback for improving student learning. These include:

- A survey on the current practices and implementation of the Student-Staff Consultative Group of all departments to identify good practices;

- A search for international best practices in collecting student feedback for improving teaching and learning;

- An open forum, held in May 2012, to provide an opportunity for staff to discuss and share good practices in collecting and using student feedback; and

- Drafting of a set of guidelines on collecting and using student feedback at PolyU, based on the experiences gained from the activities above [SM11].

R9.2   QAC(AD) also approved, at the recommendation of LTC, at its 24th meeting held on 30 November 2012 that all departments be required to establish a Student-Staff Consultative Group – in addition to student surveys – as a formal channel for soliciting student feedback on their undergraduate programmes. The Guidelines and Regulations for Programme Planning, Validation and Management have been updated accordingly and disseminated to all departments for information and implementation.

Progress on Addressing QAC's Affirmations

A1   *Affirmation 1*

The QAC affirms the introduction at PolyU of a new management structure which has the goal of improving clarity in roles and responsibilities of senior executives and bolstering the capacity for policy development.

A1.1   With the appointment of President Tong in 2009, a new senior management structure was approved by the University Council and has been implemented in phases as planned. The roles and responsibilities of each SME, and the units they are assigned to oversee, are clearly defined.

A1.2   A working group was set up by the President in June 2010 to review the committee structures of Senate, Committees and Consultative/Advisory Groups of the President. The proposed revisions to the Senate Committees were discussed and approved by Senate at its 71st meeting held on 2 June 2011, for implementation with effect from 1 July 2011. The revisions include:

- Re-instatement of the Academic Regulation Committee;

- Relieving the Learning and Teaching Committee of the responsibility of the drawing up and revision of academic regulations;

- Minor changes to the terms of reference and/or membership of some Senate Committees; and

- Re-designation of some President's Committees and Advisory Groups to be overseen by the relevant SME according to their work portfolio.

The updated organization and management structure of PolyU is shown on the PolyU website at:
http://www.polyu.edu.hk/cpa/polyu/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=14&Itemid=37&lang=en

A1.3   Each SME is delegated by the President to chair or contribute to the Senate and President's Committees and the Consultative/Advisory Groups that are most relevant to their work portfolio. The updated compositions and terms of reference of the committees are announced to all PolyU staff via the University's intranet at: https://www2.polyu.edu.hk/Script/staff/committee/commit.htm .

A2   *Affirmation 2*

The QAC affirms PolyU's actions in strengthening Annual Programme Reviews by the inclusion of data on student attainment of programme learning outcomes.

A2.1   As stated in our Institutional Submission for the QAC Audit, in order to collect data on students' attainment of the intended programme learning outcomes for review and improvement purposes, we requested all departments to develop and

pilot in 2009/10 a programme Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan (LOAP) for each of their undergraduate programmes.

A2.2   To sustain this effort, we have incorporated in the PolyU QA Handbook and the Guidelines and Regulations for Programme Planning, Validation and Management, the requirement to include the programme learning outcomes assessment results in the annual Programme Review Report, which will form part of the department's Annual QA Report to be submitted to the overseeing SME for evaluation.

A2.3   All departments have implemented their programme LOAPs and incorporated the results into their Annual Programme Review Reports as planned. However, the submission of Annual Programme Review Reports via the departmental Annual Business Plan and QA Report for academic department was suspended in 2011 as a result of the decision of QAC(AD) to explore ways to streamline the QA processes of Annual Business Plan, Annual QA Report and Departmental Staffing Plan.

A2.4   As noted in R2.2 above, a proposal to implement an Annual Operation Plan (AOP) for academic departments in place of the Annual Business Plan and QA Report was approved by QAC(AD) in November 2012. Henceforth, the Annual Programme Review Report with data on student attainment of programme learning outcomes will be included in the AOP for submission to the overseeing SME for review.

A3   *Affirmation 3*

The QAC affirms PolyU's attention in programme development to emerging trends in the disciplines and professions as well as region-specific content that will prepare students and graduates for professional practice beyond Hong Kong.

A3.1   In addition to the existing mechanisms in place to solicit external inputs for planning or revamping of programmes through the Departmental Advisory Committee, the Departmental Academic Advisor system and the appointment of overseas experts in the DR Panel, we have established an International Advisory Board at the University level and Faculty/School Advisory Committees at the faculty or school levels to provide the university and the respective faculty/school a broader view on our programmes and future development from non-local and local academics, industry, the professions and the community. This will further facilitate the alignment of emerging trends within the disciplines and region-specific content with programme development.

A3.2   To equip our students for professional practice outside Hong Kong, we have also included, in our 2012/13 – 2017/18 Strategic Plan, specific strategies to help engage our students more in non-local learning and/or work experiences, including:

- To create and invest in new partnerships/agreements with overseas universities and universities in the rest of China in order to expand incoming and outgoing exchange opportunities outside of Hong Kong (Learning and Teaching Key Goal 4, strategy (a));

- To actively encourage and support every PolyU student to have at least one month of learning experience outside of Hong Kong (Learning and Teaching Key Goal 4, strategy (b));

- To reinforce a global perspective in our curricula and thus better equip our students to be global citizens through increasing opportunities for international exchange and internships (Internationalization, Branding and Marketing Key Goal 1, strategy (a));

- To develop and offer placement and research opportunities in the Chinese mainland to enhance students' professional competence (Engaging the Nation Key Goal 1, strategy (a));

- To develop and offer community service learning opportunities in the Chinese mainland to nurture students as educated global citizens with a passion to service the community (Engaging the Nation Key Goal 1, strategy (b)); and

- To leverage our alumni and industrial networks in the Chinese mainland to enhance the learning and career opportunities of our students (Engaging the Nation Key Goal 1, strategy (e)).

A3.3   Appropriate SME has been assigned as the "owner" to oversee planning and set targets for each of the goals and strategies, and to monitor progress in implementation.

A3.4   To better prepare our students for professional practice both within and outside Hong Kong, a new Office of Careers and Placement Services was established in July 2012 to coordinate the Work-Integrated Education and create placement opportunities, and to provide career education and guidance services for students.

A4   *Affirmation 4*

The QAC affirms the attention being paid by PolyU to the development of assessment processes that are consistent with objectives and intended learning outcomes.

A4.1   We have sustained our efforts in emphasising and promoting the adoption of assessment practices that are aligned with the University's intended learning outcomes. Faculty/School/College Deans and Department Heads have been requested to monitor the alignment of assessment strategies with intended learning outcomes at both the programme and subject levels via the following mechanisms:

- At the programme level – (a) a clear indication of the assessment methods used for each of the learning outcomes in the programme LOAP, and (b) the inclusion of the Learning Outcome Assessment Results Form in the Annual Programme Review Report in the departmental annual planning exercise;

- At the subject level – (a) the use of the Subject Description Form during programme validation which, *inter alia,* requires teachers to provide details of the assessment methods to be used and the intended learning outcome(s) that each assessment method purports to assess, and (b) a review of the Subject Description Forms in the Definitive Programme Document by both the Faculty and Departmental LTC.

A4.2   To promote and further enhance the adoption of effective assessment practices, the Educational Development Centre continues to provide workshops and professional support on various aspects of assessment, including the design of appropriate assessment methods, the proper implementation of criterion-referenced assessment, and the provision of prompt feedback to students. In the period from November 2010 to December 2012, a total of fifty-five workshop/seminar sessions have been organized on those themes [SM12], including several sessions forming part of the "Introduction to University Teaching" (IUT) course and the "Becoming an Effective Teaching Assistant" (BETA) course which aim to help new teachers develop knowledge and skills in designing effective assessment strategies and methods.

