

City University of Hong Kong Quality Audit of Sub-degree Operations 2018 Progress Reports

Institutional Submission to the Quality Assurance Council
of the University Grants Committee

September 2020



香港城市大學
City University of Hong Kong

CONFIDENTIAL to staff members of
City University of Hong Kong and members of the QAC of UGC

Table of Contents

Preamble	2
Chapter 1 Summary of Recommendations and Affirmations	3
Chapter 2 Progress on Recommendations	10
Chapter 3 Progress on Affirmations	20
Glossary of Abbreviations	24
List of Appendices	25

Preamble

The quality audit for sub-degree operations conducted by the Quality Assurance Council of the University Grants Committee is the first of its kind for the sub-degree sector in Hong Kong. The exercise provided City University of Hong Kong (CityU) with a valued opportunity for a comprehensive review of its quality assurance mechanisms for sub-degree programmes, administered by three sub-degree providing units (SDPUs). CityU appreciates the Quality Assurance Council's recognition of CityU's sub-degree programmes, as fit for purpose and meeting the expectations of students, employers, and other stakeholders. CityU at the same time notes that sub-degree programmes account for a small and shrinking share of the University's portfolio.

As a university which is committed to a culture of reflective practice and continual improvement in both process and quality, CityU took the Quality Assurance Council's comments seriously. In the 18 months following the release of the *Report of a Quality Audit of Sub-degree Operations of City University of Hong Kong* (hereinafter referred to as the “*Audit Report*”), CityU has worked closely with its SDPUs to actively re-examine quality assurance policies, procedures and practices with an aim for further enhancement. By gathering the input from respective units of the University, an action plan was devised. The action plan forms the basis for a series of initiatives adopted by CityU and its SDPUs to improve the quality of learning and teaching. To keep track of the progress for the various enhancement initiatives, respective units were invited to report to the Associate Provost (Quality Assurance) on regular basis.

This *Progress Report* explains how CityU and its SDPUs have addressed the affirmations and recommendations made by the Quality Assurance Council. The *Progress Report* first summarises all affirmations and recommendation, together with CityU's follow-up actions, and then explains each of the quality enhancement actions undertaken in more details.

Chapter 1 Summary of Recommendations and Affirmations

1.1 The Audit Panel made seven recommendations (areas where the University was suggested to focus its efforts on improvement) and five affirmations (areas where the University was already making progress). The table below summarises the recommendations and affirmations and respective follow-up actions adopted by CityU.

	Recommendations	Follow-up Actions
Approach to Programme Quality Assurance		
R1	While each of the three SDPUs reports ultimately to the Senate, there is no evidence that all three reports are deliberated by the same institutional body. Though this does not pose an immediate risk to the academic quality or standards of any of the SDPUs, and does not imply that the systems in place for quality and standards are in any way deficient, it does mean that the University is missing opportunities for comparative analysis and sharing of experience and good practice. While recognising that this will become less important as CityU streamlines its SD provision, the University is recommended to establish a process to ensure that the quality and standards of each of the SDPUs is considered on, at least, an annual basis, by the same institutional body. [Audit Report para. 2.11]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The two academic units in the College of Engineering (CENG) that offer sub-degree programmes will add a separate one-page executive summary giving an overview of the programmes to CENG for consideration when submitting the annual programme reports. A representative who has knowledge of the CENG Associate Degree (AD) programmes (e.g. Dean's nominee or a member of the College Board) will give a presentation on the one-page summary at the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) meeting. Community College of City University (CCCU) and School of Continuing and Professional Education (SCOPE) will continue to submit the annual quality assurance report to the QAC with presentation by a representative. Feasibility of recording the programme intended learning outcomes (PILOs) using a database to capture changes and their impact of programme-course mapping will be explored. It is expected that the data can be used by respective units for further analysis on impact on graduate outcomes.
Curriculum Design, Programme Development and Approval Processes		
R2	The Panel noted the high degree of attention and investment by the University in programme design and approval, and accreditation and re-validation. However, although there is clarity around the approval of minor and major programme changes and the various associated roles and responsibilities, a lighter touch is generally employed through annual monitoring, that may result in incremental change of PILOs. This	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SDPUs will report changes to PILOs in their quality assurance report / executive summary as changes to PILOs are normally classified as major changes. Changes of this kind need to be approved at both department and College level. Feasibility of recording the PILOs using a database to capture changes and their impact of programme-course mapping will be explored. It is expected that the data can

	could be mitigated at SCOPE where triennial periodic programme reviews complement annual reporting procedures. Notwithstanding this, the University is recommended to consider how oversight of programme monitoring could most effectively guard against the possibility of progressive changes to the intended programme learning outcomes. [Audit Report para. 3.10]	<p>be used by respective units for further analysis on impact on graduate outcomes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCCU will generate a PILOs summary from the annual programme reports to analyse the effectiveness of the programme.
Programme Delivery, including Pedagogical Approaches, Learning Environments and Resources, Scheduling		
R3	The University is encouraged to consider ways in which the annual QA reports from the SDPUs could be brought together to facilitate the sharing of good practice and the monitoring of provision across the range of different programmes. While there is evidence of the use of e-pedagogies, there is scope for the wider use of innovative teaching methods across the SDPUs. The Panel also recommends more comprehensive and systematic coordination in the collection of student data including various surveys of student opinions on their learning experience and expectations. Such data could be analysed, aggregated and integrated more effectively to enhance teaching and learning practices. [Audit Report para. 4.9]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extraction of the good practices section from CENG's one-page report summary and CCCU's and SCOPE's annual quality report for posting on the QAC's website. This practice mirrors that adopted by the QAC for the University proper's annual summary reports on AD/degree/taught postgraduate annual programme reports. • SDPUs to review the surveys and data collected. Then, a working group comprising representatives from SDPUs to review the surveys conducted at individual units and formulate a plan to analyse, aggregate and integrate the data to enhance teaching and learning practices.
Support for Teaching Quality including Pedagogical Development		
R4	Professional development opportunities are independently offered to teaching staff of the three SDPUs. The Panel found evidence that staff members have made use of the funding to join activities that keep them updated about their respective fields of interest, but the levels of participation in teaching-related professional development activities vary across the different SDPUs and are generally very low. CityU is recommended to develop the role of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop an overarching staff development framework. • Office of Education Development and Gateway Education (EDGE) to collect staff development needs from SDPUs; and address the corresponding support provided to the units concerned in their annual report to the QAC. • SDPUs to support and encourage staff to participate in work development programmes by providing them with relevant information, for example, online courses provided by EDGE. Staff members

