INTRODUCTION

The Higher Education Quality Committee project, *Building new quality management systems in merged higher education institutions* (CHE, 2005a), which forms part of a capacity development initiative by the HEQC, is aimed at ensuring that higher education institutions (especially merged institutions) are provided with the requisite information, understanding and capacity to respond successfully to quality assurance requirements. The University of Johannesburg (UJ) has, as a participant in the HEQC project, developed and approved its Quality Plan 2005–2006 (UJ, 2005a).

The merger between the Rand Afrikaans University (RAU) and the Technikon Witwatersrand (TWR) on 1 January 2005, which resulted in the formation of the UJ, was preceded by the incorporation of the Soweto and East Rand campuses of the former Vista University into RAU on 2 January 2004.

The UJ is a comprehensive contact university with almost 45 000 students. As a single, newly established higher education institution, it offers a comprehensive range of academic and technological programmes across five campuses and through the following nine faculties:

- Art, Design and Architecture
- Economic and Financial Sciences
- Education
- Engineering and the Built Environment
- Health Sciences
- Humanities
- Law
- Management
- Science.

---
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In establishing a new identity, the UJ has adopted a vision, a mission, strategic goals and a set of core values. Its vision is to become an internationally recognised South African university providing and expanding on academic and technological knowledge and skills that promote growth and prosperity.

The UJ was initially governed by an interim council that was in turn replaced by a permanent council on 1 July 2005. Apart from the Higher Education Act (RSA, 1997), the standard institutional statute initially applies to the functioning of the UJ until the Minister has approved a new institutional statute, as submitted by the permanent council.

Quality assurance related matters internal to the University reside in the Office for Institutional Effectiveness (IE). The IE comprises three units, namely the Institutional Research and Planning Unit (IRPU), the Quality Management Unit (QMU) and the Higher Education Policy Unit (HEPU).

In the absence of formal permanent UJ management structures, a Quality Task Team (QTT) and four Quality Project Teams (QPTs) were established to develop, in collaboration with the IE, the Quality Plan 2005–2006 for UJ. The QTT and the four QPTs (QPT: Quality Management Structures, QPT: Institutional Planning, QPT: Academic Programmes and QPT: Policies) are responsible for managing and implementing the Quality Plan. This plan was developed not only to address the merger issues identified in the HEQC Project but also to take into account the unique UJ context and needs. (See Figure 3 at the end of this paper for a diagram of management structures for the programme review process at UJ.)

The Quality Plan 2005–2006 aims to

a) develop new quality management systems that will enable the UJ to prepare for the institutional audit and programme accreditation requirements;

b) institutionalise effective quality management at all relevant planning and resources allocation levels;

c) ensure quality provision for all students in existing programmes; and

d) establish quality management arrangements for developing a new Academic Programme Structure (APS).

Figure 1 shows the interaction with existing UJ institutional structures and committees.
The main function of the QTT is to steer the development and implementation of the Quality Plan by

- appointing the members of the four QPTs;
- managing the collection of information for inclusion in the Quality Plan regarding access to different databases, collecting information by means of templates, etc.;
- liaising between the QPTs and the University Sounding Board (USB), and between the QPTs and the University;
- coordinating the work of the four QPTs;
- approving the Quality Plan, as developed by the QPTs, and consulting with the relevant Deputy Vice-Chancellors (DVCs) before submitting it to the USB, Senate and Management Executive Committee (MEC) (for final approval) and finally to the HEQC; and
- overseeing and monitoring the implementation of the Quality Plan, and submitting the subsequent progress reports to the approved structures.
The QTT Executive Committee is responsible for the day-to-day management and steering of the Quality Plan, and consists of the QTT chairperson, the four QPT leaders and two QTT members. The Office for IE, which houses the QMU, provides the secretariat for the entire process. Each of the four QPTs has developed its own terms of reference in line with the HEQC requirements and the UJ Quality Plan 2005–2006 (UJ, 2005a). For the purposes of this paper, attention will be paid only to the QPT: Academic Programmes.

**Quality Project Team: Academic Programmes**

The focus of this QPT is to facilitate and coordinate the quality arrangements and mechanisms of the existing programmes of the former RAU and former TWR, and to inform the development of a new APS for the UJ.

