

QA Report Rubrics

Notes: Deans/Director of AVA and Faculty/School/Academy Boards are encouraged to make reference to the following general descriptors of QA Report Rubrics when reviewing/considering the individual *Programme QA Reports* and preparing the comprehensive QA Report to the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC).

Criteria	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Threshold	N/A
<p>(a) Improvement made in response to last year's report</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Addressed each improvement item with explanation and evidence for success or failure. - Description of how the improvements made have been incorporated as routine operations of the Programme. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Addressed each improvement item with some evidence showing success or failure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stated that improvements have been made with no evidence provided. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - None provided. 	
<p>(b) Evaluation of KPIs for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Admissions • Medium of Instruction (MOI) • Student Performance • Course Feedback Questionnaire (CFQ) • Outcomes • Budget & quotas <i>(for self-financed programmes)</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Good evaluation and explanation of data trends in admissions, student performance, etc. - Good results or abnormalities highlighted with explanations and supporting evidence. - Benchmarking (self, local & international) attempts shown. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Explanation of data trends provided showing some analysis of the data. - Some evidence in qualitative or quantitative forms provided. - Related information, e.g. budget projection is given to support the evaluation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Simple description of data provided, with no reflective statement showing basic analysis of the data. - Apart from data provided centrally, no other data/information is included. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No sign of data gathered and shown in the report have been reviewed, no description/explanation/evaluation provided. 	

<p>(c) PILOs/GAs Achievement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Comprehensive PILOs assessment plan shown; actions and processes followed accordingly. - Good collection of multi-perspectives evidence to support claims of PILO achievement. - Reference made to University's GAs Rubrics and suggested procedure. - Good points and weaknesses identified and explained. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PILOs assessment plan included and with process explained. - Evidence included both qualitative and quantitative aspects. - Reference made to GAs Rubrics. - Work showed that members of programme team involved. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Simple description with only anecdotal evidence provided. - Work of an individual rather than the programme team. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No attempt shown; OR - Too ambitious, trying to evaluate all PILOs in one go. 	
<p>(d) Improvement Plan <i>(Should be based on evaluation in sections (b) and (c))</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improvement plan provided based on issues identified in (b) or (c) with a reasonable expectation to complete within one year. - Improvement items responding to feedback from students. - Improvement items lead to changes in T&L practices. - Improvement items lead to curriculum changes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improvement suggestions based on issues identified in (b) and/or (c). - Cover some items in "Exemplary" but not to the same extent. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - General improvement matters not relating to issues identified in (b) and/or (c). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - None provided; OR - Far too ambitious that any improvements are unlikely to happen within one year. 	

<p>(e) Any other observations <i>(this section is for the reviewer to provide additional comments, if deemed necessary, to explain their "grading" and give more assistance for the programme to improve)</i></p>					
---	--	--	--	--	--