

# Institutional feedback report

<b>Name of Institution</b>	University of Cape Town
<b>Date of institutional visit</b>	13 April 2016
<b>Names of peer reviewers</b>	Prof Gary Swartz Prof Johan Schoeman
<b>Name of CHE person involved in the visit</b>	Prof Diane Grayson
<b>Date draft report submitted to institution</b>	12 June 2017
<b>Date of final report</b>	18 August 2017

## GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO QEP PEER REVIEWER REPORTS

Four focus areas were selected for Phase 1 of the Quality Enhancement Project (QEP) with which all institutions were asked to engage, namely: (1) enhancing academics as teachers, (2) enhancing student support and development, (3) enhancing the learning environment, and (4) enhancing course and programme enrolment management. In September 2014 each university produced a baseline submission that addressed the following questions for each focus area:

- Which aspects of your institution's Strategic Plan relate to this focus area? (Please be specific by quoting from the Strategic Plan).
- What activities do you currently have in place related to this focus area that are successful? What evidence do you use to conclude that they are successful? (Do not provide detailed evidence, just a description of the type of evidence you collect and a short summary of the results.)
- What activities related to this focus area have you initiated during the past three or four years that have not been as successful as you had hoped? In what ways were they unsuccessful? What do you think might be the reasons for the lack of success?
- What activities have you recently implemented or are you planning to implement in the next 12 to 18 months related to this focus area? Why have you chosen these particular activities? What is the need or problem they are intended to address?
- What are the challenges or problems related to this focus area that still need to be addressed in your institution?

The submission also included an introductory section on the contextual features of the institution that are salient to student success, a description of how the submission was prepared, and a concluding section on other activities the institution was undertaking to promote student success and challenges being faced.

Universities were asked to submit final reports by 11 December 2015 that indicated improvements that had been made or were being planned since the baseline reports were submitted. The stated aim of the report is shown below.

The aim of the institutional report is to demonstrate efforts to bring about enhancements in each of the four Quality Enhancement Project (QEP) focus areas since the beginning of Phase 1 of the QEP in February 2014, reflect on the journey towards enhancement and assess the extent to which the efforts have resulted in improvements.

Because of widespread student protests in the last few months of 2015, some reports were submitted early in 2016. In the final report, for each focus area universities responded to the following questions:

- Summarise what the university considers to be the key issues in [this focus area] in one or two paragraphs.
- During Phase 1 of the QEP, what changes at institutional level (a) have been made, (b) are in progress, or (c) are in the planning stages that relate to enhancing academics as teachers?

- Provide one or more (but not more than 5) exemplars to illustrate specific aspects of the changes that are successful. Provide evidence for claims of success. Where an activity is in the planning stages, indicate what evidence will be collected.
- Provide one or more (but not more than 5) exemplars of changes that have not been successful and suggest reasons.
- If possible, identify one or more promising practices related to this focus area. Describe the practice and provide evidence for success. Suggest what the key features might be.
- Identify the main challenges the university still faces in relation to this focus area.

The document also included an introduction that described how the report was prepared and a concluding section on reflections on Phase 1 of the QEP.

During 2016 and early 2017 individual institutional visits were carried out by two peer reviewers and the Director: Institutional Audits. The CHE communicated with the DVC Teaching and Learning or Academic to find a suitable date for the visit, and then a formal letter was sent to the Vice-Chancellor, which included the names of the peer reviewers and a request to indicate whether he or she felt there was a serious conflict of interest. In addition to logistical matters, the letter described the purpose and format of the visit as follows:

The purpose of the institutional visit is to provide a structured opportunity for institutional leaders to engage with peer reviewers external to the institution about the journey they are taking towards improvement in the QEP focus areas, the milestones achieved, the challenges encountered along the way and the plans for further improvement. It is also an opportunity for institutions to receive feedback on their engagement with the focus areas and suggestions for what else they might consider doing, or doing differently, based on what is being learned in and with the sector. Please note that we are interested in what is being done at your university that relates to the four Phase 1 focus areas, not just designated QEP activities.

The broad frame for the visit is appreciative inquiry (AI), originally developed by Cooperrider and Srivastva (1987)<sup>1</sup>. AI is a strengths-based approach to change management that uses the “positive core” of an organisation as the starting point for growth and improvement. In contrast to problem-solving – trying to fix what is – it employs a generative method to envision what does not yet exist. While it is impossible for peer reviewers to engage in a full-blown AI process, the institutional visit is intended to focus on the positives as a springboard for thinking about what to enhance and how.

During the visit we would like to meet with the following groups of people over the course of the day:

1. Senior management (60 minutes)
2. Key role players involved with Focus Area 1 (80 minutes)
3. Key role players involved with Focus Area 2 (80 minutes)
4. Key role players involved with Focus Area 3 (80 minutes)

---

<sup>1</sup> Cooperrider, D.L. & Srivastva, S. (1987). Appreciative inquiry in organizational life. In Woodman, R. W. & Pasmore, W.A. (Eds), *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, Vol. 1, Stamford, CT: JAI Press, 129-169.

5. Key role players involved with Focus Area 4 (80 minutes)
6. Senior management (30 minutes for feedback)

The team will have read the university's QEP baseline report and final report. At the meetings, the team may ask for further information beyond what was in the two documents. The university may also wish to bring additional information to the meetings.

The selection of participants is up to you. However, we hope that you will be able to be part of the first meeting, and if possible, the last. For the meetings with senior management, we would like to speak with people who have the authority and responsibility to implement and drive initiatives at institutional level that relate to the four focus areas of Phase 1 of the QEP<sup>2</sup>. For the meetings on the focus areas, we hope that students will be included.

Several weeks before the institutional visit, the two peer reviewers were sent the institutions' two reports, two articles on Appreciative Inquiry and the peer reviewer manual, which contains, among other things, a list of possible questions and detailed guidelines for the peer reviewer report. Immediately prior to each institutional visit, the peer reviewers and the Director: Institutional Audits spent most of a day preparing for the visit by going through the institution's two submissions in detail. During this preparatory meeting, several specific questions for the senior management were formulated and areas in which the panel wanted more information were identified for each focus area. The meetings that took place during the institutional visit were audio-recorded, and the audio files were sent to the peer reviewers after the visit for reference.

Each peer reviewer report is based on three data sources: the institution's baseline submission, the institution's final report and the content of the meetings during the institutional visit. As stated in the letters to the VCs, institutions could provide additional information during the visit. Some institutions did provide further documentation to elaborate on specific issues during the visit or, by agreement, emailed additional documentation immediately after the visit; in these cases such documentation was also taken into account in writing the report. It was necessary to limit the scope of the work in this way to ensure that the work could be completed within a specified time frame and also to be fair to all institutions.