Concluding Remarks

We believe that the progress reported above clearly demonstrates PolyU's commitment to the continued enhancement of our QA processes and to improving the quality of student learning. We would like to thank the QAC Audit Panel again for their useful comments and suggestions, which have helped us greatly in our endeavours to provide the best possible education for our students.

List of Supplementary Materials

SM1	Quality Assurance and Governance in the College of Professional and Continuing Education (CPCE)
SM2	Implementation Arrangements for the Revised Governance and QA Framework of CPCE
SM3	Template for Faculty/School Report to QAC(AD) on DR exercise
SM4	Terms of Reference, Composition and Membership List of CPCE College Council
SM5	Guidelines on Department Review System for Academic Departments (Revised)
SM6	Terms of reference and composition of International Advisory Board
SM7	Terms of Reference and Composition of Faculty and School Advisory Committee
SM8	PolyU Institutional Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan 2012-15
SM9	Integrated Plan for Fostering the Development of the Desired Graduate Attributes of PolyU 2012-15
SM10	Guidelines on the Departmental Academic Advisor system (Revised)
SM11	Guidelines on Collecting and Using Student Feedback
SM12	List of Workshops/Seminars on Assessment Organised by the Educational Development Centre (from September 2011 to December 2012)

Revised governance and QA framework for CPCE

Background

1. The governance and quality assurance (QA) of CPCE programmes were reviewed in two external quality audits - first by the Joint Quality Review Committee (JQRC) and more recently by the UGC Quality Assurance Council (QAC). The JQRC review focused primarily on the operation of CPCE/HKCC as a provider of self-financed sub-degree programmes. The QAC Quality Audit, on the other hand, chose a CPCE/SPEED undergraduate programme that leads to a PolyU SPEED award as one of the three sampled programmes for detailed inspection during the audit visit.

2. The JQRC Institutional Review Report published in November 2009 commended CPCE on its well-established and adequate QA system and culture while, at the same time, recommended CPCE to:

   - Report to Senate on a regular basis
   - Bring in more advice/inputs from external experts in the QA and programme planning and review processes
   - Rationalize and simplify the current QA processes.

3. The QAC Audit Report on PolyU was released on 9 June 2011, with 9 commendations, 4 affirmations and 9 recommendations. A number of the recommendations are closely related to the governance and QA of CPCE/SPEED, as follows:

   - The QAC recommends that PolyU review the role and relationships of the Senate and the University quality assurance committees relative to the Academic Board and quality assurance committees in CPCE to ensure equivalence and appropriate oversight of those programmes delivered within CPCE for which the University grants a University award (Recommendation 1)
   - The QAC recommends that PolyU clarify the roles and responsibilities of the CPCE Council relative to the University Council and explore the implications for academic governance in the CPCE as a whole (Recommendation 3)
   - The QAC recommends that PolyU develop an institution-wide strategy to ensure that key aspects of the University's operations including all academic programmes and those offered through CPCE, are benchmarked against carefully chosen local and international peer programmes and institutions (Recommendation 4)
   - The QAC recommends that PolyU implement a requirement for external input into the development and approval of all programmes leading to a University award whether or not a given programme is subject to professional accreditation (Recommendation 7)
   - The QAC recommends that PolyU ensure reliable and consistent monitoring of equivalence in standards across all programmes and locations (Recommendation 8)

1

Recommended changes to CPCE Governance and QA system

4. In response to the recommendations of the JQRC and QAC Quality Audit Reports, CPCE submitted, in July 2011, a paper proposing a number of changes in the governance and QA of CPCE. Subsequent discussions were held between VP(AD) and CPCE key staff on their initial proposal. The *Annex* explains in more detail the guiding principles and the recommended changes for enhancing governance and QA of CPCE in response to the recommendations of JQRC and UGC QAC quality audit.

5. Essentially, the recommended changes include:

    (i) CPCE to keep its Council, but with additional membership from PolyU Council to provide stronger linkage and oversight.

    (ii) CPCE to re-name its Academic Board as College Board, with the same responsibilities and standing as other Faculty/School Boards in PolyU, and to carry out similar QA functions. Consistent with the practice of other Faculties/Schools, a College Learning & Teaching Committee and a College Research Committee will be set up under the College Board to oversee T&L and research of the College.

    (iii) CPCE to abolish its Academic Planning and Quality Assurance Committee (APQAC) to avoid confusion with the University's APC and QAC, and to streamline the programme planning, validation and QA processes.

    (iv) CPCE to follow the identical programme planning, approval and review processes for all of its programmes leading to a PolyU SPEED award. Senate can delegate the approval authority for sub-degree programmes leading to a PolyU HKCC award to APC and that for programmes not leading to a PolyU award to CPCE College Board.

    (v) A Departmental Academic Advisors (DAA) system to be introduced at the college level on broad discipline basis. Both SPEED and HKCC are required to undergo the 6-yearly Departmental Review exercise similar to other PolyU academic units.

Encl.
December 2011

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

Guiding principles for enhancing governance and QA of CPCE

1. On the understanding that the Senior Management's plan is to <u>bring CPCE closer to the PolyU proper as an integral part of the University</u> rather than turning it into an independent self-financed educational unit separated from PolyU, the proposed changes should be guided by the following two underpinning principles:

    a. The revised system and processes proposed should be aligned, <u>to the fullest extent possible</u>, with the University's generic QA framework, mechanisms and processes for all Faculties and Departments, as well as the policy and guidelines governing the programme planning, validation and review processes. In short, CPCE should be viewed and treated as one of the Faculties or Schools – albeit with a different mission and primary source of funding.

    b. The overall strategy should be to <u>rationalize and simplify</u>, wherever appropriate, the existing CPCE systems and practices to reduce redundancy, rather than to merely add extra layers to comply with recommendations of the QAC Quality Audit or the JQRC Institutional Review reports.

Recommended changes to the governance and QA of CPCE

2. CPCE Council is formed to meet the governance requirement of a limited liability company and hence needs to be retained. To provide a stronger oversight and linkage, it is recommended that additional membership from PolyU Council be invited to serve as members of the CPCE Council. This will help address the issue raised by the QAC audit panel in their Recommendation 3.

3. If CPCE is to become an integral part of PolyU and follow the University's generic QA framework and processes, the CPCE Academic Board should be renamed as CPCE College Board (to avoid confusion and be in line with other Faculty or School Boards). The CPCE College Board will be designated as one of Boards/Committees of Senate, and should take on the role and responsibilities similar to those of other Faculty/School Boards where all academic matters – including QA and programme planning and validation – within the College are dealt with. The composition and terms of reference of the College Board will be revised accordingly. There might no longer be a need to include members from other PolyU Departments on the Board.

4. It is recommended that all CPCE programmes leading to a PolyU SPEED award at the Ug degree level should go through an <u>identical</u> programme planning, validation and review processes as prescribed by the University and followed by all other Faculties (e.g. supported by College Advisory Committee, endorsed by College Board, approval by APC and Senate, etc.). Given the differences in the nature and level of those programmes, Senate can delegate the approval authority for sub-degree programmes leading to a PolyU HKCC award to APC (with the list of programmes approved presented to Senate for information), and that for programmes not leading to PolyU award to CPCE College Board.