**The terms of reference for the QPT: Academic Programmes**

a) Identification of existing academic programme and the preparation of:

i. a concise (not detailed) outline of the APS for the UJ; and

ii. a proposal for quality arrangements in the APS based on the development of datasets on existing academic programmes.

b) Diagnostic analysis and programme review to:

i. facilitate and coordinate the process of evaluating existing programmes by faculties (teaching units) in making decisions on existing programmes that will:

   • continue unchanged;
   • be consolidated where overlapping and duplication occur;
   • be discontinued and phased out; and
   • determine which new programmes should be planned.

ii. facilitate and coordinate the programme review process whereby faculties have to make quality judgements on existing programmes and formulate concrete proposals for programmes for the new APS. The project team should:

   • select areas of the HEQC Programme Accreditation Criteria;
   • identify institutional criteria/benchmarks to be agreed on through a process of consultation;
   • collect information to complete 12 DoE tables;
   • prioritise existing programmes to be reviewed/evaluated;
• design a template and manual for programme reviews;
• coordinate the appointment of panel members for programme reviews;
• organise training for programme review panels and chairpersons; and
• facilitate and coordinate the evaluation process of academic programmes.

iii. furnish the DVCs and the Academic Planning Committee (APC) with consolidated faculty-approved proposals for the development of an APS.

c) Development of a detailed implementation plan to:
i. facilitate and coordinate the development of detailed implementation plans compiled by the faculties of the approved proposals; and

ii. furnish the DVC and APC with the concrete proposals and implementation plan for the establishment of a new APS for the UJ.

d) Implementation of the detailed implementation plan to facilitate and coordinate the implementation plan in the UJ through relevant institutional structures.

RATIONALE FOR PROGRAMME REVIEWS

The UJ has undertaken to conduct programme reviews in 2006 of all the existing learning programmes, i.e. undergraduate and postgraduate. Programme reviews are undertaken with the following benefits for the UJ in mind:

• The merger of a technikon and a university, and the establishment of a comprehensive university necessitate an in-depth review of all the programmes. The purpose is not to consolidate technikon type and university type programmes by means of a mechanistic reshuffling of modules. An in-depth and critical review of existing programmes is necessary to address the comprehensive multi-campus character of this University, as reflected in its vision, mission, strategic goals and values. This in itself requires serious conceptual interrogation not only at institutional but also at faculty and programme levels. Comprehensiveness as the essential characteristic of the UJ should be reflected in the new APS. The new APS not only drives the academic architecture of this institution, but also contributes to its uniqueness.

• Programme reviews form an integral part of the University’s preparation for the National Institution Audit in 2009. Various departments/schools of analysis are used in the quality management of the institution, from short learning programmes (i.e. short courses) to academic departments/schools, academic support departments, faculties and the institution.

• The accreditation of new programmes will in future include a compulsory programme review after the first cohort of students has graduated. Programme reviews, as planned for 2006, are conducted by applying the same HEQC programme accreditation criteria and institution-specific criteria.
• The HEQC has stated clearly that a programme review process is required in merged institutions for developing a new APS. Consolidated programmes and amended programmes will be accepted as part of the University’s APS, and no official submission to the HEQC is required, on condition that a thorough process of programme review is undertaken by the institution.

PURPOSE OF PROGRAMME REVIEWS

The purpose of programme reviews is to

• develop a new APS for the UJ;

• improve the quality of existing programmes; and

• align all programmes with the nature of a comprehensive university as well as the UJ’s vision, mission and strategic goals and values.

The development of a new APS for the UJ requires that decisions be made regarding the

• consolidation of existing programmes that overlap significantly and/or where duplication occurs with regard to the purpose, exit level outcomes, curriculum, modules, names of modules, SAQA (South African Qualifications Authority) credits learning outcomes, CESM (Classification of Educational Subject Matter) categories, qualification type, learning guides as well as locality of campuses, learning pathways and relevance and demand of professional and industry context;

• continuation of existing programmes incorporating alignment to the institutional, regional and national imperatives;

• discontinuation/termination of programmes that no longer fit in with the UJ’s APS; and

• emerging new academic programmes.