	<p>the Quality Assurance Committee in the planning of professional development activities across the SDPUs and to consolidate the role of EDGE in leveraging opportunities at programme and SDPU level to produce synergy. It is also encouraged to seek ways of ensuring that more teaching staff from the SDPUs participate in the courses that it offers. [Audit Report para. 5.7]</p>	<p>are reminded that professional development is a component of staff appraisal.</p>
R5	<p>The grading system in the performance appraisal of CCCU comprises four levels ranging from exceeding required standards to failing to meet required standards. The standards are developed and agreed within Divisions prior to the appraisal cycle. CCCU is recommended to ensure that all staff are familiar with the assessment criteria and assessment rubrics for staff performance appraisal and ensure that they are fully aware of the expectations for professional standards of teaching and of the impact their performance may have on their remuneration. [Audit Report para. 5.13]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCCU will continue the practice of periodically explaining to staff members the details of the performance appraisal scheme to ensure clear understanding of the system. Changes will be made to the assessment criteria to further improve fairness and consistency.
Student Learning Assessment		
R6	<p>Regulations for managing complaints and appeals against the outcomes of assessment are in place, although not always well recognised by students. Most issues are dealt with informally by teaching staff and programme leaders. Arrangements for referral of cases to a more formal procedure are not widely known. Although students of CCCU and SCOPE are not covered by the CityU Student Complaint Procedures, the two SDPUs have their own separate procedures. The Panel recommends the University to consider its policy for student complaints and appeals to make sure that all students are fully aware of the existing arrangements and to confirm</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCCU will draw students’ attention to appeal procedures, which are clearly laid out in the CCCU website and respective programme handbooks, during the orientation. • SCOPE to review the current arrangements of disseminating the relevant procedures to students. • SDPUs to review the existing policy at SDPU level. • CityU to collect similar data from SDPUs for more effective analysis and reporting.

	equity of treatment for students, regardless of their programme of study. The University should also collect and analyse information about complaints and appeals to report to SDPU Boards and Quality Assurance Committee. [Audit Report para. 6.8]	
Student Participation and Student Support Services		
R7	The University encourages student participation in co-curricular activities, although the numbers involved are not as high as might be expected. Financial sponsorship is available to both UGC-funded and self-financed AD students. The Panel found evidence in different annual reports in each SDPU that supports the effective monitoring and improvement of co-curricular activities and internships, including evaluation reports and self-improvement and reflection sheets. The Panel recommends that the University give further encouragement to students to participate in co-curricular activities and keep a comprehensive record of all student involvement. [Audit Report para. 7.8]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCCU will continue to encourage students’ participation in co-curricular activities, both local and overseas, and support them by providing financial support and programme teams to organise a variety of activities throughout the year (e.g. Student Ambassador Scheme, Quality Campus Life Fund, summer internship, Career Advisory Resources and Training Services). • SCOPE to increase student participation rates by accommodating their needs and providing positive incentives. • University experience sharing with SCOPE on keeping a comprehensive student record.
	Affirmations	Follow-up Actions
Governance, Management, University Planning and Accountability		
A1	The Panel looked closely at the plans for the transition of CCCU to the UoW and received assurances that the process was being handled with due regard to the interests of students, staff and key stakeholders. The Panel affirms the steps that have been taken by both institutions to ensure an effective handover of responsibilities. [Audit Report para. 1.10]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CityU and CCCU to ensure a systematic handover of services from administrative units such as Finance, HR etc. • CCCU to seek confirmation from CityU on interim arrangements until CCCU’s new campus is operational. • CCCU to ensure smooth transition from CityU awards to issuing CCCU/UOWCHK awards for cohorts from 2019. • CityU to work with CCCU to ensure appropriate study support services for staff and students during the transition period. • CityU to work with CCCU to provide staff development services to enhance pedagogy during the transition period.

Curriculum Design, Programme Development and Approval Processes		
A2	<p>The vocational nature of SD programmes is highly valued by the University and by employers, and is embedded through placements and internships. An Employers Guide has been created to ensure a quality experience. The personal development of the student is also valued and co-curricular activities are in place and financial support is available. A handbook for clinical placement is provided to students of Advanced Diploma in Veterinary Nursing that includes a broad range of practical advice on study skills, learning outcomes and assessment. The Panel acknowledges the thorough engagement of industry and professional specialists in the design and detail of programme delivery and affirms the QA measures that are attached to the clinical placements. [Audit Report para. 3.12]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCOPE to track feedback from stakeholders to ensure the effectiveness of the placement in enhancing students' employability. • CCCU and its Faculty of Social Sciences to have quality assurance measures validated by the relevant professional organisation for CCCU's Associate of Social Science in Social Work programme (the only programme in the College which has clinical placements in the curriculum).
Support for Teaching Quality including Pedagogical Development		
A3	<p>Peer observation of teaching is widely used in SCOPE and CCCU, and is perceived by most staff that the Panel met as a means of providing helpful feedback to staff to enhance teaching quality. The Panel reviewed a number of reports from SCOPE and CCCU, and found a variety of formats and review issues in the reports. Such variation is also observed in the reports for evaluating teachers of the same programme. The Panel commends the University for its approach to following-up cases of low TLQ scores and for monitoring the subsequent progress of staff. It also affirms the move towards developing targeted support options to address such cases. [Audit Report para. 5.10]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CityU to share with CCCU and SCOPE current University practices for peer review and follow-up on low TLQ score cases. • CCCU Academic Board to review whether the policy on new teaching staff members should have their teaching observed for the first two years of service should be extended to staff who have served CCCU for more than two years. • CCCU to review whether peer observation of teaching should be made mandatory for both experienced and new teachers.
Systems for Acting upon Quality Assurance Data to Make Ongoing Enhancements to Student Learning		
A4	<p>Each SDPU has a separate proforma for annual reporting. At the individual</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDPUs to first review the surveys and data collected. Then, to form a working group

	<p>level, programme leaders monitor student progress and tailor action when concerns are noted. The Head of each academic unit has responsibility for creating an appropriate learning and teaching environment and programme leaders and course leaders take operational responsibilities at programme and course level respectively. It is not clear how actions in response to individual student problems are reported or feed into overall programme enhancement. Trend data on student admission, enrolment and completion is supplemented with feedback data gathered in multiple surveys and through student and employer consultation. The Panel affirms the University’s commitment to ensure improved use of data collection and analysis through quarterly reporting and by working with data owners to develop learning analytics. [Audit Report para. 8.6]</p>	<p>comprising representatives from SDPUs for the review of surveys conducted at individual units and to formulate a data analysis, aggregation and integration plan to enhance teaching and learning practices.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CENG and SCOPE to make better use of the External Academic Advisors (EAAs) (or equivalent parties) to advise on programme enhancement suggestions. • CCCU to make better use of the External Professional Advisors to advise on programme enhancement suggestions.
<p>A5</p>	<p>Programme teams develop action plans in response to analysis of quality and trend data, emergent issues and subsequent actions. The action plans, along with a review of quality metrics are captured within the annual reporting template. Systematic quality enhancement is achieved through an expectation that programme leaders will monitor trends and reflect on issues of significance. The follow-up of identified quality issues is the responsibility of the Head of academic unit. External stakeholders and EAAs are able to input into the quality reporting processes thus contributing to programme enhancements. The Panel affirms the measures proposed by the University to strengthen the procedures for the follow-through of programme quality reports for the benefit of student</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDPUs to make better use of the EAAs (or equivalent parties) to advise on programme enhancement suggestions.

	learning experience. [Audit Report para. 8.7]	
--	---	--

Notes:

1. “A” stands for “Affirmation”; “R” stands for “Recommendation”.