3

5.   To align with the normal structure and processes adopted by Faculties and Schools and to rationalize and simplify the current QA processes as recommended by the JQRC Review Panel, CPCE is recommended to abolish the CPCE Academic Planning and Quality Assurance Committee (APQAC), and let the CPCE College Board and the CPCE College LTC take over its current responsibilities. This will also help to address the issues raised by the QAC Audit Panel in their Recommendation 1.

6.   One major change that needs to be enforced across all CPCE programmes is the mandatory requirement for including inputs/advice from external experts (defined as experts from outside PolyU) in the programme planning and validation process to benchmark the quality of the programme and curriculum. Currently, not every programme in CPCE adopts this practice - but this is a salient point explicitly recommended by the QAC Audit Panel (Recommendation 4) and JQRC Review Panel in their reports.

7.   To bring CPCE closer to the PolyU proper as an integral part of the University, it is recommended that CPCE be subject to the same Generic QA framework on par with other Faculties under the oversight of QAC(AD). Under this framework, the College and its constituent departments will be required to follow, as far as practicable, the same QA mechanisms and processes, including:

   - Annual QA Report
   - Biennial Report on Departmental Performance
   - Annual Business Plan
   - Departmental Review for Academic Departments
   - Departmental Academic Advisor System

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

8.   Similar to other academic units, both SPEED and HKCC will have to undergo a 6-yearly Departmental Review. As HKCC is also subject to an external review by the JQRC on as regularly basis, it is suggested that DR for HKCC might be held after the JQRC review in order to avoid duplication of effort in preparing for the reviews.

9.   In response to Recommendations 4, 7 and 8 of the QAC audit panel, it is recommended that an Academic Advisor system be set up in CPCE. However, given the wide spectrum of programmes offered by SPEED and HKCC, it is proposed that the Academic Advisors be appointed on a broad discipline rather than on a departmental basis, who will oversee the programmes and other related activities of both SPEED and HKCC within the broad discipline.

10. The proposed changes suggested above and by CPCE will require some modifications to the University's Generic QA Framework, the line of oversight and accountability, as well as the compositions and terms of reference of related University and CPCE committees (e.g. APC, QAC(AD), LTC, CPCE College Board, etc.). Relevant departments/units/ committees will be asked to follow this up as appropriate according to the final decisions of the University regarding these.

11. The proposed changes, if endorsed by the Senior Management, will need formal approval by Senate. To allow sufficient time for preparation for the changes, the suggested date for implementation is 2012/13 academic year.

THE HONG KONG
POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY
香港理工大學

SENATE

Paper for : Information

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

1. At its 73rd meeting on 15 December 2011, Senate had approved a revised governance framework for CPCE, including the QA framework for CPCE programmes which lead to PolyU-HKCC and PolyU-SPEED awards. Senate noted that arising from this revised governance and QA framework for CPCE, the composition and terms of reference of some Senate committees and of the CPCE's College Board will need to be reviewed, and a comprehensive set of implementation arrangements will be made in due course (Ref. SEN/73/M30-M32). These arrangements (see Annex 1 attached) have been drawn up by Dean(PCE) and endorsed by the Academic Council for implementation with effect from the 2012/13 academic year.

2. Since some of the arrangements concern Senate committees, they are highlighted below for members' easy reference and the relevant section in Annex 1 listed in parenthesis:

   (i) CPCE's Academic Board will be re-designated as College Board and a committee of Senate, similar to the Faculty/School Boards in terms of role and responsibilities (2.1).

   (ii) CPCE will retain its *Academic Regulations Committee*, *Academic Appeals Committee*, and *Student Discipline Committee*. For practical reasons, these issues will continue to be dealt with at the College level, rather than through the relevant committee of the University (2.3).

   (iii) CPCE will have representation on relevant Senate committees, viz. Dean(PCE) will be included in the ex-officio membership of both *Academic Planning Committee* (APC) and *Quality Assurance Committee (Academic Departments)* [QAC(AD)], similar to the Faculty/School Deans. The membership of the *Learning and Teaching Committee* (LTC) will also be revised to include the Chairman of the College's LTC and a nominated staff, similar to the arrangements for Faculties/Schools (3.2).

3. Based on (iii) above, the composition and terms of reference of *APC*, *LTC* and *QAC(AD)* have been revised and are attached in Annexes 2 to 4 for members' information.

Encls.
June 2012

Revisions to CPCE's Governance and QA Framework

1. Introduction

1.1 With due reference to Senate paper (SEN/73/A12) on "Revised Governance Framework for CPCE, including the QA Framework for CPCE programmes which lead to PolyU-HKCC and PolyU-SPEED awards", CPCE has undertaken to review its QA framework, so that the CPCE systems and processes would be aligned, to the fullest extent possible, with the University's generic QA framework, mechanisms and processes for all Faculties and Departments. This will include the policy and guidelines governing the programme planning, validation and review processes.

1.2 As the existing CPCE systems and processes are very similar to those of PolyU, the required changes for closer alignment are generally limited in nature. These are outlined below.

2. Committee Structure of CPCE

College Board

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

Committees of College Board

2.2 In order to align the structure and processes adopted by Faculties and Schools and to rationalize and simplify the current QA processes, CPCE will discontinue its Academic Planning and Quality Assurance Committee (APQAC) by the end of the 2011/12 academic year.

2.3 CPCE has introduced two new committees under the College Board, namely the College Learning and Teaching Committee and CPCE General Education Committee. The terms of reference and composition of these two committees are presented in Appendices 2 and 3. The existing CPCE Research Committee, CAM Committee, Academic Regulations Committee, Academic Appeals Committee, and Student Discipline Committee will continue operating.

Advisory Committees

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

composition of the CPCE Advisory Committee are presented in Appendix 4.

3. CPCE Representation at Senate committees

3.1 In line with the practice for PolyU faculties/schools, it is recommended that CPCE will have suitable representations in relevant PolyU Committees from 2012/13. These will include Academic Planning Committee (APC), Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC), and the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC(AD)). Details are presented in 3.2 below.

3.2 It is recommended that as from 2012/13, Dean(PCE) will join APC and QAC(AD), while the College Board will nominate staff to join the LTC. The Chair of the CPCE LTC will also be an ex-officio member of the PolyU LTC.

4. Programme Planning, Validation and Review Processes

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

5. Generic QA Framework

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

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

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

2

5.4 According to the PolyU Guidelines for Departmental Review, three leading academics from reputable overseas universities [one of whom will be the current Departmental Academic Advisor (DAA) unless he/she is a local person from the industrial sector] will be invited by the department (with the endorsement of the Faculty Dean/School Board Chairman) to serve as the advisors to the departments.

5.5 In CPCE, Academic Advisors are appointed on a broad discipline rather than on a departmental basis, and they are expected to oversee the activities of both HKCC and SPEED within the broad discipline. With some 6 to 10 Academic Advisors being appointed, it is proposed that CPCE will not appoint any additional advisors. Similar to the PolyU system, the Academic Advisors are to present a comprehensive report to Dean(PCE) after each annual visit. These annual reports will be made available for the Panel at the Unit Review exercise.

5.6 During the Unit Review exercise, the Review Panel will be comprised of Dean(PCE) (as the Panel Chairman), at least 3 current CPCE Academic Advisors, as well as an internal academic member from another department/school. Dean(PCE) will decide whether the addition of a local industrial member (who can be a CPCE Advisory Committee member from industry) will be beneficial to the Review exercise.

Annual QA Report, Biennial Report on Unit Performance, Annual Business Plan
5.7 As from 2012/13, HKCC and SPEED will follow the PolyU system for the above processes.