Following receipt of the peer reviewers' reports, the CHE undertook a process of editing and harmonisation of the reports (to ensure a reasonable level of consistency among them) before sending them to institutions. In the initial letter to each VC it was indicated that the reports would be sent to the institutions for corrections, but that institutions were not expected to add new information at this stage. After the corrections were received from institutions, the final report was produced; new information was not included. It is hoped that the report will be a useful resource for an institution in its own journey to improvement. In addition, the reports will be among the documents that the CHE will use to produce a document synthesising what has been learnt during Phase 1 of the QEP across the sector. The final reports will serve at the Institutional Audits Committee and the Higher Education Quality Committee for information.

---

<sup>2</sup> (1) Enhancing academics as teachers, (2) Enhancing student support and development, (3) Enhancing the learning environment, (4) Enhancing course and programme enrolment management.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The University of Cape Town (UCT) is a highly regarded research-intensive university. Founded in 1829, it is one of the oldest institutions of higher learning in South Africa with a history of attracting and producing some of the best students in the country. In 2014 there were over 26,000 students enrolled across six faculties (Faculty of Commerce, Faculty of Engineering & the Built Environment, Faculty of Health Sciences, Faculty of Humanities, Faculty of Law, Faculty of Science), with female students (13 919) being in the majority, and 3 499 permanent staff, of whom 1 149 were instruction/research staff.

The University's executive management consists of the Vice-Chancellor, Registrar, Deputy Vice-Chancellors, Deans and Executive Directors. The University has a highly decentralised model of governance. The faculties, through the deans, have a high level of autonomy in terms of their processes. Institutional policies provide guidance that each faculty implements in a way that is appropriate to its own context. This means that coordination across the University requires extensive consultation and consensus.

The University of Cape Town prides itself on the quality of its staff and students. Its reputation and selection processes ensure that some of the most academically able applicants in the country are selected for entry to the University. The selection of quality students contributes significantly to the overall high student success. With 95% of the academic staff having either a Masters or Doctoral qualification in 2012, teaching is deeply informed by research. A number of initiatives have been put in place in relation to professional development for staff across the University.

There is a deep commitment to transformation and improving student access to the University. This commitment has been strengthened by the different student movements, such as the #FeesMustFall and #RhodesMustFall movements, which have forced the University to critically reflect on issues of equity and transformation, and to listen more carefully to the student voice.

The University has a stated focus on quality teaching and learning. In the last few years the University has appointed a DVC: Teaching and Learning and formed a Senate Teaching and Learning committee. The *UCT Teaching and Learning Charter* outlines responsibilities of staff and students in relation to teaching and learning and emphasises the importance of having an environment that is conducive to learning. This includes ensuring that the physical learning infrastructure meets optimum standards and the online learning tools are supported through technology provision. Deans' performance appraisal includes their teaching strategy for their faculties.

There are also numerous ways in which students are supported, at faculty level, in residences and through Student Affairs.

To prepare the baseline (2014) QEP submission, four task teams were established, comprising academic and support staff and student representatives. A QEP Coordinating

Committee monitored and oversaw the production of the report. It was chaired by the DVC: Teaching and Learning, and included the task team convenors, Dean of the Centre for Higher Education Development, Director of Institutional Planning, Quality Assurance Manager and President and Secretary General of the SRC. A similar process was followed in preparing the final (2016) report.

## **2. FOCUS AREA 1: ENHANCING ACADEMICS AS TEACHERS**

*(Including professional development, rewards and recognition, workload, conditions of service and performance appraisal)*

### **THE INSTITUTION'S STRENGTHS**

The UCT's *Strategic Plan 2010-2014*, specifically objective 5 of the plan, provides for the creation of an environment that supports the enhancement of teaching and learning through academic staff development and rewarding teaching and learning. In 2012 the University established the Senate Teaching and Learning Committee, comprised of chairs of faculty structures, to develop a coherent institutional approach to enhancing teaching and learning. This was part of a deliberate attempt to strengthen governance, oversight and accountability with respect to teaching and learning.

The Centre for Higher Education Development (CHED), led by a Dean, grew out of various incarnations of academic development structures, which had operated since the mid-1980s. It comprises the Academic Development Programme, Centre for Educational Testing for Access and Placement, Centre for Innovation in Learning and Teaching, Careers Service and Centre for Extra-Mural Studies, together with special projects directly under the Dean. In addition to the support offered to staff and students centrally, CHED also works closely with faculties on staff and student development. Some CHED staff are physically located in faculties and teach in formal, faculty-based programmes.

CHED offers several voluntary academic staff development programmes. The New Academic Practitioners Programme (NAPP) is a non-compulsory induction programme for new, full-time academic staff, comprising a 3-day residential retreat and two 1-day workshops, spread over a semester. Other regular offerings include a module on Learning and Teaching in Higher Education (LTHE), Postgraduate Diploma in Higher Education and a Short Course on Teaching. The Centre for Innovation in Teaching and Learning facilitates workshops and seminars on the effective use of technology-enhanced and enabled learning and teaching.

There is an annual Teaching and Learning Conference, which is part of the University's efforts to promote the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SOTL).

Some faculties have formal structures to enhance teaching, such as the Education Development Units (EDUs) in Commerce and in Health Sciences, the Commerce Teaching and Learning Working Group, the Health Sciences Education Interest Group and the

Academic Development Committee and Centre for Research in Engineering Education in the Faculty of Engineering and the Built Environment. The Health Sciences EDU developed and now runs a Postgraduate Diploma in Health Professional Education. The Commerce Faculty has a Commerce Education Group that organises well-attended bi-monthly seminars, and the Faculties of Law and of Engineering and the Built Environment have one-day teaching and learning workshops and retreats.

In terms of the conditions of service, full-time permanent and 3-year contract staff accumulate generous leave based on specific standards of teaching and research. Staff are also incentivised through funding from DHET awards and the skills levy to take teaching sabbatical leave to specifically work on curriculum reform or broaden their educational expertise or experience.

The University's remuneration policy aligns rewards with performance. For academic staff, the performance is in the context of the University's position as a research-led institution. This means academic staff must engage in research-driven teaching, scholarship and community engagement. For promotion, criteria are faculty-specific, but most faculties require evidence for teaching quality in the form of a teaching portfolio. In addition, staff are rewarded and incentivised through the Distinguished Teacher Award, which is regarded as very prestigious. Student course evaluations are central to the assessment of nominees.

#### **APPROACH TAKEN TO IMPROVEMENT**

The establishment of a DVC for Teaching and Learning and a Senate Teaching and Learning Committee, with representation from each faculty, is helping to engender a more coherent approach to the improvement of teaching and learning in the University. This is also resulting in an increased expectation that the quality of teaching and learning and transformation of the curricula are the responsibilities of the HODs.