Academic programmes should also be aligned to promote:

• a diverse range of programmes, including vocational, career focused, professional and general formative;

• student mobility by creating meaningful vertical and horizontal pathways between different types of programmes/qualifications;

• accessibility to programmes with a variety of entry and exit points determined by appropriate admission criteria and processes;
• articulation possibilities with other programmes (within and outside the institution, including university type and technikon type programmes);

• responsiveness to regional and national needs, and research foci coherent with the variety of programmes;

• flexibility in the strengthening of relationships with the community, civic sector, government, business and industry; and

• student success.

The consolidation, continuation and termination of academic programmes should ultimately hinge on the balance of quality, financial feasibility and sustainability, and geographic considerations.

UNIVERSITY OF JOHANNESBURG’S STRATEGY FOR PROGRAMME REVIEWS

The QMU in collaboration with the QTT and QPT: Academic Programmes has developed the following strategy for programme reviews:

• Identify all existing programmes within the nine faculties.

• Select, negotiate and develop institutional and CHE criteria for programme reviews.

• Determine the requirements of the Department of Education (DoE), the Council on Higher Education (CHE), the HEQC, the Higher Education Qualifications Framework and statutory bodies.

• Develop a programme review process that adheres to quality assurance management principles.

• Clarify the roles and responsibilities of faculties, departments and the QMU.

• Determine and negotiate a time schedule for programme reviews.

Programme review criteria

The HEQC views criteria for programme accreditation as indicators of the minimum standards required for academic programmes. The HEQC defines the criteria as ‘Minimum standards necessary to support and enhance the quality of teaching and learning in a programme’ (CHE, 2004: 34).

The programme criteria shown in Table 1 have been approved for the purpose of programme reviews to establish the new APS of the UJ. A detailed outline of the criteria, minimum standards, guidelines and documentary evidence is discussed in the institutional manual for programme reviews.
Table 1: Programme criteria approved for the purpose of programme reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREAS</th>
<th>RELEVANT ASPECTS</th>
<th>UJ CRITERION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Institutional context</td>
<td>Comprehensive nature of UJ</td>
<td>Criterion 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Programme design</td>
<td>Relation to institution’s mission and planning</td>
<td>Criterion 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs of students and other stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intellectual credibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coherence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Articulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Characteristics and needs of professional and vocational education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning materials development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Programme coordination</td>
<td>Mandate and responsibilities of the programme coordinator(s)</td>
<td>Criterion 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student input and participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation of policies for ensuring the integrity of certification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Programme administrative services</td>
<td>Provision of information</td>
<td>Criterion 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identifying non-active and at-risk students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dealing with the needs of a diverse student population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensuring the integrity of certification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Coordination of work-based learning</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Criterion 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recording system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentoring system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Student recruitment, admission and selection</td>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>Criterion 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legislative issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widening of access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assumptions of learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity of the programme to offer quality education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Staffing</td>
<td>Qualifications, teaching experience, assessment competence</td>
<td>Criterion 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research profile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Size and seniority, full-time and part-time staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legislation and conditions of service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures for selection, appointment, induction and payment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contractual arrangements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative and technical staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Academic development for student success</td>
<td>Student and staff development</td>
<td>Criterion 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional student academic support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Teaching and learning strategy</td>
<td>Importance of promotion of student learning</td>
<td>Criterion 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional type, mode(s) of delivery and student composition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriate teaching and learning methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upgrading of teaching methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Targets, implementation plans, and ways to monitor, evaluate impact, and effect improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Teaching and learning interactions</td>
<td>Guidance to students on programme integration and outcomes</td>
<td>Criterion 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching and learning methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suitable learning opportunities, student involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Internal assessment</td>
<td>Internal and external moderation</td>
<td>Criterion 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