June 2012

3

The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

College of Professional and Continuing Education

College Board

Terms of Reference

1. Generally, to co-ordinate and promote the work of the College.

2. To formulate (using the University's Strategic Plan as a basis) a College business plan which will guide the formulation of unit business plans.

3. To consider unit business plans.

4. To receive and consider initial programme proposals and then submit them, if approved, to the Academic Planning Committee.

5. To be responsible for the quality of academic programmes offered by the College and to implement institutional quality assurance policies and procedures as approved by Senate.

6. To receive and consider programme validation reports, and to submit College recommendations to Senate for implementation approval.

7. To consider and approve proposals for courses to be offered under the Credit Accumulation Mechanism (CAM).

8. To receive and consider annual Quality Assurance reports from units in the College.

9. To periodically review and advise on quality assurance matters within the College and, in particular, to submit the College's annual Quality Assurance report to the Quality Assurance Committee (Academic Departments).

10. To submit a College Report on the College's Unit Review exercises to the Quality Assurance Committee (Academic Departments).

11. To provide a forum to stimulate academic and development initiatives, particularly those involving innovation and inter-unit collaboration, as well as collaboration with other PolyU faculties.

12. To approve the entrance requirements for individual programmes offered by units of the College.

13. To be responsible for overseeing admission matters.

4

14. To be responsible, on behalf of Senate, for the examination and assessment of students in the College.

15. On behalf of Senate, to confirm examination and assessment results and academic awards for all programmes offered by the College*.

16. To consider and approve proposals for programmes to be offered in collaboration with external institutions/universities which lead to their awards.

17. To receive and review, on a regular basis, the minutes of Unit Advisory Committees.

18. To receive and review reports submitted by Academic Advisors (AA) and responses to the AA reports.

19. To submit an annual report to Senate covering the College Board's activities during the previous 12 months from 1st July to 30th June.

---

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

Composition

Chairman: Dean, College of Professional and Continuing Education

Members: All Associate Deans

                     Heads of Unit in the College

                     Heads of Cluster in the College

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

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

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

Secretary: Head of Administration

5

The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

College of Professional and Continuing Education

College Learning and Teaching Committee

Terms of Reference

1. To be responsible to University LTC (ULTC) for all matters pertaining to learning and teaching development in the College.

2. To promote, and to monitor the implementation of, policies and procedures relating to learning and quality teaching formulated by ULTC, and to make recommendations accordingly to ULTC.

3. To promote and to facilitate new and innovative learning and teaching methodologies in the College.

4. To develop, promote and disseminate good teaching and learning practices in the College.

5. To monitor the progress and quality of learning and teaching development projects in the College, and to allocate resources where such are assigned by ULTC or this Committee.

6. To consider matters of general academic procedures relating to all taught programmes, and to make recommendations accordingly to ULTC.

7. To keep under review changes in academic policies and regulations for the admission, progression and assessment of students and for the granting of awards for all taught programmes, and to make recommendations accordingly to ULTC.

8. To keep the College Board informed on a regular basis about its decisions/ deliberations.

Composition

Chairperson: Dean(PCE) or his nominee

Ex-officio: Chairpersons of HKCC and SPEED LTCs

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

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

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

                1 EDC representative nominated by Director of EDC

Secretary   Chair's nominee

6

Mode of Operation

1. The Chair of the CLTC is to be an ex-officio member of ULTC.

2. The term of service of the two full time academic staff members appointed by the College Board shall not exceed two years. They may not serve for more than two consecutive terms.

3. The term of service of the two student members appointed by the College Board shall be of one year. They may not serve for more than two consecutive terms.

4. The CLTC shall meet at least once each semester.

7

The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

College of Professional and Continuing Education

General Education Committee

Terms of reference

1. To be responsible to the College Board and work closely with clusters/discipline teams and units/programme teams for the development and implementation of General Education (GE) subjects to be offered in programmes leading to PolyU-HKCC and PolyU-SPEED awards with, as and where appropriate, due reference to:
   a. the General University Requirements (GUR) of the PolyU 4-year undergraduate degree curriculum
   b. the relevant requirements of other local universities and institutions,.

2. To endorse, monitor and review these GE subjects on offer, including their quality and implementation.

3. To seek recognition of these GE subjects from the PolyU Committee on General University Requirements (CoGUR) for meeting the PolyU GUR.

4. To take up relevant issues as may be referred to the Committee by the College Board.

Composition

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

Members: *Normally one representative for each of the four clusters*
- Cluster of Business
- Cluster of Hotel and Tourism Management
- Cluster of Humanities, Communication and Social Sciences, and
- Cluster of Science and Technology

Normally one representative for each of the following subject areas
- Human Nature, Relations and Development
- Community, Organisation and Globalisation
- History, Cultures and World Views
- Science, Technology and Environment
- Language and Communication
- Service Learning
- Leadership and Intra-personal Development

Secretary: A staff from Dean's Office

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

8

The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

College of Professional and Continuing Education

CPCE Advisory Committee

Terms of Reference

1. To provide a forum for academics, industry, commerce, Government, the professions and the community to advise the College of Professional and Continuing Education (CPCE) and to contribute to its strategic direction and development.

2. In relation to the needs of Hong Kong and the region, to advise CPCE on the scope and nature of its academic programmes, research and other activities.

Composition

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

Terms of Office and Period of Appointment

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

Frequency of Meetings

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

9

The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

College of Professional and Continuing Education

Academic Advisor System

1.   **Introduction**

1.1   At CPCE, External Examiners/Advisors may be appointed for individual programmes of study, as and when these are required by the respective Validation Panels or Professional Bodies.   External Examiners/Advisors are normally appointed on a programme or scheme basis.

1.2   The JQRC (Joint Quality Review Committee) undertook a full institutional review of the sub-degree programmes of HKCC and SPEED in December 2008.   The Panel's Report, received in late 2009, made a number of recommendations, including one in respect of 'Externality in Quality Assurance'.   In response to the JQRC Report, CPCE management proposes the introduction of an Academic Advisor System.

1.3   Upon the appointment of Academic Advisors, Units should review the need for the continued appointment of External Examiners/Advisors for individual programmes.   In this regard, particular attention should be given to the requirements of relevant professional bodies.

2.   **The appointment of Academic Advisors**

2.1   Academic Advisors will be appointed at the CPCE level on the basis of academic disciplines.   Their role is to give advice to HKCC, SPEED and the relevant academic cluster in respect of academic activities falling within the area of the Academic Advisors' expertise.

2.2   The Head of Cluster will, in consultation with the Directors of HKCC and SPEED, identify the academic disciplines within the Cluster for the appointment of Academic Advisors.   Following consultation with the Directors of HKCC and SPEED, nominations for Academic Advisor should be submitted by the Cluster Head to Dean(PCE) for endorsement, and to Vice President (Academic Development) for approval.   The nominations should contain information on the Academic Advisor's background and employment history, plus information on the Advisor's expected contributions to the academic activities of the relevant CPCE units.

2.3   Appointment of Academic Advisors will normally be made initially for a term of 3 years with the possibility of renewal for another term of 3 years. The maximum period of appointment should not normally exceed 6 years.

2.4   Academic Advisors can be appointed either locally or from overseas.

10

2.5 Academic Advisors should be invited to visit CPCE and its units once each year for a period of about one week, i.e. 3 visits for each term of appointment.

2.6 Prior to nomination, potential Academic Advisors should be approached informally by the Head of Cluster to see if s/he is willing to serve. In this process, it must be made clear to the potential nominee that the approach is in the nature of an enquiry and is not a formal commitment on the part of CPCE.