Chapter 2 Progress on Recommendations

Recommendation 1

While each of the three SDPUs reports ultimately to the Senate, there is no evidence that all three reports are deliberated by the same institutional body. Though this does not pose an immediate risk to the academic quality or standards of any of the SDPUs, and does not imply that the systems in place for quality and standards are in any way deficient, it does mean that the University is missing opportunities for comparative analysis and sharing of experience and good practice. While recognising that this will become less important as CityU streamlines its SD provision, the University is recommended to establish a process to ensure that the quality and standards of each of the SDPUs is considered on, at least, an annual basis, by the same institutional body. [Audit Report para. 2.11]

Ensure that the quality and standards of SDPUs' programmes are considered by the same institutional body

R1.1 CCCU and SCOPE submit annual quality assurance reports to the QAC for consideration to ensure that proper quality assurance mechanisms are in place in the College/School. The respective College/School representatives serving on the QAC present their reports at the QAC meeting. CENG reports on the AD programmes together with the degree programmes via the College's *Annual Summary Reports on Associate and Undergraduate Degree Programmes*. To ensure that sub-degree programmes receive similar coverage and attention at institutional level, starting from the 2018/19 reporting exercise (i.e. 2019/20), the two CENG academic units in CityU that offer the sub-degree programmes (namely Department of Architecture and Civil Engineering and Division of Building Science and Technology) are requested to add a separate one-page executive summary to the annual programme reports for CENG's review. This one-page executive summary (Appendix 1) together with the annual programme reports of individual programmes will first be considered by the CENG. The CENG will then prepare a separate *College Annual Summary Report on Associate and Undergraduate Degree Programmes* for the QAC's reference. The QAC considered the executive summary at its May 2020 meeting; and resolved that the CENG had satisfactorily discharged its duties in relation to quality assurance for its associate degree programmes.

Enhance transparencies and sharing of good practices

R1.2 Following the arrangement adopted by CCCU and SCOPE, a CENG representative with thorough knowledge of the AD programmes was invited to give a presentation at the QAC on the one-page executive summary, starting with the 2018/19 reporting exercise. This arrangement aims to enhance transparency and to share good practices at institutional level. The good practices identified from the AD programmes are also posted on the QAC website for a wider CityU community's reference. The latest CCCU and SCOPE reports were deliberated by the QAC in February 2020. CCCU will continue to submit its quality assurance report to the QAC until all sub-degree students who receive the CityU award have graduated. The last CityU-award receiving CCCU cohort is expected to graduate by summer 2020.

More effective tracking and analysis of PILO change purposes

R1.3 The QA team in the Office of the Provost has been working closely with the Academic Regulations and Records Office (ARRO) on creating the Online Catalogue

Management System. This system aims to enhance the current approach, which is largely manual, in managing the curriculum requirements of programmes and course syllabi. Through this new system, academic units will be able to access, create and modify the programme/course documents (namely the curriculum information record and course syllabi) in a more streamlined manner in terms of i) content management functionalities (e.g. validation and change tracking); ii) electronic workflows for gathering inputs from stakeholders and approval seeking; iii) platforms for publishing the latest programme/course related documents; and iv) provisions for archiving approved versions of the said documents. Furthermore, it is planned that academic units can also capture changes and their impact of programme-course mapping. With the data so obtained, academic units can conduct further analyses concerning the programme/course impact on graduate outcomes.

- R1.4 The system scope is extensive. The system initially covers *course-level* documents. Upon successful implementation, the system will then be extended to include also *programme-level* documents. The Working Group for the New Catalogue Management System was formed in late November 2018, with representatives from ARRO, Enterprise Solutions Office, QAC, Chow Yei Ching School of Graduate Studies, and general offices of some academic units. Having reviewed the solutions provided by potential vendors, the Working Group submitted its recommendation to the University in July 2019.
- R1.5 The Covid-19 pandemic, coupled with the social unrest in the second half of 2019, slowed down the project progress at the administration and procurement junctures. Quotation assessment with justifications of accepting the offer from the designated service provider was eventually submitted in April 2020. Upon receiving the University's approval, the catalogue management system at course level is targeted to be implemented in October 2021. After the launch of the course-level catalogue management system, the University will explore the adoption at programme level.

Recommendation 2

The Panel noted the high degree of attention and investment by the University in programme design and approval, and accreditation and re-validation. However, although there is clarity around the approval of minor and major programme changes and the various associated roles and responsibilities, a lighter touch is generally employed through annual monitoring, that may result in incremental change of PILOs. This could be mitigated at SCOPE where triennial periodic programme reviews complement annual reporting procedures. Notwithstanding this, the University is recommended to consider how oversight of programme monitoring could most effectively guard against the possibility of progressive changes to the intended programme learning outcomes. [Audit Report para. 3.10]

Ensure that PILO changes are properly reported

- R2.1 Starting from the 2018/19 reporting exercise, the two CENG academic units which offer AD programmes are also required to report PILO changes in their annual programme reports in addition to following the prevailing arrangements for College/School Board approval of change requests. This arrangement will better capture any changes made to the PILOs. An overview of the PILO changes is also required in the College/School

summary of annual programme reports to be submitted to the QAC by CENG. No PILO changes were reported for 2018/19.

- R2.2 The Academic Board of CCCU and SCOPE continue to submit their annual quality assurance report to the QAC (CCCU until end of the 2019/20 academic year). The CCCU report captures PILOs resulting from internal revalidation and re-accreditation by Hong Kong Council for Accreditation of Academic and Vocational Qualifications (HKCAAVQ) (Appendix 2). The SCOPE annual report also records approved changes to programmes, including changes in PILOs, in the School's annual quality assurance report for submission to the QAC. There were no PILO changes in 2018/19.

More effective tracking and analysis of PILO change purposes

- R2.3 CityU is in the process of creating the Online Catalogue Management System to track PILO changes more effectively to facilitate more in-depth analysis. Details are covered in R1.3 to R1.5 above.