The #RhodesMustFall campaign and the Black Academic Caucus provided further impetus for the institution to reflect in-depth on issues pertaining to pedagogy and curriculum. As a result, a number of participatory forums have been formed across the University.

#### **IMPROVEMENTS UNDERTAKEN AND PROGRESS MADE**

There appears to be a culture shift from valuing only (or largely) research activities, to an appreciation for teaching and learning, as shown, for example, in increased recognition for teaching in promotions and the establishment of institutional and faculty structures and committees related to teaching and learning.

##### *Professional Development*

The University initiated a curriculum review process, as part of a broader transformation review, in order to inform a fresh perspective on professional development for academic

staff. This is important and commendable as it aligns professional development with transformation, academic and social imperatives.

The NAPP programme has led to networking and communities of practice among participating staff. NAPP has furthermore led to reflective practices and critical dialogues. However, it is up to HODs to decide whether or not their new staff attend.

There are a number of faculty-based initiatives on professional development. The Faculty of Engineering and Built Environment has faculty retreats, which focus on a number of issues that positively affect the development of academics in relation to teaching. One of those issues is the importance of developing a clear teaching philosophy. The Faculty of Humanities organizes curriculum development workshops for academics and professional staff working on curriculum development. These workshops are specifically aimed at courses offered across the largest departments in Humanities. The Faculty of Commerce has established a Teaching Development Programme, which involves the promotion of collaborative teaching (including mentoring), coordination of learning and development initiatives and incentives for teaching. In addition to mentoring, the programme also includes workshops that offer practical techniques for academics to use in teaching and managing feedback in large classes and other related issues. This is an example of an innovative and practical project that might be worth adopting across the institution and sharing with the sector; the 2016 QEP Institutional Report notes that this programme is popular among new and experienced academics from within the Commerce Faculty, as well as from other faculties.

Attention is being given at institutional level to academics through the Recruitment, Development and Retention (RDR) programme. The focus of the RDR programme is to look at support across the institution, including from the New Generation of Academics Programme of the Department of Higher Education and Training. Some programmes have the financial means to appoint a mentor. The goal is to ensure that the HOD, mentor and the academic have a three-way relationship in order to provide tailored support to develop and support young academics.

In response to a concern from students that it sometimes seemed as if their evaluations were not being acted upon, the University now requires Deans to look carefully at student evaluations and report back to the Faculty Councils. However, in the interviews students indicated that they hardly ever get feedback. In addition, they indicated that the lecturer can choose which questions to ask on evaluations, which may not allow students' concerns to be raised. To address such concerns, the Commerce Faculty has requested an external evaluation on these issues and how to evaluate students' learning.

#### *Conditions of Service and Performance Appraisal*

The University has a remuneration policy framework, which links performance with rewards. The framework sets out clearly the criteria and areas of measurement, together with certain principles, such as fairness and transparency in the process. Staff members are

required to engage with their heads of departments to discuss performance targets and performance reviews. As part of this engagement, academic staff have to prepare teaching portfolios, in line with the discipline and departmental imperatives. The Faculty Promotions and Remuneration Committee is responsible for assessing the performance of staff every four years, and rating staff according to a set scale. Staff identified as underperforming are provided with support through an improvement plan, while those performing well are rewarded.

### *Rewards and Recognition*

The evaluation of teaching is now firmly embedded in the ad hominem promotion process. The Dean of CHED sits on faculty promotions committees in order to try to ensure consistency in the way in which teaching is evaluated in each Faculty.

### *Workload Model*

The University does not have an overarching workload model. Faculties have discretion in terms of having defined workload models. The University acknowledges that this creates disparities, which can result in some staff members having excessively high workloads in relation to others. Of particular concern is that some young academics are given high teaching loads, which makes it difficult for them to establish themselves as academics.

## **SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER IMPROVEMENT**

In a University that uses such a highly devolved management model, both Deans and HODs play critical roles. In the interviews, it emerged that some HODs find the wide range of activities that they are expected to manage challenging. The panel suggests that the University consider providing more support and development for HODs, especially new HODs.

The institution should consider making NAPP or another form of induction into university teaching compulsory for all newly appointed academic staff, before their permanent appointment can be confirmed. Given that there are also faculty-based initiatives to develop and improve teaching, the University might consider an extended induction programme with both centrally and faculty-based elements. Such a programme could also attract credits towards a PGDip, as is done, for example, at Rhodes University.

The feedback loop on students' evaluation of courses and lecturers needs to be closed, to ensure that students are informed of what improvements have been implemented following their evaluations. The panel suggests that the institution strive for greater consistency in administering student course and lecturer evaluations across Faculties, and that Faculties develop clear mechanisms to provide feedback to students. In this regard, the feedback envisaged through Deans is a positive development.

There is a concern that new academics often have high teaching loads and do not receive mentoring. The panel recommends that an institution-wide approach be developed that will

ensure that young lecturers have time and space to develop and establish themselves as university teachers and researchers. In addition, consideration should be given to providing mentoring for all young academics. (There does not necessarily have to be a one-on-one mentoring relationship; small group mentoring can be effective.) The Supporting Emerging Academics' Teaching Programme (seaTEACH) is a positive development in this regard.

During the institutional visit staff raised concerns around the promotions process, particularly in the way in which teaching is recognised, assessed and rewarded. While there are clear criteria on paper, in practice there appear to be inconsistencies in how they are applied. The panel suggests that the University explore ways of ensuring greater consistency in promotions decisions, while allowing for some flexibility based on discipline or faculty context-specific issues. Similarly, conversations at institutional level on workload allocation could lead to a fairer distribution of work across faculties and departments. It is possible that this could lead to greater productivity and to cost savings.

### **3. FOCUS AREA 2: ENHANCING STUDENT SUPPORT AND DEVELOPMENT**

*(Including career and curriculum advising, life and academic skills development, counselling, student performance monitoring and referral)*

#### **THE INSTITUTION'S STRENGTHS**

UCT's *Strategic Plan: Transformation of UCT Towards Non-Racialism – Redress, Diversity, Inclusiveness and Recognition of African Voices* states the University's commitment to enhancing student support and development through the establishment or strengthening of a range of initiatives, aimed at catering for the needs of a diversity of students.

The University's flexible foundational provision is a noteworthy way of providing academic support to students with different levels of academic preparation by embedding support and development into structured extended degree programmes comprising both mainstream and credit-bearing foundation courses. These programmes take various forms, depending on the faculty, including a foundation year at the beginning of the programme, augmented courses (double the time of mainstream courses) and augmenting courses (additional to mainstream courses). In some faculties, students may move from mainstream to extended degree programmes at multiple points in the year.

