

**Rubric for RPg Annual Programme QA Reports**

**Programme: \_\_\_\_\_**

**Report for Academic Year: \_\_\_\_\_**

**For Faculty/School/AVA Board**

Note: You are invited to make reference to the Vision 2020 document and the themes of enhancing the student learning experience and global engagements: strategies and current developments, when reviewing/comment on individual Programme QA Reports.

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Standard</b>	<b>Basic</b>	<b>Missing</b>	<b>N/A</b>
(a) Improvement in response to last year's report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Addressed each improvement item with explanation and evidence for success or failure</li> <li>- Description of how the improvements made have been incorporated as routine operations of the programme</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Addressed each improvement item with some evidence showing success or failure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Stated that improvements have been made with no evidence provided</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- None provided</li> </ul>	
Other Comments:					

Criteria	Exemplary	Standard	Basic	Missing	N/A
<p>(b) Evaluation of KPIs for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Admissions</li> <li>• Student Performance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Attract and retain high quality RPg students;</li> <li>- Good evaluation and explanation of data trends in admissions, student performance, etc.</li> <li>- Set standards and policies for completion, time to degree, mentoring outcomes, milestones and RPg student job placement; establish tracking and reporting procedures;</li> <li>- Good results or anomalies highlighted with explanations and supporting evidence.</li> <li>- Establish excellent standards for mentoring, dissertation committees and dissertation supervision</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Explanation of data trends provided showing some analysis of the data</li> <li>- Some evidence in qualitative or quantitative forms provided</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Simple description of data provided, with no reflective statement showing basic analysis of the data.</li> <li>- Apart from data provided centrally, no other data/information is included</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No sign of data gathered and shown in the report have been reviewed, no description/explanation provided.</li> <li>- Delays caused by inadequate mentoring (e.g., high student to faculty ratios, lack of engagement from supervisors, advising errors, etc.),</li> <li>- Inadequate preparation for job placement, limiting job opportunities for Rpg students or early attrition of RPg students.</li> </ul>	
<p>Other Comments:</p>					

Criteria	Exemplary	Standard	Basic	Missing	N/A
<p>(c) Evaluation of KPIs for Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Outcomes Achievement</li> <li>- Lines of Evidence Identified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Comprehensive PILOs assessment plan shown; actions and processes followed accordingly</li> <li>- Good collection of multi-perspectives evidence to support claims of PILO achievement</li> <li>- Reference made to University's GAs Rubrics and suggested procedure</li> <li>- Good points and weaknesses identified and explained</li> <li>- Relevant evidence is collected; have identified examples of RPg student performance at varying levels of mastery for each relevant PILO.</li> <li>- Author or co-author a manuscript that is suitable for publication in a professional journal related to the student's academic focus. Manuscripts for journals may include empirical studies, book reviews, and commentary</li> <li>- Strong evidence of authorship or co-authoring on paper(s) proposed for, and presented at, a national or international conference.</li> </ul>	<p>PILOs assessment plan included and with process explained</p> <p>Evidence included both qualitative and quantitative aspects</p> <p>Reference made to GAs Rubrics</p> <p>Work showed that members of programme team involved</p> <p>Relevant PILOs are identified. Concrete plans for collecting evidence for each PILO are agreed upon.</p> <p>Author or co-author a manuscript that is suitable for publication as a book chapter in an edited volume related to the student's academic focus.</p> <p>Moderate evidence of authorship or co-authoring on paper(s) proposed for, and presented at, a national or international conference.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Simple description with only anecdotal evidence provided</li> <li>- Work of an individual rather than the programme team</li> <li>- The relevant PILOs are identified, e.g., ability to integrate knowledge to solve complex problems; however, concrete plans for collecting evidence for each PILO have not been developed.</li> <li>- Author or co-author a manuscript that is suitable for publication - may include empirical studies, book reviews, and commentary.</li> <li>- Limited evidence of authorship or co-authoring on paper(s) proposed for, and presented at, a national or international conference.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No attempt shown; OR Too ambitious, trying to evaluate all PILOs in one go</li> <li>- It is not clear which PILOs will be assessed</li> <li>- No presentation or publication, or plan to produce these shown.</li> <li>- Inadequate or no evidence of authorship or co-authoring on paper(s) proposed for, and presented at, a national or international conference.</li> </ul>	