More effective monitoring of teaching and learning effectiveness using PILOs summary

- R2.4 In its meeting in March 2020, the CCCU Validation and Monitoring Committee conducted a thorough examination of the outcomes of PILO assessments in annual programme reports. The exercise covered all CCCU programmes developed in 2017/18, a total of 33 AD programmes. Direct (course-embedded assessment and/or capstone project) and indirect (students' perception of the extent that they have attained the PILOs) evidence was examined. The findings confirm that most (26 out of 33) programmes are generally able to meet their stated PILOs. Seven programmes were found to have their PILOs partially achieved. The CCCU Validation and Monitoring Committee concludes that there is a need to raise students' awareness of the PILOs and the contribution of individual courses and the respective CILOs to the PILOs. Students' lack of awareness is believed to be the major reason for the perception of a relatively low level of the PILOs achievement. Programme teams of the seven programmes have been invited to re-examine the curricula as well as the teaching and learning activities with a view to strengthening the achievement and raising awareness thereof. The analysis report¹ was submitted to QAC in May 2020 for information via the CCCU Academic Board.

Recommendation 3

The University is encouraged to consider ways in which the annual QA reports from the SDPUs could be brought together to facilitate the sharing of good practice and the monitoring of provision across the range of different programmes. While there is evidence of the use of e-pedagogies, there is scope for the wider use of innovative teaching methods across the SDPUs. The Panel also recommends more comprehensive and systematic coordination in the collection of student data including various surveys of student opinions on their learning experience and expectations. Such data could be analysed, aggregated and integrated more effectively to enhance teaching and learning practices. [Audit Report para. 4.9]

¹ Document to be submitted separately to the Quality Assurance Council for reference.

Facilitate the sharing of good practices on annual basis among SDPUs

- R3.1 In the CENG *Annual Summary Reports on Associate and Undergraduate Degree Programmes* and CCCU annual report to the QAC, apart from a critical evaluation of the programmes under the reporting year, it is the usual practice of these two units to include a section on good practices. Starting from the 2018/19 reporting exercise, apart from posting the good practices of CENG's AD programmes online, the QAC has also extracted the relevant sections from CCCU's annual report for online sharing (Appendix 3).
- R3.2 Before the submission of the annual quality assurance report to the QAC, SCOPE's Sub-committee on Programme Monitoring and Review discusses the good practices identified from individual programmes. Selected good practices are disseminated to all staff via intranet. Starting from the 2019/20 reporting exercise, SCOPE will add a new section on good practices in its annual quality assurance report for submission to the QAC. Following the prevailing practice, QAC will extract the relevant section to be posted on the QAC website for CityU community reference. With SCOPE's input added, there will be a comprehensive section on good practices of all SDPUs on the QAC site.

More effective analysis of student data to enhance teaching and learning

- R3.3 CCCU academic units conduct two major types of surveys, including the Teaching and Learning Questionnaire (TLQ) for individual course sections (course-level) and a graduate survey (programme/college-level) regarding post-graduation further study and employment situations. A summary of the findings of the two surveys and their implications for improvement actions are presented in the annual programme reports or annual faculty reports. Drawing from these reports, CCCU presents an overall picture of all programmes in its annual quality assurance report to the QAC. The surveys conducted by CCCU are considered sufficient and fit-for-purpose so far. Since the last cohort of CCCU students who will receive the CityU award will be graduating by summer 2020, CCCU has been excluded from further reviews of survey data use.
- R3.4 The two CENG academic units that offer AD programmes conduct the TLQ at course level, similar to CityU UGC-funded degree programmes. During the course of study, students will also be invited to complete the Student Learning Experience Survey so that the University can gain a better understanding of their learning experience. The collected information has been used to develop plans for continuous improvement and enriching the quality of student learning. After graduation, AD students will be invited to complete the Graduate Employment Survey. Information collected includes employment status and profile, level and destination of further studies, and students' experience and satisfaction with the University.
- R3.5 SCOPE, like CCCU and CityU, conducts course-level and programme-level surveys. The Advanced Diploma programmes use the same TLQ format as CityU and CCCU. As of 2019/20 Semester A, the QA Team of the Office of the Provost, which administers the University's TLQs, extends its support to SCOPE's TLQ as well. SCOPE now follows CityU's TLQ cycle and makes use of the same platform as CityU proper and CCCU for TLQ distribution, evaluation and report generation, thereby enhancing University-wide procedure integration.

- R3.6 Apart from standardising the TLQ operations, SCOPE has taken a further step to review its graduate survey policies and the survey instrument. SCOPE is using a standard questionnaire, plus allowing programme teams the flexibility to customise one question in the questionnaire. SCOPE considers it necessary to further standardise the surveys to facilitate a meaningful data analysis. SCOPE is hence in the process of developing a system to capture all survey results for producing various requested reports. The School's Academic Service Unit will also convene a Graduate Survey Task Force, bringing together members from School management, the Student Development Unit, plus marketing and quality assurance teams, to review and update the existing graduate survey instruments and draft policy. The School will set up an activity life cycle, and also review how data will be analysed and used. The exercise is expected to be completed by the 2020/21 academic year.
- R3.7 CityU has invited its Statistical Consulting Unit in the Department of Management Science to review the findings and formulate a follow-up plan on how to improve survey data use. The target completion date will be the end of the 2020/21 academic year.

Recommendation 4

Professional development opportunities are independently offered to teaching staff of the three SDPUs. The Panel found evidence that staff members have made use of the funding to join activities that keep them updated about their respective fields of interest, but the levels of participation in teaching-related professional development activities vary across the different SDPUs and are generally very low. CityU is recommended to develop the role of the Quality Assurance Committee in the planning of professional development activities across the SDPUs and to consolidate the role of EDGE in leveraging opportunities at programme and SDPU level to produce synergy. It is also encouraged to seek ways of ensuring that more teaching staff from the SDPUs participate in the courses that it offers. [Audit Report para. 5.7]

Develop an overarching staff development framework

- R4.1 The Office of the Provost in collaboration with the EDGE formulated *Guidelines on Staff Development for Academic Staff*², which were approved by the QAC in May 2019 for implementation starting 2019/20. The *Guidelines* document was informed by local and overseas benchmarking. It aims to set foundational standards for assuring and enhancing the quality of the academic staff (covering both faculty and teaching staff), new and existing at different levels. The document serves as a supplement to the existing staff development policy with specific focus on staff training. To ensure that the *Guidelines* are made easily accessible, EDGE has posted them on the staff development webpage; a respective link was also included in the CityU Quality Manual.
- R4.2 The *Guidelines* document was also shared with the Director of SCOPE and the Vice President (Academic) of CCCU for dissemination to their teaching staff so as to raise awareness and encourage participation in staff development activities.

² Document to be submitted separately to the Quality Assurance Council for reference.