The University launched the First Year Experience (FYE) project in order to respond to the challenges faced by first year students and the associated low success rates. It is an umbrella project designed to improve undergraduate completion rates by 2020. Three key components are mentoring, early interventions and orientation. Faculties run different forms of mentorship schemes for first year students. The mentors are senior students who provide mostly psycho-social and some academic support, while developing their own leadership

skills in the process. The Early Assessment Report is a University-wide initiative designed to identify mainly first year students who are at risk of failing early on in the first semester. Course convenors upload marks after the first quarter assessments, which are aggregated by an administrator in each faculty for each first year student. Students identified as being at risk are contacted by faculty academic staff members by email and offered various support services. Orientation is a long-standing programme at UCT, organised by a central Orientation Coordinating Committee, and involving academics, student support staff and student organisations.

Counselling is offered both centrally, through the Student Wellness Service, and through some faculty-based counsellors. Other non-academic support offered includes peer support in residences and career planning, information and personal development through the Careers Service.

Academic literacy and writing support are offered through the Writing Centre, which falls under CHED. A number of forms of academic support are offered in faculties, including tutoring and subject-specific “hotseats”. Some courses are offered during the summer or winter vacations for students who want to reduce their load or repeat courses they failed. The Faculty of Engineering and the Built Environment offers Tutored Reassessment Programmes in summer and winter in key gateway courses with high failure rates (also referred to as “Courses Impeding Graduation”, CIG), comprising intensive tutoring followed by an examination. In the Faculty of Health Sciences first year students have “supervised homework” sessions.

### **APPROACH TAKEN TO IMPROVEMENT**

A key influence on the University’s approach to improvements in this focus area has been the various student movements formed around issues of transformation in the institution. The *2016 Phase 1 Institutional Report* states that students, particularly black students, have expressed dissatisfaction with what they considered discriminatory and exclusionary practices. Consequently, the University undertook a self-reflective and broad participatory process in order to inform the type of improvements needed. The need to hear the student voice more and to be more cognisant of students’ views has been recognised, while determining how to do this is a work in progress.

In addition, the University is starting to take an approach that is driven by the use of data in order to ensure that interventions respond to the needs of students, and to be able to monitor and evaluate the impact of interventions. The University’s Data Warehouse (based on SAP finance/SAP HR and SAP Business Objects) has comprehensive data related to students, such as admissions data, students’ academic and financial records and survey data. Further additions are being made to the data, which will improve the University’s ability to provide evidence as a basis for enhancing student support.

### **IMPROVEMENTS UNDERTAKEN AND PROGRESS MADE**

The University's detailed cohort studies, which it has undertaken for a number of years, show that there have been improvements in student retention and throughput rates, and a reduction in the number of exclusions on academic grounds, presumably as a result of the many student support activities that it has put in place. There is, however, still a large gap in the exclusion rates for black and white students (27% and 4%, respectively, for the 2010 cohort).

Increasing use of data across the University is enabling a range of role players, including staff from faculties, Student Affairs and the Academic Development Programme, to monitor the effectiveness of interventions, the profile of students and student progress. This has been supported by the appointment of a data analyst and the establishment of a data task team, which will help the University develop an institutional learning analytics framework.

Peer mentoring is taking place at a number of levels in the University – faculty-based, through Student Affairs and in residences. While the mentoring seems to be very beneficial for those students who have access to it, because of the different role players involved in organising it, some students may be assigned more than one mentor. As one student put it during the interviews, this can be confusing as it is not clear what the role is of each mentor.

In addition to the extended and flexible curricula offered in all faculties, support interventions are increasingly being offered to mainstream students. Initiatives in the Faculties of Commerce and Health Sciences were mentioned during the interviews as being effective in providing a variety of support and development opportunities throughout the degree programme. It was mentioned that in Commerce students can apply to be part of academic development activities without feeling stigmatised.

Teaching Development Grant (TDG) funds are being used to implement a number of new initiatives. An example is “Plus” tutorials offered in eight departments in Humanities, which accompany mainstream modules and, while intended for extended degree students, are also open to mainstream students.

There are a number of initiatives driven by Careers Service, which are aimed at providing employment opportunities and developing the employability of students. One of these is the use of the MyCareer portal to post vacancies for graduates. There were more than 5000 vacancies posted on the portal in 2014 and over 1200 employers in the database. Efforts are also being made to create an Africa job-seeking portal. The Careers Service structures its programmes based on surveys, including an exit survey, and feedback by students. It offers credit and non-credit bearing personal and professional development courses. Recently it launched an online career development module.

Students can keep their UCT email for life, or change it online, so it is possible to maintain contact with alumni. During the interviews it was mentioned that 98% of alumni stay in touch with the University. There is also a Beyond School Careers Programme, which held 131 events in 2015 for learners.

The University offers support to students in residences through the Office of Residence Life. This includes academic support and development programmes aimed at helping students attain identified UCT graduate attributes. According to the final QEP report, some of the programmes are offered in collaboration with faculties with the aim of “building transferable skills, foster life-long learning, increase the uptake of academic development opportunities and promote intellectual enquiry.” There are, however, no “day houses” or similar structures for students who are not in residence.

A Director was appointed to coordinate the institutional First Year Experience (FYE) programme in October 2014, using TDG funding and located under the Dean of CHED. The main areas of focus are early warning assessment, sites on the University Learning Management System (Vula), extended orientation and digital literacy training. The FYE provided two interns per Faculty during Orientation, who staffed helpdesks. Extended orientation activities were organised per faculty. The Director also coordinates support activities for students from Khayelitsha (the 100UP+ Project) who are identified as showing promise while at school.

The Early Warning Assessment (EWA) is being implemented across the University after week six. It is done differently in each Faculty. Faculties receive reports of student marks, and then students who appear to be at risk are identified. The responsibility for contacting them lies with different people in different faculties, and includes tutors, the Faculty Office and academics. Students are invited to come in and either be counselled or referred for support, but it was not clear whether there was follow up for those students who chose not to. Perhaps consideration should be given to making such contact mandatory for at risk students.

The University Writing Centre appears to be providing great value, is popular with students, and appears to be delivering results. The suggestion of developing faculty-based hubs also appears to be very positive as an addition to an already successful service. The *2016 Institutional Report* states that, CHED, through the assistance of TDG funding, established a “new post dedicated to developing academic staff’s capacity to strengthen academic literacy skills at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels”. This person also set up a Writing Lab in the Faculty of Health Sciences.

The UCT Libraries provide support in the form of information, digital and data literacy training. The LibGuides are used as a tool for self-directed learning through audio and video clips. There is also an experiment of using gaming as an information tool.

The Global Citizenship Programme appears to be an important initiative, which exposes students to broad foundational knowledge, developing the capacity for leadership, and promoting students’ awareness of themselves as future global citizens.

The Step Up developmental course offered in the Faculty of Commerce, providing skills for stress management, developing an identity and other forms of personal development, combined with the mentoring programme, appears to be effective in supporting students.