| Student assessment policies and procedures | Monitoring of student progress  
Validity and reliability of assessment  
Recording of results  
Security  
Recognition of prior learning (RPL) |
|------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Student assessment practices             | Integral part of teaching and learning  
Internal (or external) assessment  
Internal and external moderation  
Reliability  
Rigour and security |
| 7                                        | Venues, IT infrastructure and training  
Size and scope of library resources  
Integration of library resources into curriculum  
Management and maintenance of library resources  
Library support and access to students |
| Infrastructure and library resources     | Criterion 13 |
| 8                                        | Policies, regulations and procedures  
Equity and access  
Preparation of students |
| Postgraduate policies, regulations and procedures | Criterion 14 |
| Delivery of postgraduate programmes     | Management of the postgraduate programme  
Assessment  
Implementation of policies for student admission and selection  
Implementation of criteria for selection and appointment of supervisors  
Implementation of guidelines on roles and responsibilities of supervisors and students |
| 9                                        | Criterion 15 |
| Student retention and throughput rates   | Monitoring of information  
Remedial action  
Profiles of entering and qualifying class  
Employability of students  
External acknowledgement of programme |
| Programme impact                        | Criterion 16 |

**Categories of judgement**

Internal and peer review panels will first evaluate the programme(s) against each individual criterion as set out in the Manual for the Programme Review at the UJ. The following categories are used to classify judgements in each criterion:

a) **Commend**: All the minimum standards specified in the criterion were fully met and, in addition, good practices and innovation were identified in relation to the criterion.

b) **Meets minimum standards**: Minimum standards as specified in the criterion were met.

c) **Needs improvement**: Did not comply with all the minimum standards specified in the criterion. Problems/weaknesses could be addressed in a short period of time.

d) **Does not comply**: Did not comply with the majority of the minimum standards specified in the criterion.
Clusters of programmes

All learning programmes, i.e. undergraduate and postgraduate, should be reviewed. To make the review process more manageable and cost effective, clusters of programmes are recommended for review purposes, e.g. a cluster of programmes that overlap. A cluster consists of a number of programmes grouped together, and may also include programmes across departments and faculties. Each cluster of programmes will undergo a process of internal self-evaluation, followed by a peer review. The process will allow faculties and departments to submit existing programmes and their proposals for review. Their concrete proposals should indicate:

- programmes that should continue unchanged;
- programmes that should be consolidated;
- amendments to existing programmes; and/or
- programmes that will be discontinued and phased out.

All foundation programmes (i.e. NQF level 5) should also be reviewed as part of the undergraduate programmes to which they are linked. The programme portfolios should include all the evidence as required by the UJ Programme Criteria when applied to the programme and the supporting foundation programme.

Credit-bearing short learning programmes (i.e. short courses) that articulate directly with an accredited programme should be reviewed as part of that particular cluster of programmes. The following programme review clusters are proposed:

- **A cluster of programmes that overlap.** This cluster includes programmes from the former RAU and former TWR (and can also include Vista programmes) that overlap significantly in purpose, outcomes, contents, etc., which could be consolidated into one programme. A typical example would be the BTech Optometry and the B Optometry, but could also include programmes at postgraduate level.

- **A cluster of programmes that should articulate directly.** Typical examples include a BTech programme with an honours and a master’s programme, but could also include the overlap between a four-year BTech and a three-year bachelor’s degree, as well as accredited diplomas and certificates. The focus here is a review of these programmes individually, but also their articulation. By applying the level descriptors (as part of the UJ Programme Criteria), departments and faculties can determine whether a programme’s exit level outcomes are pitched at the right level, and to what extent these programmes articulate.

- **An open cluster of individual programmes.** Faculties and departments may identify their own clusters of programmes to include programmes that are excluded from the two clusters described in this document. Clustering could be done by taking a common denominator into consideration (e.g. all the master’s programmes in languages).
PROGRAMME REVIEW PROCESS

The **internal review process** consists of the following two phases:

- Self-evaluation
- Internal panel review.

This process requires the faculty/department/school to engage in critical self-evaluation so as to identify areas of duplication and/or overlapping for possible consolidation with another similar programme or module; best practice; improvement areas; and other interventions required in order to enhance the quality of the programmes. This process should culminate in the preparation of a portfolio document that addresses the criteria and the minimum standards set out.

It is recommended that the portfolio of evidence be organised by criterion, and within each criterion, by minimum standard. Each standard should be addressed in terms of the faculty/department/school compliance and include an analytical discussion of the strengths and areas for improvement in relation to the criterion and the minimum standards. Each criterion should include a plan of action that will address areas identified in the self-evaluation for possible consolidation and/or improvement.