Criteria	Exemplary	Standard	Basic	Missing	N/A
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strong evidence of active participation in teaching, workshops and grant applications to enhance competitiveness for career opportunities as appropriate.</li> <li>- Strong evidence to suggest broadening of professional foundations through activities such as participating in teaching an undergraduate level lecture course using active engagement strategies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Moderate evidence of active participation in teaching, workshops and grant applications to enhance competitiveness for career opportunities as appropriate.</li> <li>- Moderate evidence to suggest broadening of professional foundations through activities such as participating in teaching an undergraduate level lecture course using active engagement strategies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Limited evidence of active participation in teaching, workshops and grant applications to enhance competitiveness for career opportunities as appropriate.</li> <li>- Limited evidence to suggest broadening of professional foundations through activities such as participating in teaching an undergraduate level lecture course using active engagement strategies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Inadequate or no evidence of active participation in teaching, workshops and grant applications to enhance competitiveness for career opportunities as appropriate.</li> <li>- No evidence to suggest broadening of professional foundations through activities such as participating in teaching an undergraduate level lecture course using active engagement strategies.</li> </ul>	
Other Comments:					
<p><b>(d) Improvement Plan</b> Should be based on evaluation in sections (b) and (c)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Improvement plan provided based on issues identified in (b) or (c) with a reasonable expectation to complete within one year</li> <li>- Improvement items responding to feedback from students</li> <li>- Improvement items lead to changes in T&amp;L practices</li> <li>- Improvement items lead to curriculum changes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Improvement suggestions based on issues identified in (b) and/or (c)</li> <li>- Cover some items in “Exemplary” but not to the same extent</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- General improvement matters not relating to issues identified in (b) and/or (c)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- None provided OR</li> <li>- Far too ambitious that any improvements are unlikely to happen within one year</li> </ul>	

Criteria	Exemplary	Standard	Basic	Missing	N/A
Other Comments:					
(e) Process of Review	<p>Excellent evaluation of programme's learning outcomes, assessment plan, evidence, benchmarking results, and assessment impact.</p> <p>Evaluative feedback and suggestions for improvement provided to improve student learning.</p>	<p>Good analysis of direct and indirect evidence of student learning in the programme and offer evaluative feedback and suggestions for improvement.</p>	<p>Adequately addressed indirect and possibly direct evidence of student learning in the programme at the descriptive level, rather than providing an evaluation.</p>	<p>Does not adequately address evidence concerning the quality of student learning in the programme.</p>	
Other Comments:					
(f) Any other observations (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)		<p>For (b), Further info on the employment or promotion prospects of graduants may be useful</p> <p>For (c), course assessment data should not be the only evidence for PILOs achievement; aggregation of courses and indirect measures should also be deployed.</p> <p>Some PILOs were assessed using one course only, again not convincing</p> <p>The GAs Rubrics should be referenced.</p>			

**References:**

- Brooks, R L., and D. H. Accountability, assessment and doctoral education: Recommendations for moving forward. *European Journal of Education* 42.3 (2007): 351-362.
- Brooks, R. L. (2005). Measuring university quality. *The Review of Higher Education*, 29, pp. 1–21.
- Golde, C., Jones, M., Bueschel, L., Conklin, A.& Walker, G. E. (2006) The challenges of doctoral program assessment: lessons from the Carnegie initiative on the doctorate, in: P. Maki & N. Borkowski (Eds) *The Assessment of Doctoral Education: Emerging Criteria and New Models for Improving Outcomes* (Sterling, Virginia, Stylus) pp. 53–82.