### **SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER IMPROVEMENT**

It is evident from the two institutional reports and the engagement with participants during the visit that UCT has done extensive work in this focus area. The panel commends the University for this and encourages it to continue with its commitment to student support and development. Suggestions for further improvements are given below.

While there are a number of peer mentoring initiatives, the panel suggests that coordination among them and sharing of effective models would prevent some students from being assigned more than one mentor (and the possibility that others may have none). It would also help rationalise limited resources and student time, and mitigate the dissatisfaction voiced by some students about the differential resources allocated to support students in different Faculties. The current mentoring programmes seem to be structured according to the unit within the University that offers them, as opposed to taking a holistic view of the student and his or her needs.

Residence programmes clearly benefit students in residence, but there is no similar support for day students. The University could consider creating “day houses”, which provide day students with a peer group with whom they can socialise and feel a part, as is done at the University of Pretoria, and appointing “wardens” for groups of day students, as is done at Rhodes University.

The flexible curriculum initiatives appear to be effective in enabling a number of students to succeed. However, the issue of participating students feeling stigmatised was mentioned in both the reports and the interviews, except in the Faculties of Commerce and of Health Sciences. It would be worth considering what these Faculties do that is successful in this regard, and see to what extent general principles could be identified that could guide initiatives in other Faculties and at institutional level.

The FYE is an initiative that is being shown to be effective at a number of universities. The panel got the impression that, as with many other activities at UCT, much of it is individualised within faculties. While there is undoubtedly value in tailoring programmes to the needs to students in different faculties, there is also value in ensuring that students across the University are provided with access and development opportunities in key areas, such as a range of academic literacies. The panel recommends that the FYE committee, which is a coordinating body, look at how to ensure this, as well as identifying activities and resources that could be offered centrally. Currently the development of academic literacies is addressed at faculty level in different forms, depths, and over differing time scales. The South African National Resource Centre for First Year Experience and Students in Transition, based at the University of Johannesburg, could provide valuable insights.

The Early Warning Assessment is a good initiative, although six weeks into the term may be too late to save some students from failing the semester, and, as with other initiatives, is implemented in different ways in different faculties. Given the efforts the University is making to creating data analytics capabilities, it would be useful to consider incorporating a system of electronic flagging for students who seem to be falling behind, as well as the extent to which they take up support opportunities. This will assist when decisions about academic exclusions are being made.

During the visit it was communicated that the student wellness service is in extremely high demand, and that there was insufficient capacity to deal with student needs. There is perhaps a need for reflection on the scale and capacity of the wellness services required to address the needs of the current student cohort. During the interviews, faculty-based counselling services were mentioned as being available in some faculties; students mentioned that the differences in what was available in different faculties was resulting in negativity from the less resourced faculty student bodies. It was also mentioned that students are often not aware of services available, suggesting that a more effective communication strategy may be needed to inform students about available services.

There are many commendable new initiatives which are discussed in the report that have been funded by Teaching Development Grants, which have will be ending. The University should consider funding alternatives and sustainable budget allocations for initiatives that are shown to be effective.

#### **4. FOCUS AREA 3: ENHANCING THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT**

*(Including teaching and learning spaces, ICT infrastructure and access, technology-enabled tools and resources, library facilities)*

##### **THE INSTITUTION'S STRENGTHS**

The *UCT Strategic Plan 2010 – 2014* commits the University to use ICT to enhance teaching and the teaching and learning environment. The University adopted a set of optimal standards for formal teaching venues, which includes the provision of audio visual facilities.

Technology considerations are part of the University's spatial planning. The Library offers a number of facilities and services to students and staff, such as the Research Commons and Research Wings, which are well-equipped with computer, network and printing equipment and Wi-Fi connectivity. A very high proportion of students have their own computers, laptops, iPads or other mobile devices. The University has therefore implemented a 24/7 Wi-Fi enabled learning environment across the campus and residences. In addition, many computer labs are open 24 hours a day.

The main library provides 24/7 access to study spaces. Linked to this is the impressive system of a free 'nearly-24/7' shuttle service for students between residences, campuses and learning spaces in the University.

The Centre for Innovation in Learning and Teaching has developed VULA, an open source online learning system based on Sakai, which has been developed in collaboration with other institutions in South Africa and abroad. VULA is a platform for collaboration, information sharing and course administration.

There is a constant endeavour to provide both flexible physical learning environments (classrooms that can be reconfigured with access to different teaching modalities) and a flexible virtual learning environment (access to material independent of space and time).

### **THE APPROACH TAKEN TO IMPROVEMENT**

The University's approach to enhancements in this focus area has been largely through spatial planning, which is aimed at standardising classroom equipment, providing social learning spaces, optimising the use of existing physical space and ensuring that the design of new learning spaces allows for flexibility.

### **IMPROVEMENTS UNDERTAKEN AND PROGRESS MADE**

UCT has designed and built six new-style hybrid classrooms, seating 130 students each, in the new Snape engineering building, which, through its curved, gently raked seating configuration, allows for group work and problem solving, interspersed by short periods of lecturing. A brand new, 400-seat, raked lecture theatre has just been completed with state of the art recording, streaming and voice amplification equipment. The Classroom Renewal Project has spent more than R100 million upgrading 89 existing classrooms to a physical, audio-visual and IT standard approved by the Classroom Facilities Advisory sub-committee. The standard incorporates a teaching wall, lectern and technology that allows for a wide range of teaching styles.

A number of major building projects and refurbishments have been implemented on campus. Existing spaces, both on campus and in residences, such as Forest Hill, have been redesigned to encourage collaborative learning. The "My Space" project facilitated the redesign of faculty foyers into learning spaces by introducing extra seats and tables with Wi-Fi in 23 buildings. Following the success of the indoor "My Space" project, an outdoor version of this has been rolled out and so far over 200 benches and tables have been installed between buildings and in gardens to facilitate more social learning spaces.

Study centres and classrooms have been refurbished with custom-designed furniture to create flexible spaces that can accommodate multi-modal teaching, and be adapted to future pedagogical needs. In the interviews, it was stated that UCT has 700 seats in 40 learning spaces across campus, all with Wi-Fi connectivity. In addition, hybrid studio learning spaces with state of the art audio and visual equipment to enhance presentations have been

established in Architecture. However, there are challenges with getting approval for renovation in older, listed buildings, in common with other older Universities.

In the main library, the physical spaces previously taken up by books have been re-allocated to learning spaces comprising 210 seats, in line with the “commons model”. Evidence for the effectiveness of these projects is the increased usage by students, as well as the "LibQUAL" user satisfaction survey, random seat occupation counts and focus group interviews, which are used to gauge success. Direct help lines and regular user surveys also provide evidence for the success of spatial planning initiatives and the virtual environment.