Strengthen support for SDPUs

- R4.3 To better address academic staff's development needs, EDGE invited SDPU officers in charge of staff development matters to a meeting in August 2019. The purpose of the meeting was to learn about not-yet-addressed staff development topics of interest from SDPUs. In response to the collected feedback, a number of new half-day and full-day workshops were introduced starting September 2019. They included *staff development support provided by EDGE, online resources available to new colleagues, sharing by Teaching Excellence Awards winners or winners of College level teaching awards, workshops on use of new approaches for teaching and other classroom skills and briefing for Teaching Development / Startup Grants*.
- R.4.4 EDGE took an additional step in January 2020 to conduct an online needs analysis for individual SDPUs. Around 100 responses were received. From among them, the top 10 staff development needs were identified. Based on this needs analysis, EDGE launched three new modules in 2019/20, on *Active Learning & Interactive Teaching, Acquiring and Using Students' Feedback* and *Teaching Critical Thinking*. Eight of the top 10 needs are now covered by EDGE's Expert Educators Seminar Series and Online Staff Development Modules; the other two are covered by other units. EDGE will provide more details on the effectiveness of its staff development initiatives in the form of an annual report to the QAC. The first report covering 2019/20 will be submitted for the QAC's consideration by October 2020.
- R.4.5 To help SDPUs keep track of academic colleagues' participation in staff development activities, EDGE will send annual reports to the SDPUs presenting i) the number of development module completions or completions with honours by units' faculty/teaching staff; and ii) the participation of members in other staff development events. The information will serve as planning input for SDPUs' future staff development activities. According to EDGE's report, a total of 8, 47, and 21 SDPU colleagues joined EDGE's Expert Educators Seminar Series, Online Staff Development Modules, and Face-to-Face Staff Development Seminars respectively in 2019/20. Also, to prepare for teaching online during the Covid-19 pandemic, 59 SDPU colleagues participated in the Zoom Face-to-Face Training Seminars held in the early of February 2020.
- R.4.6 The latest online staff development modules offered by EDGE can be found at <https://www.cityu.edu.hk/edge/staffdev/>.

Encourage more staff to participate in professional development programmes

- R4.7 The *Guidelines on Staff Development for Academic Staff* invites academic unit Heads and Deans to recognise academic staff who have completed a minimum set of teaching and learning activities, for example, recognition in the annual performance-based-pay-review exercise.
- R4.8 SCOPE has also proactively encouraged its academic colleagues (both full-time and part-time) to enhance their domain knowledge and pedagogical level. Staff development activities organised by SCOPE, CityU's EDGE and other departments from CityU or external organisations such as HKCAAVQ, Federation for Self-financing Tertiary Education, the Education Bureau are posted onto the Part Time Lecturers Corner (www.scope.edu/ptlcorner) which is an online portal for part-time lecturers.

R4.9 Apart from the established practice of holding an orientation each September to welcome all current and new teaching staff to network with the fellow teaching and administrative staff of SCOPE, an EDGE representative (senior education development coordinator) is now invited to introduce staff development activities and online staff development modules offered by EDGE. During 2018/19, SCOPE organised a number of staff development seminars. SCOPE specifically requested EDGE to offer a seminar on the *ABCs of OBTL* (November 2019) for SCOPE staff. Other EDGE seminars which SCOPE academic staff attended included *Lecturing Made Easy as Planning, Implementing, and Evaluating (P.I.E.)* and *How Augmented Reality (AR)/Virtual Reality (VR) is Going to Change Teaching and Learning*. According to the feedback received, participants found the seminars useful in enhancing their teaching skills and equipping themselves with the updated technology applied in teaching, for example, in fire engineering and construction management.

Recommendation 5

The grading system in the performance appraisal of CCCU comprises four levels ranging from exceeding required standards to failing to meet required standards. The standards are developed and agreed within Divisions prior to the appraisal cycle. CCCU is recommended to ensure that all staff are familiar with the assessment criteria and assessment rubrics for staff performance appraisal and ensure that they are fully aware of the expectations for professional standards of teaching and of the impact their performance may have on their remuneration. [Audit Report para. 5.13]

Ensure a fair and rigorous grading system for staff appraisal

R5.1 To ensure a fair and rigorous grading system, CCCU conducted a review of its performance appraisal forms. In the review, CCCU revisited the assessment domains and developed rubrics to gauge performance levels. The revised appraisal scheme will focus on four domains: i) teaching and learning, ii) research activities (for staff on professorial scale), iii) contributions to the College, academic and professional bodies, and the community, and iv) professional development. There are clear rubrics linked with each domain. The revised scheme underwent broad consultation with staff (in a briefing session in November 2019 and in the College Staff Consultative Committee in January 2020) and received full support from the staff and Deans. The College Management Committee discussed and approved the revised performance appraisal forms and rubrics in principle at its May 2020 meeting yet also determined that some additional improvements could still be made. A final version was thus developed, and the College Staff Consultative Committee members indicated their support by circulation in June 2020. The College Management Committee approved the revised forms and rubrics³ for implementation with effect from 2020/21 in its August 2020 meeting.

Recommendation 6

Regulations for managing complaints and appeals against the outcomes of assessment are in place, although not always well recognised by students. Most issues are dealt with informally by teaching staff and programme leaders. Arrangements for referral of cases to a more formal procedure are not widely known. Although students of CCCU and

³ Document to be submitted separately to the Quality Assurance Council for reference.

SCOPE are not covered by the CityU Student Complaint Procedures, the two SDPUs have their own separate procedures. The Panel recommends the University to consider its policy for student complaints and appeals to make sure that all students are fully aware of the existing arrangements and to confirm equity of treatment for students, regardless of their programme of study. The University should also collect and analyse information about complaints and appeals to report to SDPU Boards and Quality Assurance Committee. [Audit Report para. 6.8]

Ensure better communications with students

- R6.1 All CCCU programme handbooks will continue the current practice to include a section on student complaints and appeal procedures (Appendix 4). To ensure that students are fully aware of the relevant information, programme teams included “student complaints and appeal procedures” as one of the information items to be shared with students, starting with the 2019 student orientation. The programme teams will maintain this practice in future student orientations.
- R6.2 SCOPE has also strengthened its communication with students on complaints and appeal procedures. Starting 2019/20, SCOPE programme teams were reminded by its Academic Service Unit to upload relevant regulations on complaints and appeals against the outcomes of assessment to Canvas for students’ reference.