2.7 If it is considered appropriate for the Academic Advisor to visit CPCE and its units more than once each year, or once only for the 3-year term, this can be allowed subject to the endorsement of Dean(PCE) and the approval of the Vice President (Academic Development).

2.8 CPCE and/or the Academic Advisor may choose to shorten the period of appointment provided that due notice is given.

3. Criteria for the appointment of Academic Advisors

3.1 Candidates proposed for appointment as Academic Advisor should be of a high academic and/or professional standing. They should possess expertise appropriate to the academic discipline in question, and should be in a position to provide advice on academic matters related to curriculum planning, subject development, inter-unit cooperation, articulation pathways, provision of equipment and facilities, research and consultancy, and other relevant issues.

3.2 Academic Advisors are expected to be currently active in their profession. Their period of office should normally not extend beyond their expected time of retirement from full-time employment by more than one year, unless they are still active in their profession.

4. Duties of Academic Advisors

4.1 An Academic Advisor is expected to give advice, in the relevant academic discipline, to cluster/units in the following areas:

(i) *Staffing and resources*

- staff qualifications and experience
- staff recruitment and development policies
- effectiveness of staff appraisal system
- resources allocation and management

(ii) *Quality assurance system*

- performance standards and measurement systems

11

    ❑ feedback mechanism from students, articulation partners, employers and External Examiners etc.

    ❑ action on feedback

(iii) *Academic programmes*

    ❑ curriculum design, monitoring and review
    ❑ articulation pathways within CPCE
    ❑ Programme Learning Outcomes Assessment Plans (LOAP) and results, if appropriate

(iv) *Teaching, learning and assessment*

    ❑ alignment of teaching, learning and assessment with intended learning outcomes
    ❑ learning environment, academic support services
    ❑ evidence of students' attainment of intended learning outcomes

(v) *Research, consultancy, other scholarly activities and services to the professional community*

    ❑ performance
    ❑ future development
    ❑ relationship with industry/the professional community

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

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

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

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

6. **Administrative arrangements**

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

7. **Honorarium for Academic Advisors**

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

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

Academic Planning Committee
教務策劃委員會

Terms of Reference

1. To advise Senate on all matters relating to the academic planning and review of taught programmes leading to PolyU awards.

2. To review and revise, as required, policies relating to academic planning and review of taught programmes and, where necessary, to formulate new policies for the consideration of Senate.

3. To advise Senate on initial programme proposals*, prior to their further development and validation by the Faculties, Schools and CPCE.

4. To approve, on behalf of the Senate, initial programme proposals for sub-degree programmes leading to PolyU-HKCC or PolyU-SPEED awards, for their further development and validation.

5. To undertake advance planning and preparation for submission of the triennial Academic Development Proposals (ADPs) to the UGC, in consultation with Faculties/Schools and Departments, and giving due regard to the University's Strategic Plan.

6. To submit an annual report to Senate covering the Committee's activities for the previous 12 months from 1st July to 30th June.

_____

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

Composition

Chairman : Vice President (Academic Development)

Members : Deputy President and Provost

　　　　　　 All Faculty Deans and School/College Board Chairmen

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

　　　　　　 Academic Secretary

　　　　　　 Director of Finance

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

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

Learning and Teaching Committee
教學委員會

<u>**Terms of Reference**</u>

1. To be responsible to Senate for matters pertaining to learning and teaching development, inclusive of the use of modern education technology.

2. To develop policies and procedures relating to the promotion of learning and quality teaching for approval by Senate.

3. To promote and facilitate new and innovative learning and teaching methodology, and to disseminate good practices in teaching and learning for sharing purpose.

4. To allocate grants which have been earmarked for the improvement of learning and teaching.

5. To submit an annual report to Senate covering the Committee's activities for the previous 12 months from 1st July to 30th June.

<u>**Composition**</u>

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

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

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

        Chairmen of Faculty/School/College Learning and Teaching Committee

        FAST
        FB
        FCE
        FENG
        FH
        FHSS
        SD
        SHTM
        CPCE

        Dean of Students

        Director of Educational Development

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

1

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

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

June 2012

[**Note:** Changes are <mark>highlighted</mark>.]

Quality Assurance Committee (Academic Departments)
質 素 委 員 會 (教 學 部 門)

Terms of Reference

1. To monitor the implementation of the University's Quality Assurance framework, as approved by Senate, and its associated policies and processes.

2. To formulate and review the quality assurance policies and processes pertaining to academic departments under the purview of this Committee.

3. To receive and consider Departmental Review and Quality Assurance reports from Faculty/School/College Board on their academic units.

4. To conduct academic audits, as and when appropriate, on specific aspects of the academic functions of the University.

5. To promote the sharing of experience and good practices across academic departments and to provide a forum for the discussion of matters relating to quality assurance, performance measurement, and related issues.

6. To submit an annual report to Senate covering the Committee's activities for the previous 12 months from 1st July to 30th June.

Composition

Chairman   :   Vice President (Academic Development)

Members   :   Vice President (Research Development)

                 All Faculty Deans and School/College Board Chairmen

                 Chairman of Quality Assurance Committee (Non-academic Units)

                 Academic Secretary

                 Head of Internal Audit

                 Director of Educational Development

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

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

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

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

THE HONG KONG
POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY
香港理工大學

Quality Assurance Committee (Academic Departments)

Paper for : Discussion

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Encl.
September 2012

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

The Report should include the following key elements:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

November 2012

The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

College of Professional and Continuing Education (CPCE)

College Council

Terms of Reference

1. To govern CPCE and to develop its mission and strategic directions;

2. To establish and approve major policies for its management in accordance with the mission and strategic directions of CPCE;

3. To approve the business plans and annual budget of CPCE and its units;

4. To approve other operating and capital investment budget, tuition fees and other income, lease and purchase of property;

5. To approve staffing and compensation policy;

6. To appoint, on the recommendation of the President of PolyU, Heads of the constituent school, college or other operating unit(s) of CPCE;

7. To have the right to delegate part of its authority to its committees or the Dean (PCE); and

8. To co-opt up to two members to serve on the College Council.

<u>Composition and Membership List</u>

Chairperson

President of PolyU
    Professor Timothy Tong

Vice-Chairperson

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

Ex-officio members

Deputy President & Provost
    Professor Philip Chan

Executive Vice President
    Mr. Nicholas Yang

Dean, College of Professional and Continuing Education
    Professor Peter Yuen

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

Director of Hong Kong Community College
    Dr. Simon Leung

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

Appointed members

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

Professor Louis Cheng, Professor, School of Accounting and Finance

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

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

Three external members, appointed by the President of PolyU

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

Professor Kenneth Pang, PolyU Council Member

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

Co-opted member

Dr. Peter GP Walters, Associate Dean (QA)

Secretary

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

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

Assistant Secretary

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

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

(November 2012)

Guidelines on the Departmental Review System for Academic Departments

Introduction

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

Purposes and focus of the Departmental Review system

2.   The Departmental Review (DR) system aims to serve two main purposes:

    (i)   To be an instrument for quality enhancements in academic departments; and

    (ii)   To be a major input for future strategic planning and visioning of the academic departments, and for international benchmarking.

3.   The focus of the Departmental Review exercise will be more on quality enhancements, and not solely on quality assessments or evaluating a department's past performance. It will also focus on international benchmarking to align with our strategic vision to become a world class university.