A regional consortium, CHEC/CALICO, is currently undertaking a feasibility study for cooperative off-site storing of low-use print collections from the library, which will enable the re-purposing of additional space for cooperative group learning.

The main library, which is heavily constrained in term of physical expansion, has launched an innovative solution to space creation by inserting satellite facilities in existing campus buildings, managed as extensions to existing undergraduate study areas. This creates exciting technology-rich spaces (collaborative computing, electronic whiteboards) in support of collaborative learning, which is becoming a characteristic of the changing educational learning models of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Moreover, this initiative has lessened the strain on the main library and serves as a very convenient venue for students based on the south campus.

Given the exorbitant prices of textbooks in the context of a falling Rand, a concept document is being drafted to design and implement an alternative open textbook model for South Africa. This includes the incorporation into textbooks of unique digital collections held in libraries that can now become visible through enhanced web technology and metadata standards.

As far as blended learning is concerned, UCT partnered with “Coursera” and “Future Learn” and these MOOCS have had a positive effect on feeding into the online learning space. Other, more recent developments include Opencast Matterhorn for lecture recording, Turnitin (plagiarism protection software), Adobe connect (for virtual meetings) and UCT Open Content.

The lecture recording project, which was researched by the Faculty of EBE, has had a positive impact on student learning. UCT has also recently started using the videoconferencing software platform available with TENET, called “Vidyo”, which works with a wide range of devices, can host multiple participants and can work effectively over slow connections with limited bandwidth. UCT has also recently subscribed to high quality online videos, “Lynda.com”, covering a wide range of subjects for both staff and students.

One of the faculties obtained approval to use “Proctor U” to facilitate the use of personal laptops for assessment under examination conditions. This is a potential solution to the administrative and logistical challenges inherent in increased student numbers writing in distributed examination venues. In addition, the Faculty of Commerce has introduced two

blended learning qualifications using the private commercial “Get Smarter” platform, which led to a number of changes in various policies to cater for the virtual rather than the physical environment. The changes in the online environment have had a positive knock-on effect on contact courses.

### **SUGGESTIONS AND AREAS FOR FURTHER IMPROVEMENT**

The main suggestion from the panel is to make better use of existing space. It appears that the central timetabling and venue allocation software has limitations in that venues may be underutilised. For example, when a venue is only needed at a certain time for a few weeks of the semester, it is shown as occupied for the whole semester. During the interviews, the panel was told that sometimes bigger rooms are booked than the class size warrants, sometimes because of a lecturer’s personal room preference, which means that close monitoring of room allocations in relation to class size is needed. Another issue raised is that there are some venues that faculties seem to regard as “theirs” in that they are not available for use by students outside of the faculty when not needed by the faculty. This appears to be especially true of computer laboratories. One system that could be considered is an app that displays in real time which computers are free anywhere on the campus, which students can then book.

Little mention was made in the final report or during the interviews of how widespread the use is of VULA. If it is not already the case, the panel suggests that every course should have a presence on VULA to, at the very least, provide students with easy access to study guides, course information and teaching resources (or links to them).

## **5. FOCUS AREA 4: ENHANCING COURSE AND PROGRAMME**

### **ENROLMENT MANAGEMENT**

*(Including admissions, selection, placement, readmission refusal, pass rates in gateway courses<sup>3</sup>, throughput rates, management information systems)*

#### **THE INSTITUTION'S STRENGTHS**

UCT, through its *Strategic Plan 2010-2014*, is committed to transformation in the form of change in the demographics of both students and staff. One of the ways it is working to achieve this is by looking at the policies and criteria related to course and programme enrolment. In this regard, the University makes use of the National Benchmark Tests (NBTs) to place students into programmes that will provide them with the support they need, in line with enrolment targets, which are set by the Senate and Council in consultation with faculties. Demographic transformation is one of the principles underpinning the enrolment

<sup>3</sup> “Gateway courses” are those courses that have a large impact on students’ ability to progress. Typically they are prerequisites for other courses, and often they have large enrolments. At many universities, examples of gateway courses are first year Mathematics and Economics. In some cases, if students fail a gateway course they automatically have to extend their studies by one or two semesters.

targets as stated by the admissions policy. The Institutional Planning Department is instrumental in setting enrolment targets through, among other things, annual reviews of enrolment.

The University allows students to apply for two programmes of study. During the orientation week, advice on curriculum choices is offered and students are given time to make informed choices when they register. In some instances, it is possible for students to be admitted to a faculty other than the one they initially chose, provided they meet the requirements. This helps improve students' chance of success.

In the case of academic exclusion on the grounds of failure to meet progression requirements, the University has Readmission Appeals Committees based in faculties. The composition of each committee includes representatives from the SRC, Student Affairs and the Centre for Higher Education Development. This appeals process seems to be well entrenched in faculties and thorough enough to allow at least half of the excluded students to be readmitted.

With respect to gateway courses, the Institutional Planning Department collects data that is used to identify courses that impact on students' ability to graduate. This data allows the university to implement initiatives aimed at improving student performance in gateway courses.

The Early Assessment Review (see focus area 2) is used to identify first year students who might be at risk. This is done in the first quarter of the academic year, after the first round of assessments has been done and the students' marks have been captured. Remedial action is then suggested to help students to improve their performance.

Oracle's PeopleSoft is UCT's student information system used for purposes of enrolment management. The system allows the University to generate customised reports based on the University's needs. The *2014 Institutional Report* states that there is a good correlation between admissions targets and the actual enrolments achieved as a result of effective use of the system.

### **APPROACH TAKEN TO IMPROVEMENT**

The Institutional Planning Department uses an analytical model to assist the University to set enrolment targets and monitor student intake in line with the admissions policy. The Department provides detailed data-based reports, which are then used for annual review of the admissions process. This assists in the process of continuous improvement. It has resulted in new initiatives, such as the no-show surveys, which help identify why some students who were offered places did not take them up.

### **IMPROVEMENTS UNDERTAKEN AND PROGRESS MADE**

In line with the University's commitment to transformation and improving access, a new admissions policy was introduced in 2016, in which socio-economic status, race and educational disadvantage of students are considered in addition to their NSC (National

Senior Certificate) scores. This is in recognition of inequities in the schooling system that often disadvantage students from lower quintile (poor) schools who apply to UCT.

The Centre for Educational Testing for Access and Placement (CETAP) is busy with an initiative to establish the predictive value of admission criteria and NBT scores, and a report on this is due shortly. While performance varies by faculty, initial indications are that, in general, the survival rates are higher for students who are strong in academic literacy. In addition, survival rates are higher in mathematically demanding programmes of study when students perform well in the NBT mathematics assessment. The report may bring interesting insights into assessing the readiness of students for university study, developing interventions to assist in preparation for their studies, and providing support pathways after admission.