**A brief overview of the stages in the review processes**

The following steps are followed in the programme review process (see Figure 2):

1) Identification and prioritisation of programmes within clusters for review by faculty/department/school

2) Training of academic staff on the following dimensions:
   a) Programme criteria and evidence required
   b) Compilation of a portfolio

3) Self-evaluation of programmes by faculties/departments/schools, including:
   a) Compilation and preparation of the portfolio by relevant academic staff, using the instruments and criteria developed for this purpose
   b) Self-evaluation exercise by department/school/faculty
   c) Formulation of a concrete proposal regarding whether programmes should continue unchanged, be consolidated/amalgamated or discontinued

4) Submission of self-evaluation and formulated proposals by faculties of their programme to QPT: Academic Programmes/QMU of IE
5) Internal desktop screening of institutional self-evaluation portfolios by the QMU of IE

6) Request to institutions to release experts to participate as evaluators and panellists

7) Call for the nominations, selection and appointment of chairperson, evaluators and panellists

8) Distributing of portfolios to chairpersons, evaluators and panellists two weeks (ten working days) prior to site visits

9) Evaluation of portfolio submissions by relevant experts, evaluators and chairpersons

10) Development of the schedule for site visits of the review panel by QMU

11) Informing faculties of the site visits and composition of the review panels

12) QMU: draft schedule of the site visit to selected experts for suggestions on adjustments

13) Site visit by a panel of peers and experts

14) Evaluation report developed by the chair on the basis of panel deliberations

15) Evaluation of all reports, related documentation, concrete proposals and recommendations by the faculties

16) Communication of recommendations to institutions with a five-day window period for the submission of comments on errors of fact, discrepancies and omissions

17) Faculty approval of proposals; submissions to the QPT: Academic Programmes

18) Submission to university approval structures for academic programmes (Faculty Board, APC, Senate Quality Committee (SQC) and SENEX)

19) Review by APC, SQC, SENEX of the concrete proposals and recommendations in the light of institutional comments and submission of final recommendations to the Senate

20) Decision by the UJ Senate

21) Communication of outcomes to faculties

22) Notification to HEQC and DoE

23) Implementation of the APS and programmes.
Figure 2: Flow chart of the programme review process
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The following task teams, committees and panels are involved in the programme reviews.

**Portfolio task teams**

For each cluster of programmes, a Portfolio Task Team (PTT) is appointed to collect the evidence per programme and develop a portfolio for each programme. The principle of equal representation (i.e. former RAU and former TWR staff members on these PTTs) should be applied where applicable (e.g. when former RAU and former TWR programmes overlap). The PTT is also responsible for the narrative in which the programme-specific evidence is interpreted in terms of the programme review criteria.

**Internal programme review committees**

The Internal Programme Review Committee (IPRC) is appointed to evaluate all the programmes in a particular programme review cluster. Different IPRCs should be appointed for different clusters of programmes. The IPRC will meet on site to conduct interviews, discuss evidence, etc. It will receive the different programme portfolios (in the cluster) from the PTT and evaluates them by applying the programme review criteria, and by taking the particular cluster into consideration (i.e. programmes that overlap or programmes that should articulate directly). Its report should include an individual evaluation of each programme in the cluster, but it should also address the particular focus, e.g. to what extent the programmes articulate.

Faculties are advised to keep these committees small, limiting the number to four to six members. The IPRC should at least consist of:

- An external chairperson (preferably not from the UJ or the former RAU or former TWR). The IE can provide guidance by appointing a suitably qualified/competent/experienced chairperson. This person should manage the evaluation process and is responsible for compiling the report.

- A programme expert who can evaluate all the programmes in the cluster, as well as the modules from a field of specialisation with a specific perspective. This should be a specialist in the relevant field with a good knowledge and understanding of the whole programme. The principle of equal representation (i.e. former RAU and former TWR) should be applied where applicable (e.g. when former RAU and former TWR programmes overlap).