Review cycle

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

Review mechanism

5.   *Appointment of overseas academic members*

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

<center>1</center>

5.2 In steady-state, these advisors will be appointed to a 6-year term of office, to tie in with the DR cycle, and they will form the core of the Review Panel mentioned in paragraph 4 above. If the DAA is not able to serve for the full 6-year DR cycle due to special circumstances, one of the other two overseas academic members will be appointed as the new DAA, and another overseas academic member will be appointed as a replacement advisor.

5.3 If there are more than one discipline in a department, separate Panels/overseas academic members will be formed/appointed to review each discipline, as deemed appropriate and determined by the Faculty Dean/School Board Chairman.

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

6. *Annual/biennial visits of the overseas academic members in the first five years of each review cycle*

6.1 The DAA will be invited to visit the department for a period of one week once every year, whilst the other two overseas academic members will only need to come for one to two days every two or three years (or two to three days if there is only one visit before the Review Panel exercise). Even though it cannot be expected that each of the three overseas academics will serve for the full 6-year cycle of a DR exercise, it must be ensured that every overseas academic member who will be part of the DR Panel will have visited the department (with a view to gathering information and giving advice) at least once before the actual Review Panel exercise.

6.2 After each annual visit, the DAA will present a comprehensive report to the Faculty Dean/School Board Chairman on the broad directions of the department, and recommend how the department can further enhance in terms of benchmarking against its international peers. The other two overseas academic members will submit a report after their visit(s), but the report can be more succinct than the DAA's. The academic department will then copy a full set of these reports to the DAA and overseas academic members, to facilitate the exchange of views between the three of them (see also paragraph 6.4). Since another QA mechanism, i.e. the Annual QA Report exercise, will be retained, the DR exercise/reports will also provide the forum for the Faculty Dean/School Board Chairman to comprehensively review a department's performance over the years.

6.3 The DAA's annual visit should, as far as practicable, be scheduled to tie in with a Departmental Advisory Committee (DAC) meeting, to enable the DAA to share with DAC members his observations pertinent to the academic activities and the future development of the department, and for the DAA to gauge the needs from the industrial perspective. *(This Section 6.3 is also applicable to CPCE.)*

6.4 It is anticipated that the three overseas academic members may visit the department at different times of a year and therefore may not be able to meet together every year. They will be expected to exchange views on the department through correspondence, and after perusal of the annual/biennial reports submitted by the other advisors concerned.

2

7. *A comprehensive Review exercise in the 6th year of each review cycle*

7.1 In the 6th year of each review cycle, a comprehensive Review exercise will be undertaken by a Review Panel comprised of the Faculty Dean and School/College Board Chairman (as the Panel Chairman), the three overseas academic members (at least 3 current CPCE academic advisors for HKCC/SPEED), and an internal academic member from another department/School. The Faculty Dean and School/College Board Chairman will decide whether the addition of a local industrial member (who can be a DAC member from industry, or a CPCE Advisory Committee member from industry for HKCC/SPEED) will be beneficial to the Review exercise.

7.2 The Review exercise to be undertaken by the Review Panel will be for a duration of one to two days. The Review Panel will take account of (1) a brief self-evaluation document prepared by the department, and (2) the annual/biennial reports submitted by the overseas academic members during the previous five years, and how the department has addressed the issues raised therein to enhance its quality, raise its profile, and strengthen its position etc. The Review Panel will also conduct interviews with departmental leaders, the department's staff and students, relevant industrial representatives and alumni, and will come up with an overall report on the Review exercise. The Review Panel will not be required to give the department a rating. However, the Review Panel will indicate how the department compares, on a variety of aspects, with the academic departments elsewhere and in the same discipline (and which the DR Panel is familiar with), which will serve as part of the benchmarking exercise for the department.

8. *Focus on International Benchmarking*

8.1 To achieve the purpose of international benchmarking, the system requires the appointment of overseas academic members who then serve as key members of the Review Panel. Further to this, cognate programme, Department or the institution as a whole can be identified and selected as benchmarking partners, to form part of the focus of the Review Panel's deliberations.

8.2 The general criteria for selecting benchmarking partners should include the international ranking of the cognate programme, the Department or the institution as a whole; the academic and/or research strength of the (external) Department concerned, and any other special justifications for making the choice. The programmes and institutions selected for benchmarking should generally be of high academic and professional standing.

8.3 If cognate programme(s) are to be selected for benchmarking purpose, it should involve not more than 3 such programmes of peer institutions. The Department can propose the specific programme(s) for approval by the Faculty Dean (same procedure as for the appointment of overseas academic member).

8.4 If an external Department or institution are to be selected for benchmarking purpose, the selection process will involve nomination by the Head of Department, endorsement by the Faculty Dean, and approval by the VP(AD), (same procedure as for the appointment of DAA).

8.5 The following are the essential parameters to be measured against the benchmarked institutions:

3

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

9.   *Departmental Response*

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

Involvement of academic department

8.   10.   *Nomination of overseas academic members*

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

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

9.   11.   *Documentation requirements*

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

10.   12.   *Response to DR report*

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

Involvement of Faculty Dean and School/College Board Chairman

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

4

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

12. 14. For the Review Panel exercise in the final year of each 6-year cycle, the Faculty Dean/ and School/College Board Chairman will:

(i) chair the Review Panel;

(ii) nominate, for the approval of VP(AD)/Chairman of QAC(AD), an internal academic member from another department/School to serve as member of the Review Panel; and

(iii) invite, as deemed beneficial to the Review exercise, a local industrial member (who can be a DAC member from industry, or a CPCE Advisory Committee member from industry for HKCC/SPEED) to be a member of the Review Panel.

(iv) present the Faculty/School/College Report to QAC(AD) on DR Panel exercise(s) conducted in the year. A template for this Faculty/School/College Report is attached in the Annex.

Remuneration for DAA and overseas academic member

13. 15. The current remuneration package for external specialists will be applicable to the DAA and the overseas academic members, as follows:

(i) *Departmental Academic Advisor* (DAA) [or Academic Advisor for CPCE] will receive an honorarium per annum, as at present.

(ii) *Overseas academic member* will receive an honorarium per annum, following the rate previously used for overseas panel member of a DA exercise.

14. 16. For other expenses arising from their visits to an academic department and for the DR Panel exercise, the DAA (or Academic Advisor for CPCE) and overseas academic member will be reimbursed at the same rate which is currently applicable to all categories of external specialists.

November 2012

International Advisory Board
國際顧問委員會

Terms of Reference

1. To contribute international perspectives to strategic priorities and development imperatives at PolyU.

2. To act as a sounding board to the President on major initiatives of PolyU.

3. To dedicate time to meet twice a year.

4. To serve for a term of three years.

Composition

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Secretary: To be appointed by the President

Mrs Winnie Eley, Director of International Affairs

Notes
Current term of office: 2010 - 2013

16 November 2012

THE HONG KONG
POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY
香港理工大學

Faculty Advisory Committee
學院顧問委員會

Terms of Reference

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

1. Give advice to the Dean and the Faculty Board on the Faculty Plan and future developments.

2. Identify opportunities in research and education.

3. Advise the Dean on ways in which the community can contribute to the further development of the Faculty.

4. Receive summary reports on Departmental Advisory Committee meetings, and others, as appropriate, on the work of the Faculty, using suitable statistical data and benchmarks.

Membership [1]

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

* A person external to the University

<u>Note 1</u>

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

<u>Note 2</u>

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

<u>Terms of Office and Period of Appointment</u>

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

<u>Frequency of Meetings</u>

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

11 January 2012

School Advisory Committee
學院顧問委員會

Terms of Reference

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

5. Give advice to the Dean and the School Board on the School Plan and future developments.

6. Identify opportunities in research and education.

7. Advise the Dean on ways in which the community can contribute to the further development of the School.

8. Receive summary reports on School Industry Advisory Committee meetings, and others, as appropriate, on the work of the School, using suitable statistical data and benchmarks.