Ensure equity of treatment for all students

- R6.3 To ensure students from different SDPUs are treated equally in terms of academic review matters, CityU proposed a review of SDPUs’ existing policies. CENG adopts CityU proper’s academic regulations for AD programmes, which apply to both degree and taught postgraduate programmes. For CCCU, the last cohort of students receiving the CityU award will graduate by 2019/20. Both CityU and CCCU therefore consider that any further review will not be meaningful and beneficial. The focus of the review hence covers only SCOPE.
- R6.4 SCOPE’s QA Team together with the Academic Services Unit in consultation with the Associate Director, re-examined the School’s academic review policy from April to June 2019 in order to ascertain its consistency with CityU’s regulations, and to check the practices of programmes and dissemination channels. Focus group meetings with selected programme teams and programme leaders were then held to collect inputs on implementation of the academic regulations. The review confirms that i) SCOPE’s academic review regulations are aligned with those of CityU; and ii) students are informed of the regulations from student handbooks and/or Canvas. Given that no major discrepancies were identified, CityU considered forming a Working Group to review the respective SDPU academic regulations not necessary.
- R6.5 SCOPE’s review, nonetheless, suggests that further improvement could be made in terms of workflow enhancement (e.g. increase transparency) during the implementation of the academic review regulations. In this connection, operation guidelines⁴ and FAQs in relation to the regulations were developed and then disseminated to staff in a briefing as well as on SCOPE’s intranet.

⁴ Document to be submitted separately to the Quality Assurance Council for reference.

Standardise practices

R6.6 The QAC annually collects details from Grade Review Committees, the Academic Review Committee and the Provost, concerning reviews/appeals against course grades and decisions of College/School Grade Review Committees and Examination Boards of the University. Starting from the 2018/19 reporting exercise, both CCCU and SCOPE were required to submit similar details to the QAC. No cases were reported. This reflects the robust and stringent assessment procedures adopted by the SDPUs. Similar analysis will be continued on annual basis.

Recommendation 7

The University encourages student participation in co-curricular activities, although the numbers involved are not as high as might be expected. Financial sponsorship is available to both UGC-funded and self-financed AD students. The Panel found evidence in different annual reports in each SDPU that supports the effective monitoring and improvement of co-curricular activities and internships, including evaluation reports and self-improvement and reflection sheets. The Panel recommends that the University give further encouragement to students to participate in co-curricular activities and keep a comprehensive record of all student involvement. [Audit Report para. 7.8]

Ensure more student participation in co-curricular activities

R7.1 CCCU continues to fund college-level student activities (e.g. Study Abroad Scheme, Student Ambassador Scheme, summer internship, Career Advisory Resources and Training Services). Moreover, financial support is available for programme teams to organise a variety of activities for students (e.g., student gatherings, local visits, overseas study tours). The high number of student participation (Appendix 5) indicates that CCCU has been effective in motivating students to take part in co-curricular activities which enhance their learning experience.

R7.2 To encourage students to participate in the School's co-curricular activities, the SCOPE Associate Director who is in charge of the Students Development Unit and English Enhancement Programme conducted three student focus group meetings (with three Advanced Diploma programmes) from May to June 2019. The meetings allowed the School to understand student development needs and to explore ways of enhancing their participation in co-curricular activities. Students were interviewed on their awareness of student support provisions in SCOPE, their previous participation in development activities, and additional activities students would desire. The feedback is summarised in Appendix 6. In response, several measures have already been put in place. Firstly, the School will now alert programme leaders in advance of the student activities. Programme leaders will then remind students and encourage them to join. In addition, the School intends to schedule some activities on Saturdays for more timetabling flexibility. Notwithstanding the Covid-19 outbreak, the School strived to hold the activities, however, via online platform. As of July 2020, 90 Advanced Diploma students have taken English Enhancement Programme courses, 14 have participated in Career Support events, and 4 have joined Student Development Unit activities. SCOPE keeps a precise record of student participation rates and will continue to collect views from Advanced Diploma students via student focus groups and programme leaders.

Ensure a comprehensive record of all student involvement

R7.3 CityU developed and refined a Central Repository on Student Development Activities (CRESDA) over a period of four years, as a mobile-friendly, online, central repository

of undergraduate student development activities. The system helps the University to review students' soft-skills development and ensure the Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) of student development activities are aligned with the CityU Ideal Graduate Outcomes (IGOs). For staff, CRESDA helps to record activities organised by individual units, lists the ILOs of the activities and their alignment with the IGOs, and documents the nature of the activities organised by individual units to identify service gaps. For students, CRESDA captures and categorises their soft-skills development activities and outcomes neatly and systematically in one online portfolio. With the summaries of students' on-going achievements generated by CRESDA, students can easily track their out-of-class activities and the various skills they developed, honed and deployed. The system also helps students to identify attributes and skills they need to further develop, in order to assist them in finding the right kind of student development activities and programmes to register, with the directed outcomes that match their needs to fulfil the IGOs. Given the scale of SCOPE, CRESDA may not be a direct fit for SCOPE. However, the experience accumulated in connection with the CRESDA development may be useful for SCOPE to acquire its own system.

Chapter 3 Progress on Affirmations

Affirmation 1

The Panel looked closely at the plans for the transition of CCCU to the UoW and received assurances that the process was being handled with due regard to the interests of students, staff and key stakeholders. The Panel affirms the steps that have been taken by both institutions to ensure an effective handover of responsibilities. [Audit Report para. 1.10]

Ensure a smooth and successful transition

A1.1 The CCCU Academic Board prepared the *Report on the Transition Process from Community College of City University*⁵, which details the progress of various transition activities. CCCU reports that all transition activities have been progressing well, except the delay in the construction of the Tai Wai new campus. To minimise the potential negative impact on student learning experience, CityU and CCCU arrived at the understanding that CityU will fill the accommodation gap by continuing to provide CCCU with *student learning space* for an extended time (until the 2020/21 academic year). The Report was considered by the QAC and then submitted to the Senate for information on 12 November 2019 via the Academic Policy Committee.

A1.2 CCCU successfully registered as an independent CAP320 post-secondary institution on 2 July 2019⁶. CCCU can now confer its own degree and sub-degree awards. Starting with the 2019 cohort, all SD students enrolled at CCCU will graduate with a CCCU/UOWCHK award (and will not receive a CityU award anymore).

Provide same level of service to staff and students

A1.3 The Co-Operation Deed executed between CityU, CCCU and UOW dated 26 November 2014 sets out the arrangements between the parties for CityU's continued support of CCCU while the College is associated with CityU. The Co-Operation Deed specifies the categories of support facilities and support services to be provided by CityU (including the Run Run Shaw library, information technology support, and student records). EDGE services also continue to be available to CCCU staff. CCCU has been actively taking up relevant services to prepare for the complete exit from CityU.

Affirmation 2

The vocational nature of SD programmes is highly valued by the University and by employers, and is embedded through placements and internships. An Employers Guide has been created to ensure a quality experience. The personal development of the student is also valued and co-curricular activities are in place and financial support is available. A handbook for clinical placement is provided to students of Advanced Diploma in Veterinary Nursing that includes a broad range of practical advice on study skills, learning outcomes and assessment. The Panel acknowledges the thorough engagement of industry and professional specialists in the design and detail of programme delivery and affirms the QA measures that are attached to the clinical placements. [Audit Report para. 3.12]

⁵ Document to be submitted separately to the Quality Assurance Council for reference.