- One UJ staff member from another faculty or a relevant academic support unit who is an expert in teaching, learning, assessment and curriculum-related issues in higher education.
**Peer review panels**

A Peer Review Panel (PRP) is appointed for each cluster of programmes. The panel will meet on site to conduct an evaluation of the portfolio by validating evidence, conducting interviews, discussing evidence, etc. The following documents are submitted to the PRP:

- Programme portfolios in the particular programme
- IPRC report
- Academic department’s comments on the report
- Academic department’s concrete proposals (i.e. the proposed curriculum for the consolidated programme, proposed amendments to a programme, etc.).

The appointment of panel members and the clustering of programmes should be done with the financial implications in mind (i.e. for site visits, travelling arrangements and costs, accommodation, etc.). The PRP should include at least the following people:

- An external chairperson (preferably not from the UJ or the former RAU or former TWR). The IE can provide guidance in the appointment of a suitably qualified/competent/experienced chairperson. This person should manage the evaluation process and is responsible for compiling the report.
- A programme expert from another merged institution who can evaluate all the programmes in the cluster, as well as the modules from a field of specialisation with a specific perspective. This should be a specialist in the relevant field with a sound knowledge and understanding of the whole programme. If a particular cluster of programmes is not offered by any of the merged institutions in South Africa, a specialist from any other SA university may be included.
- A representative of the professional council/board if one or more of the programmes in the cluster is accredited by a professional council or body.
- A representative of the industry or profession (i.e. no UJ staff member or any former RAU or former TWR staff member).
- One UJ staff member from another faculty or a relevant academic support unit, who is an expert in teaching, learning, assessment and curriculum-related issues in higher education. The IE can provide guidance in the appointment of a suitably qualified/competent/experienced chairperson.

**Faculty quality manager**

It is recommended that each faculty appoint a quality manager to plan, manage and coordinate the various teams, processes, etc. in the faculty. This should be a (senior) academic with a sound knowledge and understanding of the faculty and its programmes.
ROLE PLAYERS AND THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES

Faculties are reminded that programme reviews are evidence based. All the relevant documents, e.g. policies, agendas, minutes and learning guides, should be included in the programme portfolio. The programme review process itself should also adhere to quality measures as reflected in the programme criterion on programme reviews. Documentation on the programme review process itself, e.g. planning documents, allocation of responsibilities for the collection of evidence, and minutes of programme review meetings serve as evidence of the quality of the process followed (see Table 2). The proposed schedule is shown in Table 3.

Table 2: The programme review (PR) process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSIBILITIES: FACULTIES &amp; DEPARTMENTS</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITIES: QMU IN IE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning and budgeting</td>
<td>Planning and budgeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify programme clusters and plan budget in consultation with QMU</td>
<td>Provide guidelines in Planning Programme Reviews (UJ, 2005b), for planning and budgeting purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and nominate staff members to attend PR workshops in October, November 2005 and February 2006</td>
<td>Provide support on PR budgeting (i.e. programme cluster templates, an index of generic fees and expenses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant PTTs meet with representatives from QMU in the IE</td>
<td>Organise PR workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organise institutional seminars on topics such as comprehensive universities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide a PR Manual for faculties and departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meet with PTTs to discuss PR process, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clusters and panels</td>
<td>Clusters and panels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify clusters of programmes to be reviewed.</td>
<td>Provide guidelines and support/advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify PTTs responsible for evidence collection and portfolio compilation according to the criteria in the PR Manual.</td>
<td>Provide advice on external chairpersons for IPRCs, PRPs and UJ experts on teaching, learning, assessment and curriculum-related issues in higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and contact members of the IPRC and the PRP</td>
<td>Provide report template for SE report and guidelines for the SE (in PR Manual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organise PR including letters to members of the IPRC and the PRP, provide guidelines on SE or peer review process, PR schedule for the particular cluster of programmes, travelling arrangements, accommodation and financial arrangements, lunches, venues, programme for site visit, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection of evidence</td>
<td>Collection of evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTTs analyse UJ PR Criteria and minimum standards in the PR Manual to identify and interpret required evidence</td>
<td>Provide support with / advice on portfolio development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTTs develop programme portfolios according to guidelines in the PR Manual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal scanning/approval of the portfolio may be required by the Dean or the Faculty Quality Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme portfolios</td>
<td>Programme portfolios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit hard copies of the portfolios (per cluster) to the QMU for critical scanning</td>
<td>Critical scanning of the portfolios for completeness before they are submitted to the IPRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit portfolios to IPRC for SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self evaluation and SE report</td>
<td>Self-evaluation and SE report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of portfolios in the cluster by the IPRC Committee submits SE Report according to PR schedule to relevant department(s) and to the QMU</td>
<td>Overseer process of SE, provide advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department(s) comments on SE report and submits SE report and comments (including their concrete proposals) to the Faculty Quality Committee, Dean and/or Faculty Board</td>
<td>Provide guidelines for the consolidation, amendment of programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide programme templates for concrete proposals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESPONSIBILITIES: FACULTIES & DEPARTMENTS