Membership [1]

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

* A person external to the University

<u>Note 1</u>

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

<u>Note 2</u>

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

<u>Terms of Office and Period of Appointment</u>

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

<u>Frequency of Meetings</u>

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

11 January 2012

PolyU Institutional Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan 2012-15

	Professional competence	Other desired graduate attributes of PolyU					Remarks
		Critical thinker	Effective communicator	Innovative problem solver	Lifelong learner	Ethical leader	
Direct assessments							
1. Assessment via P-LOAP							
• Via course embedded assessment in DSR	●	●		●	●		Implemented by respective programme teams, reported in PLOA Report to be included in the Dept Annual QA Report (with improvement plan/actions), to be submitted to Faculty Dean/School Board Chairs for monitoring and review
• Via assessment of Capstone Project	●	●	●	●	●		
• Via assessment of students' performance in WIE			●				
• Via assessment of DSR language subjects	●		●				
2. Assessment of GUR outcomes							
• Via course embedded assessment in CAR subjects [New]		●	● [For subjects with W Requirements]				Implemented/assessed by the subject teachers concerned, reported to CoGUR for monitoring and review
• Via course embedded assessment in LCR subjects [New]			●				
• Via course embedded assessment in L&IPD subjects [New]					●	●	
• Via course embedded assessment in S-L subjects [New]		●		●		●	
3. Other direct assessment measures/activities							
• IELTS results of graduating students			●				Required by UGC, collected by AS & reported to CoGUR for monitoring and review
• Collegiate Learning Assessment (developed by CAE, USA)		●	●	●			Conducted biennially for international benchmarking purposes on a stratified sample basis, coordinated by VPAD Office and reported to CoGUR for monitoring and review
Total	3	4+1	6+1	3+1	3	2	

	Professional competence						Remarks
Indirect assessments via institutional surveys*							
1. Graduate employment survey							Conducted by SAO, on employment of graduates of all FT taught programmes (HD, Ug and TPg) irrespective of sources of funding [focusing on employment data only]
2. SAARD		●	●	●	●	●	Conducted by SAO, for promoting students' personal development as well as for estimating the 'value-added' change in students' attainment of the intended outcomes
3. Revised Alumni survey	●	●	●	●	●	●	Conducted by EDC, in collaboration with departments, on alumni's perception of attainment of institutional as well as programme learning outcomes (can be extended to track graduates' employment and career growth over time)
4. Employer survey by EMB/EDB **	●		●	●		●	Conducted (triennially) by EMB/EDB and reported to UGC and institutions concerned
5. Survey of Students' First year Experience at PolyU [New]							A new survey to be developed, focusing on students' First Year Experience at PolyU, including academic advising
6. Student exit survey [New]	●	●	●	●	●	●	A new survey of graduating students to be developed, for collecting data on three major aspects: SAARD, student engagement, and total learning experience at PolyU

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

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

[Revised 1 March 2012]

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

	Professional competence	Critical thinker	Effective communicator	Innovative problem solver	Lifelong learner	Ethical leader	Department or units with primary responsibility	Remarks
Planned curricular activities/experience for the 4-year curriculum								
Major/Programme								
• Totality of the Major curriculum (all DSR subjects together)	●	●	●	●	●	⊙	F/S Board, Dept and Programme Team and Committee concerned	May vary from programme to programme
○ Capstone project [new]	●	●	●	●	●			
○ WIE	⊙	⊙	●	⊙	⊙			
○ DSR language subjects [new]	●		●		⊙		ELC/CLC	
General University Requirements								
• Freshman Seminar [new]	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙		F/S Board	
• Language and Communication Requirement [new]			●		⊙		CoGUR and ELC/CLC	
• Leadership and Intrapersonal Development [new]		⊙	⊙	⊙	●	●	CoGUR	
• Service Learning [new]	⊙	●	⊙	●	⊙	●	CoGUR	
• Cluster Area Requirement [new]		●	● [particularly for CAR with R&W Requirements]		●		CoGUR	To develop also "multidisciplinary perspective"
• Healthy Lifestyle Requirement [new]					●	⊙	CoGUR and SAO	To promote a healthy lifestyle

	Professional competence	Critical thinker	Effective communicator	Innovative problem solver	Lifelong learner	Ethical leader	Department or units with primary responsibility	Planned provisions /participation
Co-curricular activities/experience								
• Study trips and other co-curricular activities organized by Departments or programmes	●	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	Dept and Programme Team	
• Academic exchange, other non-local experiences including offshore WIE	⊙	●	●	●	●		Dept, IAO, CMAO and SAO	
• Language Enhancement Programme and activities			●				ELC/CLC	
• Read@PolyU [new]			●				LIB	
• Cultural activities organized by CPEO							CPEO	
• Student SPECIAL ePortfolio [SAO]			●		⊙		SAO	
• Mental Health Caring Project			⊙	●		●	SAO	
• Entrepreneurship Programme	⊙	⊙	●	●			SAO	
• Community service learning Programme	⊙	⊙	●	●		●	SAO	
• Hall Education Programme		⊙	⊙	⊙	●	⊙	SAO	
• Complementary Studies Programme	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	●	⊙	SAO	
• Learning Enhancement Programme	⊙		⊙		●		SAO	
• Peer Mentoring Programme (including Non-local Students' Mentorship Programme)			●	⊙		●	SAO	
• Personal Development Programme	⊙	⊙	●	⊙	●	⊙	SAO	
• Sports Team Development Programme				⊙	●	⊙	SAO	
• Physical Education Courses					●	⊙	SAO	
• Career and WIE training organized by SAO			●		⊙		SAO	

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

Departmental Academic Advisor System

1. **Introduction**

1.1 Before the introduction of the Credit-based System, an External Examiner was appointed for each programme leading to an award of the University. The External Examiner was expected to moderate examination questions and play an active part in the final assessment.

1.2 With the implementation of the Credit-based System, a Departmental Academic Advisors (DAA) system has been introduced. Under the new system, instead of appointing an External Examiner for each programme, each Department should appoint a Departmental Academic Advisor to monitor and maintain the standard of all academic functions of the Department. The Departmental Academic Advisor will advise on all aspects of the Department's work (see Section 4.1 below).

1.3 In exceptional cases, and where the appointment of an External Examiner is a condition to fulfill requirements of the professional body, the Department concerned should inform the relevant professional body of the introduction of the new system and make every effort to get them understand the role of Departmental Academic Advisors which replaces External Examiners. If the retention of External Examiner is still considered necessary, the request for the retention should be put forth to Vice President (Academic Development) for approval via the Faculty Dean/School Board Chairman concerned.

2. **The appointment of Departmental Academic Advisors**

2.1 Each Department shall normally have one Departmental Academic Advisor. Departments offering programmes in more than one specialised area may, with the agreement of the relevant Faculty Dean/School Board Chairman and approval of Vice President (Academic Development), appoint more than one Departmental Academic Advisor.

2.2 Nominations for Departmental Academic Advisor should be submitted by the Head of Department to the Faculty Dean/School Board Chairman for endorsement, and to Vice President (Academic Development) for approval. The nominations should contain information on the Departmental Academic Advisor's background and employment history, plus information on the Departmental Academic Advisor's expected contributions to the Department in respect of his expertise. Please refer to Annex I for a sample of the Nomination Form to be used.