The development of the UCT data enterprise warehouse is a positive initiative, combining a comprehensive mix of student data, including learning activity data, integrating VULA, school level marks and socio-economic profiles. This is complemented by the SAP business objects interface, allowing effective and efficient data extraction and analysis at user level. The introduction of a data task team is also positive and should help guide the design and use of data in fostering student success.

There does, however, appear to be a very uneven use of the data warehouse across faculties, with differing applications. The university should perhaps consider some form of institutional guidance with respect to best use and practices.

Improvements in the early warning assessment review process are positive. However, there appeared to be a lack of tracking of initiatives and advice, particularly with respect to whether action had been taken, and more importantly, the measurement of the success of the initiatives put in place. It appears that such evidence is being collected, but comments were made during the interviews that it was too early to measure the success or failure of the various initiatives. In addition to this, a challenge for the institution is to get staff to use the database and information available more routinely to monitor students and initiate supporting measures.

There appears to be a difference in opinion as to how available data is used to predict throughput rates, particularly with respect to the development of a retention model and the validation of factors used in such a model. This links to the *UCT 2020 vision* for 'size-and-shape'.

Gateway courses are receiving considerable attention at UCT. A 2015 report to the Senate Teaching and Learning Committee indicated that not only can individual courses impede progression but certain course combinations may make progress difficult. Two important interventions to improve student success in gateway courses are Tutored Reassessment Programmes (TRPs) and offering some courses during summer and winter "terms" by

offering the same number of contact hours as the normal course but in four weeks (c.f. focus area 2).

The University is beginning to develop an online registration system, which is due to be piloted in 2017.

### **SUGGESTIONS AND AREAS FOR FURTHER IMPROVEMENT**

Further investigation is needed into the difference in persistence and success for black and white students. A question arose as to the ability of university staff to deal with the differing student populations, that is, whether staff had been equipped with the necessary tools to help all of their students succeed.

The University is encouraged to get its online registration system up and running, as is the case at most other South African universities. While it is valuable for students to receive curriculum advice, especially in first year, some curriculum advice can be done online through specialised software. Such software can, for example, help students map out the curriculum for their entire degree, and see where changes are needed if they fail a course or change their interests.

As mentioned under focus area 2, in some faculties students can move from the mainstream to the extended degree programme some weeks into the term. Another option to consider is to allow students to remain in the mainstream but to take a reduced load of credits as is done, for example, at Rhodes University.

## **6. SUMMARY**

The institution's approach to improvement is continuous, with significant involvement from senior management in identifying, supporting, approving and bringing about improvements in the focus areas. This includes institution-level policies, committees and working groups, monitoring and evaluation activities, and the implementation of strategic plans. The creation of the position of DVC: Teaching and Learning and the formation of the Senate Teaching and Learning Committee are important in contributing to an increased institutional focus on teaching and learning. This focus is promoted and supported in a number of ways by the Centre for Higher Education Development (CHED), which has been in existence for several decades, and works at institutional, faculty and individual (staff and student) levels. CHED has long been a model for scholarly academic development in South Africa.

Enhancing academics as teachers through professional development has historically been a strength of UCT. This has been further enhanced through the development of CILT to enhance teaching with technology, and a number of individual faculty initiatives to support teaching activities. Several faculties have faculty-based professional development activities and communities of practice related to the teaching and learning of particular disciplines. The New Academic Practitioners Programme (NAPP) seems to provide a valuable induction

into university teaching for those who participate voluntarily. The panel suggests that the University consider making some form of induction programme compulsory during new academics staff's probation period, possibly by building on the NAPP and including discipline or faculty-specific components, some of which are already in place. While the panel recognises the University's devolved approach to management, it is suggested that the University look at ways to ensure greater consistency in the ways in which promotions criteria related to teaching are applied in different faculties and how workloads for young academics are determined. It is important that young academics have the time to establish themselves as teachers and researchers, and not get overloaded with teaching.

The University has many commendable activities in place to support students and foster their development. As with professional development, the University has a long history of offering a number of different flexible degree options, which differ in form from one faculty to another. In some faculties students can move from mainstream to extended degree programmes at different times in the year. However, in both the written reports and during the interviews reference was made to the problem of extended degree students feeling stigmatised. This does not appear to be the case with students in the Faculties of Commerce or Health Sciences. The panel suggests that the University consider elements of these two faculties' approach to academic development that might be applied in the other faculties.

A number of peer mentoring programmes are in operation, which are organised by different role players, including Student Services, the residences and faculties. While these programmes appear to be successful, there is a lack of coordination, which results in some students being assigned more than one mentor, which may be inefficient in terms of students' time and university resources. The panel suggests the University consider how mentoring initiatives can be coordinated, focusing on the student rather than the structure that is offering the mentoring. The appointment of a First Year Experience Coordinator is a good initiative, as research has shown that FYE is a high impact practice that has a positive influence on student success. Given that most of the activities appear to be faculty-based, it is suggested that the University explore how to ensure that all students, regardless of faculty, have access to areas of development that are regarded by the University as key for all of its students, such as the development of various academic literacies. The impressive work of Careers Service, including the Career Portal, is doubtless making an important contribution to the employment and employability of UCT students.

It is clear from the reports and the interviews that UCT has undertaken a major upgrade of existing classrooms and funded several new classrooms. This is complemented by good ICT infrastructure and almost 24/7 access to library and some laboratory facilities, and supported by the almost 24/7 Jamie bus shuttle service. In addition, UCT has created significantly more social learning, study and rest spaces, both in residences, as well as in and outside buildings on its various campuses, with an attendant increase in connectivity and access to mobile technology for students. The virtual learning environment appears to include several high-end, sector-leading initiatives. However, it appears that optimal use is not being made of existing facilities. Two contributing factors to this were raised during the interviews:

timetabling software that indicates that a venue is occupied for a whole semester when it may only be needed for a few weeks and a sense that certain facilities are “owned” by a particular faculty and thus not available to students in other faculties when not in use by the “home” faculty. The panel suggests that the University look into these issues.

Enrolment planning is carefully implemented and monitored. The introduction of the no-show surveys is a good practice, which could be shared with the sector to help provide feedback as to why students did not choose their institution. The University has committed itself to achieving greater equity in student success across demographic categories. A new approach to admissions has been introduced in which students will be selected on the basis of a range of indicators, including academic performance, race and socio-economic status. The University does not yet offer online registration, although it plans to begin to do so in 2017. It is encouraged to implement this, and to consider making use of online curriculum advising software to supplement the extremely time-consuming advising that is currently done by selected academic staff. Promoting the use of the Careers Service online career development module may also be worthwhile.

The creation of a data warehouse with ready access by faculties and staff members is an important advance in the University’s ability to monitor student progress and success and identify possible areas for attention.