⁶ <https://www.cspe.edu.hk/en/institution-details.page?instId=CIU/02>

Strengthen employability potential of graduates

A2.1 SCOPE continues the existing practice of requiring programmes with placement to capture feedback from stakeholders and report it in the Annual Programme Reports. Currently, only one SCOPE SD programme (i.e. Advanced Diploma in Veterinary Nursing) provides placement arrangement. Feedback from stakeholders such as students, host companies, host mentors, course tutor, on placement is reported in the Annual Programme Report (Appendix 7).

Incorporate quality measures into programmes with placements

A2.2 One of the indicators of programme quality is accreditation by relevant recognised professional bodies. CCCU received the final reports on Qualification Recognition Assessment⁷ on the Associate of Social Science in Social Work (Full-time and Part-time) and the approval from the Social Workers Registration Board (SWRB) of the qualification for three academic years from 2019/20 to 2021/22 provided that the College fulfils the two conditions listed in the Report. They are: i) adding a part-time cohort after being recognized by the SWRB; and ii) adjusting the arrangements of elective courses for the full-time mode. These proposed changes, subsequently approved by the CCCU Academic Board, aim to ensure that students have achieved the standards expected by the professional body for a PASS in clinical placements.

Affirmation 3

Peer observation of teaching is widely used in SCOPE and CCCU, and is perceived by most staff that the Panel met as a means of providing helpful feedback to staff to enhance teaching quality. The Panel reviewed a number of reports from SCOPE and CCCU, and found a variety of formats and review issues in the reports. Such variation is also observed in the reports for evaluating teachers of the same programme. The Panel commends the University for its approach to following-up cases of low TLQ scores and for monitoring the subsequent progress of staff. It also affirms the move towards developing targeted support options to address such cases. [Audit Report para. 5.10]

Strengthen teaching support, especially for staff with less satisfactory teaching performance

A3.1 CityU shared with CCCU and SCOPE the current university practice of identifying teachers with relatively low TLQ scores and ways to handle such cases. Furthermore, the guidelines on peer observation were also shared with CCCU and SCOPE.

A3.2 CCCU developed the *Guidelines on Follow-up Actions on Teaching Feedback Information Obtained for Teaching Enhancement*⁸, which explicitly stipulate follow-up actions. The guidelines aim to i) ensure that students' feedback on learning experience and staff teaching is collected and used effectively for improving teaching and learning; and ii) set out a framework for record-keeping of actions taken for quality assurance purposes. The eligible users as well as the responsibility of different stakeholders are clearly detailed. The guidelines were considered by the CCCU Quality Assurance Committee in June 2019 and approved by the Academic Board in September 2019 for immediate implementation. The guidelines and their effectiveness will be reviewed in March 2025.

⁷ Document to be submitted separately to the Quality Assurance Council for reference.

⁸ Document to be submitted separately to the Quality Assurance Council for reference.

A3.3 It was originally planned that EDGE would run peer review workshops and provide additional support to colleagues from SDPUs interested in enhancing their skills in these areas. Due to suspension of face-to-face teaching towards the end of Semester A to Semester B 2019/20, and priority being given to the support of online teaching, planning and execution of peer-review workshops has to be delayed until the 2020/21 academic year when SDPUs colleagues can again participate in the said workshops. The new target completion date for this initiative is now June 2021.

Enhance teaching quality and strengthen staff support through peer review

A3.4 In response to the Audit Panel's comments, CCCU conducted a review of its policy on peer observation of teaching. The College updated its guidelines⁹ by expanding the scope to cover also experienced teaching staff. Under the new guidelines, academic staff who serve the College for more than two years will have their teaching observed at least once every three years. The guidelines provide details about the role of the reviewers, the process, documentation as well as follow-up actions to be taken. The CCCU Quality Assurance Committee considered the guidelines in June 2019 and the Academic Board approved them in September 2019. The guidelines have already taken effect from 2019/20 onwards. The next review will be conducted in March 2025.

Strengthen support for staff with low TLQ scores

A3.5 CCCU developed a report template for supervisors' use when meeting with staff receiving relatively low TLQ scores. The supervisors are required to record the issues discussed, actions to be taken and expected completion dates. The template (sample in Appendix 8) was approved by CCCU Quality Assurance Committee in June 2019 for implementation with effect from the 2019/20 academic year.

A3.6 In SCOPE, all TLQ scores are monitored and reviewed by the Director and Associate Director. For staff with less satisfactory scores, the Academic Service Unit will remind the Associate Director to pay extra attention and take follow-up actions. Records of low TLQ score cases are kept by the Academic Service Unit. A report template and an example of follow-up actions taken for staff with relatively low TLQ score can be found in Appendix 9.

Affirmation 4

Each SDPU has a separate proforma for annual reporting. At the individual level, programme leaders monitor student progress and tailor action when concerns are noted. The Head of each academic unit has responsibility for creating an appropriate learning and teaching environment and programme leaders and course leaders take operational responsibilities at programme and course level respectively. It is not clear how actions in response to individual student problems are reported or feed into overall programme enhancement. Trend data on student admission, enrolment and completion is supplemented with feedback data gathered in multiple surveys and through student and employer consultation. The Panel affirms the University's commitment to ensure improved use of data collection and analysis through quarterly reporting and by working with data owners to develop learning analytics. [Audit Report para. 8.6]

⁹ Document to be submitted separately to the Quality Assurance Council for reference.

More effective use of feedback collected to better inform teaching and learning

A4.1 With reference to the efforts the SDPUs taken and the plan for analysing survey data to better inform teaching need learning, please refer to R3.3 to R3.7 for more details.

Make better use of the EAAs (or equivalent parties) to advise on programme enhancement suggestions

A4.2 Given the importance of external benchmarking, all SDPUs have been actively engaging their EAAs (or equivalent parties) to advise them on how to improve programmes. Some key comments made by the EAAs concerning CENG AD programmes and follow-up by respective academic units are summarised in Appendix 10.

A4.3 The EAA reports of SCOPE continuing education programmes are reviewed by the relevant Section Leaders or academic coordinator to ensure that the EAAs' advice is followed up properly. The Academic Services Unit compiled the *Guidelines on Handling EAA Reports and Report Proforma* (Appendix 11) in October 2019. The *Guidelines* document provides an overview of the role and responsibilities of the EAAs and the procedure to engage an EAA. A report template for the EAA's use has already been drawn up to facilitate report preparation and structuring by EAAs. SCOPE's follow-up on EAA comments is summarized in Appendix 10.