2.3 Appointment of Departmental Academic Advisor will normally be made initially for a term of 3 years with the possibility of renewal for another term of 3 years. The maximum period of appointment should not exceed 6 years.

2.4 Departmental Academic Advisors can be appointed either locally or from overseas.

2.5 Departmental Academic Advisors should be invited to visit the Department once each year for a period of about one week, i.e. 3 visits for each term of appointment.

1

2.6 Before a nomination for the appointment is made to the Faculty Dean/School Board Chairman, the nominee should be approached informally by the Head of the Department to see if he is willing to accept. In this initial approach it must be made clear to the nominee that the approach is in the nature of an enquiry and is not a formal commitment, either on the part of the University or the nominee.

2.7 If a Department considers it appropriate for the Departmental Academic Advisor to visit the Department more than once each year, or once only for the 3-year term, this can be allowed subject to the endorsement of the relevant Faculty Dean/School Board Chairman and the approval of Vice President (Academic Development).

2.8 The University and/or the Departmental Academic Advisor may choose to shorten the period of appointment provided that due notice has been given.

2.9 Departmental Academic Advisors are responsible for the continuous monitoring of a Department, in accordance with its strategic directions and macro plans. For better integration with the Departmental Review (DR) system, a department will nominate, for the respective Faculty Dean/School Board Chairman's endorsement, its current Departmental Academic Advisor (unless he/she is a local person from the industrial sector) to serve as an overseas academic advisor to the department under the Departmental Review system. (For details of the DAA's role in the DR system, please refer to the "Guidelines on the Departmental Review System for Academic Departments".)

3. Criteria for the appointment of Departmental Academic Advisors

3.1 Candidates proposed for appointment as Departmental Academic Advisor should be of a high academic and/or professional standing. They should possess expertise appropriate to the Department/discipline in question, and should be the persons from whom the Department may seek advice on academic matters related to curriculum planning, subject development, inter-departmental cooperation, provision of equipment and facilities, research and consultancy, etc.

3.2 Departmental Academic Advisors are expected to be currently active in their profession. For candidates reaching the age of retirement, their period of office should be determined so as not to extend beyond their expected time of retirement from full-time employment by more than one year, unless they are still active in their profession.

3.3 The standard of cognate study programmes in the DAA's current university/institution is one of the factors for considering his suitability for appointment.

3.4 Departmental Academic Advisors are also expected to complement the international benchmarking efforts of the PolyU, at the Departmental and programme levels.

4. Duties of Departmental Academic Advisors

4.1 A Departmental Academic Advisor is expected to give advice to the Department on all aspects of the Department's work, including the following:

(i) *Departmental mission, strategic plan and organisation*

2

- departmental mission and objectives
- departmental strategic plans, and its harmonization with the Institutional Strategic Plan
- committee structure of the Department

(ii) *Departmental staffing and resources*

- staff qualifications and experience
- staff recruitment and development policies
- effectiveness of staff appraisal system
- resources allocation and management

(iii) *Departmental quality assurance system*

- communication of departmental strategic plan
- performance, measurement and expected level
- feedback mechanism from students, employers and External Examiners etc.
- action on feedback

(iv) *Academic programmes (including self-financed programmes)*

- curriculum design, monitoring and review
- Programme Learning Outcomes Assessment Plans (LOAP) and results
- service teaching provided by the Department

(v) *Teaching, learning and assessment*

- alignment of teaching, learning and assessment with intended learning outcomes
- learning environment, academic support services
- evidence of students' attainment of intended learning outcomes

(vi) *Research, consultancy, other scholarly activities and services to the professional community*

- strengths and weaknesses
- plans
- output
- relationship with industry/the professional community

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

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

3

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

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

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

6. **Administrative arrangements**

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

7. **Honorarium for Departmental Academic Advisors**

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

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

4

Learning and Teaching Committee

Guidelines on Collecting and Using Student Feedback

October 2012

<u>**Overview**</u>

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

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

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

<u>**Strategies for Collecting and Using Student Feedback**</u>

1. Frequency and timing

    (a) It is recommended that instead of a single end-of-semester feedback (e.g. SFQ), interim/multiple feedback should be collected during the semester to allow improvement be made to benefit the current cohort of students.

    (b) Where possible, it is desirable to schedule the collection of student feedback on a programme prior to programme committee meetings to allow issues to be followed up by the programme committee.

2. Collecting feedback

    (a) In general, using a combination of strategies to collect feedback is more effective than relying on a single one. In order not to overload students, alternate use of 'fast' and more in-depth feedback collection method can be considered. In addition to Student/Staff Consultative Groups, other appropriate methods such as interim feedback questionnaires and online feedback system may also be used based on individual needs. Departments can exercise their own discretion to determine whether or not they should use a combination of strategies to collect student feedback. Workload of staff and students has to be taken into consideration as well.

1

(b) Before requesting feedback from students, departments should let them know the following:
- why teachers are interested in their input
- what teachers are interested in (identify specific areas of concern if necessary)
- how teachers/department will use the information collected
- that identity of individual students will be kept confidential although a summary of data may be disseminated

(c) Teachers should encourage students to identify both strengths and weaknesses, as well as problems and solutions.

(d) The collection of feedback should focus on topics relevant to the improvement of educational provision, such as quality of teaching, academic programmes/subjects, various university facilities (e.g., computing, library, recreational and sporting facilities).

3. Using feedback for improvement

(a) Student feedback should be actively and timely considered for improving teaching, learning and the programme. Action plans in response to student feedback should be drawn up by appropriate staff (e.g., programme leaders) who have a major role in managing the quality of the programme.

(b) Programme leaders should ensure that actions planned in response to student feedback are communicated to all teaching/support staff involved for proper implementation.

(c) Feedback which concerns academic support units such as the Library, ITS, SAO, etc. should be forwarded to the respective units for follow up.

4. Informing students of outcomes

(a) Students should be informed of the outcomes of feedback collection. The following framework can be used for relating the outcomes to students:
- Which suggestions will be acted upon promptly and how
- Which suggestions will be worked upon but will take a longer time and why
- Which suggestions teachers would like to act on but are unable to and why
- Which suggestions will not be acted upon and why
- Which suggestions will be forwarded to other committees/units concerned for follow-up actions and why

(b) Departments can choose the channel of communication with students as appropriate, e.g., circulation of minutes to student representatives for their reporting to other students, LEARN@PolyU, notice board, newsletters, email, posts on students' portal and departmental intranet.

(c) Teachers collecting feedback on the subjects can consider more interactive approaches to informing students, e.g., verbal report to the class, discussing with students their feedback and improvement plans.

5. Documentation and reporting

   (a) Departments are advised to keep a record of the feedback collected from their students, regardless of the means by which the feedback is collected.

   (b) For SSCG, the minutes of meetings, content of feedback and action plans for improvement in response to the feedback should be included in the record. Minutes should be circulated to relevant committees and/or personnel such as Departmental Undergraduate Programme Committee, DLTC, subject leaders and/or Scheme Chairs and students.

   (c) Responses to student feedback should be reported in the Annual Report and Business Plan (ARBP).

   (d) Documentation about collecting, recording and using student feedback should be made readily available to demonstrate the department's commitment to quality improvement in quality audit/review exercises.

October 2012

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

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

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

IUT: "Introduction to University Teaching" course

BTTR: "Basic Teaching Techniques for Research Staff and Research Students" course

BETA: "Becoming an Effective Teaching Assistant" course