Concrete proposals are submitted on programme templates for consolidated, amended, unchanged and discontinued programmes. Consult Academic Staff Development Unit on the development of consolidated and amended programmes and curriculum development matters.

Table 3: Proposed schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time frame</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sep 2005</td>
<td>Planning programme reviews (PR) for budgeting purposes</td>
<td>Identify PR clusters in and across faculties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Identify and establish faculty structures and people to steer PR process in the faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule PR in faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Identify and appoint chairpersons and members of the IPRC &amp; PRPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Analyse criteria to identify responsibilities, kinds of evidence required, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan and schedule responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collect and interpret evidence (e.g. policies, surveys, learning guides, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop portfolio and organise sets of evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Submit portfolio to IPRC at least two weeks prior to site visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June – August 2006</td>
<td>IPRCs conduct self-evaluations</td>
<td>Site visits by IPRCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IPRC submit their report to the relevant department, two weeks after site visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2006</td>
<td>Department’s comments on SE report and concrete proposals</td>
<td>Consult QMU on PQM matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consult unit for work-based learning (where applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consult Academic Staff Development Unit on curriculum development matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop concrete proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revise programme portfolios and evidence in preparation for PRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Submit the following documents at least two weeks prior to site visit to the PRP members:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Programme portfolios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The department’s comments on the report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department’s concrete proposals in response to the report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October – November 2006</td>
<td>Site visits by PRPs</td>
<td>Site visit by PRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Panel submits report two weeks after site visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January – March</td>
<td>Submissions (i.e. FAPS, rationale and Department comments on Panel’s report)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2007 | concrete proposals) to faculty boards and APC | Finalise concrete proposals  
Develop a FAPS and a rationale |
|---|---|---|
| April – June 2007 | APC develops APS | APC provides feedback to the departments on their concrete proposals, FAPS and rationale  
APC submits the APS to SENEX and Senate for approval |
| August – November 2007 | SENEX and Senate approve APS and the faculties’ concrete proposals  
QMU submits APS and relevant documents to the HEQC | Faculties finalise their concrete proposals and submit them to the faculty boards for approval and then to  
SENEX and Senate  
APC submits APS to Senate for approval |
| October – November 2007 | Faculties plan curriculum implementation, e.g. develop learning materials, align curriculum matters with institutional and faculty-specific policies, address programme implications for human and financial resources, marketing, etc. | Consult relevant academic support units, e.g. the Academic Staff Development Unit, CenTAL, etc.  
Monitor progress in programme consolidation, within faculty structures and the APC/SQC |
| 2008 | Implementation | Faculties, relevant DVCs and the APC  
Progress monitored by faculty quality structures and the APC/SQC |

**SELF-EVALUATION PROCESS**

Proposed steps to be followed (e.g. consolidation of a university type and technikon type programme):

1) The faculty identifies a cluster of programmes where there is a significant overlap and/or duplication of modules.

2) The department, in conjunction with the faculty, identifies and appoints an IPTT and IPRC members for the self-evaluation of the programmes.

3) The IPTT develops an evidence-led portfolio by applying the UJ criteria for programme review as formulated in this manual. A narrative account should be given in relation to each criterion statement and minimum standards that consist of the following key areas:

3.1 A descriptive account of the faculty/department/school performance around the criterion statement (use questions/guidelines to guide response).