The panel was impressed with the many interventions at the University to support staff and students. However, there appears to be unevenness in provision and uptake. In the interviews students mentioned that there is considerable variation in what is available to students from different faculties, which can lead to resentment. It also affects students’ sense of belonging, particularly for day students, who may feel isolated and alienated. Strong identification with a faculty can help overcome such feelings and support student success. At some universities, such identification is encouraged, for example, through “faculty houses”, which provide physical spaces and structures for academic and social support.

On the other hand, the panel got the impression that the extent of the devolution of activities to faculties at the University makes it difficult for the institution as a whole to move forward and to optimise the use of its resources. It is suggested that the University consider how to promote greater sharing of good practices across faculties and harmonisation of the ways in which policies are implemented. In some cases, there seems to be a need for a university wide framework or policy, such as for student support and development. In addition, the University could consider how to make greater use of technology in promoting student success, for example, through software that flags students who are at risk and sends a message to a designated support person for follow-up and ongoing monitoring.

The panel also suggests that the University consider developing measures to monitor the effectiveness of its many support interventions in order to provide guidance on how best to utilise limited resources.

The events of the past two years have clearly resulted in an increased awareness on the part of the University of the need to hear and heed the student voice, beyond having student representatives in formal committees. How to do this effectively remains an ongoing challenge for all universities.

In conclusion, UCT is clearly taking very seriously its commitment to providing quality education and a beneficial learning experience to its students within the context of a highly regarded, research intensive university.

**APPENDIX: Programme****CHE - QUALITY ENHANCEMENT PROJECT VISIT TO UCT  
FINANCE MEETING ROOM 301, LEVEL 3, BREMNER BUILDING****PROGRAMME FOR WEDNESDAY, 13 APRIL****TIME: 08H30 – 17H00**

<b>No.</b>	<b>ITEM</b>	<b>TIME</b>	<b>DURATION</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>SENIOR MANAGEMENT GROUP</b>	<b>08H30 – 09H30</b>	<b>60 minutes</b>
	Tea break	09h30 – 09h45	<b>15 minutes</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>FOCUS AREA 1</b> ENHANCING ACADEMICS AS TEACHER	<b>09H45 – 11H00</b>	<b>75 minutes</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>FOCUS AREA 2</b> ENHANCING STUDENT DEVELOPMENT & SUPPORT	<b>11H10 – 12H25</b>	<b>75 minutes</b>
	Lunch break	12h25 – 13h10	<b>45 minutes</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>FOCUS AREA 3</b> ENHANCING THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT	<b>13H20 – 14H35</b>	<b>75 minutes</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>FOCUS AREA 4</b> ENHANCING COURSE & PROGRAMME ENROLMENT	<b>14H45 – 16H00</b>	<b>75 minutes</b>
	Tea break	16h00 – 16h15	<b>15 minutes</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>CLOSING DISCUSSION WITH SENIOR MANAGEMENT</b>	<b>16H15 – 16H45</b>	<b>30 minutes</b>

### SENIOR MANAGEMENT GROUP

NO.	NAME	DESIGNATION
1.	Prof Sandra Klopper	DVC: Teaching and Learning
2.	Prof Francis Petersen	DVC: Institutional Innovation
3.	Prof Hugh Corder	Specialist Adviser
4.	Prof Anwar Mall	Acting DVC: Transformation
5.	Prof Danie Visser	DVC: Research & Internationalisation
6.	Mr Royston Pillay	Registrar
7.	A/Prof Suellen Shay	Dean: Centre for Higher Education Development
8.	Ms Judy Favish	Director: Institutional Planning Dept.
9.	Dr Moonira Khan	Director: Department of Student Affairs
10.	A/Prof Tessa Minter	Deputy Dean: Academic Affairs, Commerce Faculty

### FOCUS AREA 1 (ENHANCING ACADEMICS AS TEACHERS)

NO.	NAME	DESIGNATION
1.	A/Prof Suellen Shay (Convenor)	Dean: Centre for Higher Education Development
2.	Prof Susan Kidson	Former Deputy Dean: Faculty of Health Sciences
3.	Ms Renee Smit	Lecturer, ADP: Dept. of Electrical Engineering
4.	Dr Kasturi Behari-Leak	Lecturer, CILT
5.	Ms Judy Favish	Director: Institutional Planning Department
6.	A/Prof Lucia Thesen	ADP: Language Development Group
7.	Dr Claire Blackman	Lecturer, Dept. of Maths
8.	Mr Siphosethu Ngcongolo (Student)	Chairperson: Faculty Student Council, Health Sciences
9.	Mr Dominic Schorr	Chairperson: Faculty Student Council, Engineering & the Built Environment
10.	Ra'eesah Manie	Academic Chair: Commerce faculty

### FOCUS AREA 2 (ENHANCING STUDENT DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPORT)

NO.	NAME	DESIGNATION
1.	A/Prof Ermien Van Pletzen (Convenor)	Director: Academic Development Programme (ADP)
2.	Mr David Casey	Director: Career Services

3.	Ms Edwina Brooks	Director: Student Development Cluster
4.	Dr Reggie Raju	Deputy Director: UCT Libraries Client Liaison Services
5.	Ms Alison Meadows	Senior Lecturer
6.	Mr Chanda Chungu	Deputy Speaker: Student Parliament

### **FOCUS AREA 3: (ENHANCING THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT)**

<b>NO.</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>DESIGNATION</b>
1.	Ms Gwenda Thomas	Executive Director: University Libraries
2.	Mr Nigel Haupt	Director: Physical Planning Unit
3.	Mr Stephen Marquard	Learning Technologies Co-ordinator, CILT
4.	Dr Cheryl Brown	Senior Lecturer, CILT
5.	Ms Charmaine January	Manager: Student Residence Life Division
6.	Mr Sean Abrahams	Senior Co-ordinator: Residence Life Division
7.	Ms Thembelihle Ncayiyana	Chief Whip: Student Parliament

### **FOCUS AREA 4: (ENHANCING COURSE AND PROGRAMME ENROLMENT)**

<b>NO.</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>DESIGNATION</b>
1.	Dr Karen Van Heerden (Convenor)	Deputy Registrar: Academic Administration
2.	A/Prof Brandon Collier-Reed	Deputy Dean: Undergraduate Education, Faculty of Engineering & the Built Environment (EBE)
3.	A/Prof Gonda Perez	Deputy Dean: UG Education & Operations. Faculty of Health Sciences
4.	Dr Daniel Munene	Academic Development Co-ordinator, ADP: Commerce EDU
5.	Ms Jane Hendry	Chief Information Officer: Institutional Information Unit
6.	Mr Ashraf Conrad	Principal Planning Officer: Institutional Information Unit
	Ms Loyola Nyathi	Chairperson: EDU