3.2 Some of the criteria require detailed information, which is provided in a diagram below the criterion.

3.3 The following information should be included in the portfolio:

- Programme name
- Qualification code
- NQF level
- Total number of credits for the
- Programme outline (curriculum)
- Fundamental, core and elective modules (name and code)
- Credits assigned to the different modules
programme

- Duration of the programme
- Rules of combination
- Purpose of the programme
- Exit level outcomes
- Assessment criteria
- Admission requirements
- Articulation with other programmes (vertical and/or horizontal)
- Indication of how the critical cross-field outcomes are reflected

Learning outcomes of the module
- Assessment criteria per module
- Learning guides
- Brief outline of the learning content of the modules (the extent of the outline should be sufficient for a panel to determine the complexity and depth of the learning content, and to identify the differences and similarities of the content)

4) An analysis of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats.

5) The completed portfolios of the programmes are submitted to the IPRC for the self-evaluation process.

6) The IPRC evaluates both programmes by applying the UJ criteria and minimum standards. Judgments are made based on an overall assessment of the performance in relation to the minimum standards and the criterion. Each criterion is ranked in term of commend (C), meet minimum standard (MMS), needs improvement (NI) or does not comply (DNC). The committee should analyse both programmes in term of the:

- Purpose of the programme
- Exit level outcomes
- Level descriptors
- Assessment criteria
- Admission requirements
- Articulation with other programmes (vertical and/or horizontal)
- Indication of how the critical cross-field outcomes are reflected
- Programme outline (curriculum)
- Fundamental, core and elective modules (name and code)
- Credits assigned to the different modules
- Learning outcomes of the module
- Assessment criteria per module
- Learning guides
- Complexity, depth and amount of learning content per module
- Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats.
This committee should compile a report based on the evaluation of the programmes, which includes recommendations for possible consolidation. The report and portfolios are referred back to the relevant departments.

7) The department(s) comments on the report and formulates concrete proposals, including a consolidated curriculum, based on the IPRC report.

8) The department submits the portfolios, IPRC report, their comments and concrete proposals to PRP for evaluation.

9) The PRP evaluates the submitted documentation and compiles a report (after a site visit) with recommendations regarding the consolidated programme. (This is a developmental process that will enable the department to improve the programme.)

10) The department comments on the findings in the PRP report and revises the concrete proposal for submission to the dean/faculty board for approval.

11) The faculty board approves the proposal and submits all documentation to the APC and SQC.

12) After all the programmes have been subjected to the programme review process, the faculty develops the Faculty Academic Programme Structure (FAPS) and submits it to the APC.

13) The APC develops and establishes the UJ APS for submission to SENEX and then Senate for approval.

SITE VISIT BY PEER REVIEW PANEL

The purpose of a site visit is to validate statements, information and documentation reflected in the portfolios of the programmes. During the site visits the panel members hold discussions with deans, departmental chairs, lecturers, students, alumni, etc. The panel make judgements on the criteria and minimum standards in terms of the self-evaluation done by the departments.

Peer review report

After conducting the site visit and scrutinising the available evidence, the review panel again ranks the minimum standards and the criteria according to the four categories stipulated above. Ideally, this final ranking will be done on site during the panel review visit. The chairperson is responsible, in consultation with other panel members, for writing a report, which is submitted to the department for their comments. The department may point out incorrect factual information and include other responses or comments. The comments made by the department will be included (in italics) as part of the final review report. The final report is distributed to
• the head of department;
• the dean and the relevant vice-dean of the faculty; and
• the chairperson of the relevant Quality Committee.

CONCLUSION

In striving to be recognised nationally and internationally as a reputable institution, the UJ must offer high quality academic programmes which are evaluated regularly and benchmarked against specific criteria. The university has embarked on this road of excellence so as to obtain self-accreditation status for the programmes offered.

REFERENCES


Figure 3: Quality management structures for the programme review process

- **Senate**
  - Senate
  - Senate Quality Committee
  - Academic Planning Committee
  - Quality Task Team
  - Quality Project Team: Academic Programmes
  - Programme Planning & Review
  - Regular QA meetings: Feedback Reports

- **Office for Institutional Effectiveness**
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  - Project Coordinator
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  - Faculty Board
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- **Faculty Management Level**
  - Portfolio Task Team
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  - Concrete Proposals
  - Peer Review Panel
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  - Project Coordinator
  - Faculty QM
  - Faculty Board