Affirmation 5

Programme teams develop action plans in response to analysis of quality and trend data, emergent issues and subsequent actions. The action plans, along with a review of quality metrics are captured within the annual reporting template. Systematic quality enhancement is achieved through an expectation that programme leaders will monitor trends and reflect on issues of significance. The follow-up of identified quality issues is the responsibility of the Head of academic unit. External stakeholders and EAAs are able to input into the quality reporting processes thus contributing to programme enhancements. The Panel affirms the measures proposed by the University to strengthen the procedures for the follow-through of programme quality reports for the benefit of student learning experience. [Audit Report para. 8.7]

More effective use of feedback collected to better inform teaching and learning

A5.1 The engagement of EAAs is one of the major quality assurance mechanisms adopted by CCCU. To ensure that comments from the EAAs are properly recorded and followed up, CCCU modified their EAA annual report template (Appendix 12). Starting from the 2018/19 reporting year, a new section was added (Section E3) so that the EAAs' advice on programme enhancement needs is added for the programme teams' attention. CCCU's follow-up on EAA comments is summarized in Appendix 10.

Glossary of Abbreviations

AD	Associate Degree
ARRO	Academic Regulations and Records Office
CCCU	Community College of City University
CENG*	College of Engineering
CityU	City University of Hong Kong
DEC	Discovery-enriched Curriculum
EAA	External Academic Advisor
EDGE	Office of Education Development and Gateway Education
PILO	Programme Intended Learning Outcome
PhD	Doctor of Philosophy
QA	Quality Assurance
QAC	Quality Assurance Committee of City University of Hong Kong
SCOPE	School of Continuing and Professional Education
SD	Sub-degree
SDPU	Sub-degree Providing Unit
TLQ	Teaching & Learning Questionnaire
UGC	University Grants Committee
UOW	University of Wollongong
UOWCHK	UOW College Hong Kong

* The College of Science and Engineering was split into the College of Science and the College of Engineering effective 1 January 2019. The two academic units offering UGC-funded sub-degree programmes operate now under the College of Engineering.

List of Appendices

- Appendix 1** One-page Executive Summary from CENG on AD Programmes
- Appendix 2** Extract from Annual Report of the Community College of City University (CCCU) Academic Board on Associate Degree Programmes 2018/19 to QAC - PILO Changes
- Appendix 3** QAC Website on Sharing of Good Practices for Sub-degree Programmes
- Appendix 4** Extract from CCCU Programme Handbook of Associate of Business in Finance Services 2019/20 – Review of Course Grades and Appeal Procedures
- Appendix 5** Student Participation in CCCU Co-curricular Activities
- Appendix 6** Highlights on Feedback Collected from SCOPE Focused Group Meetings on Student Development Unit (SDU) Activities and English Enhancement Programme (EEP)
- Appendix 7** Extract from SCOPE’s Advanced Diploma in Veterinary Nursing Annual Programme Report - Placement-related Analysis
- Appendix 8** CCCU Sample of Supervision Record with a Staff (Relatively Low TLQ Score Case and Follow-up Actions)
- Appendix 9** SCOPE Template for Relatively Low TLQ Score Case and Follow-up Actions
- Appendix 10** Examples of SDPUs Follow through of EAAs’ Suggestions on Programme Enhancement
- Appendix 11** SCOPE Guidelines for EAA (CE Programmes) and EAA Report Proforma
- Appendix 12** CCCU EAA Annual Report Template

Appendix 1 One-page Executive Summary from CENG on AD Programmes

College of Engineering Summary Report of Annual Programme Review (Associate Degree Programmes), 2018-19

Overview

1. In 2018-19, the College of Engineering continued to offer 4 associate degree programmes:

Programme Title	Offering Academic Unit
ASc Architectural Studies	ACE
ASc Building Services Engineering	BST
ASc Construction Engineering & Management	BST
ASc Surveying	BST

All 4 associate degree programmes have been in operation for many years and are well-established in the core aspects such as curriculum design, student support, and academic standard. As part of the quality assurance process, the offering academic units regularly review the curriculum and make changes to keep abreast of the academic development.

2. In addition to acquiring knowledge through classroom teaching, students of these programmes are provided with out-of-the-classroom learning experience, including internship, and study tours. Practitioners were also invited to give lectures and share their valuable industrial experience. In addition, site visits were organized to enable students to get a feel of the real working environment.

Significant Achievements

3. The 4 associate degree programmes are accredited by professional bodies:
- Graduates of **ASc Architectural Studies** may proceed to study the top-up degree BSc Architectural Studies offered by the same academic unit. **BSc Architectural Studies** was granted a Conditional Term of Accreditation of Part I (pre-professional) by the Hong Kong Institute of Architects (HKIA) and Architects Registration Board (ARB).
 - **ASc Building Services Engineering** is accredited by the Hong Kong Institution of Engineers (HKIE). Graduates of this programme are accepted as meeting the academic requirements for the Associate Membership of HKIE.
 - **ASc Construction Engineering & Management** is accredited by the HKIE and the Hong Kong Institute of Construction Managers (HKICM). Graduates of the programme are accepted as meeting the academic requirements for the Associate Membership of these two professional bodies.
 - **ASc Surveying** is accredited by The Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors (HKIS). Graduates of the programme can join its training scheme called *Assessment of Professional Competence* to become a professional surveyor bearing the title AMHKIS and/or MHKIS.

Key Issue

4. In order to support teaching and learning activities in the long run, ASc Architectural Studies programme would require more laboratory and studio space, as observed by the accrediting body HKIA.

Appendix 2 Extract from Annual Report of the Community College of City University (CCCU) Academic Board on Associate Degree Programmes 2018/19 to QAC - PILO Changes

Learning Programme Accreditation (LPA) and Learning Programme Re-accreditation (Re-LPA) Exercise 2019

14. In 2016, the College successfully obtained accreditation from the Hong Kong Council for Accreditation of Academic and Vocational Qualifications (HKCAAVQ) for 28 Associate Degree (AD) programmes and one Diploma programme. With the validity period expiring in August 2020, the College sought learning programme re-accreditation (re-LPA) for the programmes in 2019. Learning Programme Accreditation (LPA) was also sought for five AD programmes which did not go through LPA in 2016².
15. HKCAAVQ decided to organize a site visit to examine four not-yet-accredited programmes (Associate of Arts in Cultural Studies, Associate of Business Administration in International Business Administration, Associate of Science in Aviation and Pilot Studies, and Associate of Social Science in Legal Studies) while the other programmes were examined through a paper-based review. The LPA and Re-LPA panel, chaired by Professor Joan Cooper, an emeritus professor and higher education consultant from Australia, made a three-day visit to the College from 12 to 14 June 2019. During the visit, the Panel met with the senior management staff, academic staff members managing and delivering the programmes under review, the programmes' External Academic Advisors (EAAs) and External Professional Advisors (EPAs), as well as student and graduate representatives.
16. The College received the final report of the LPA and Re-LPA exercises from HKCAAVQ in August 2019. HKCAAVQ has determined that all programmes under review meet the stated objectives and relevant QF standards and can be offered as accredited/re-accredited programmes with a validity period of four years. The validity period is from 1 September 2020 to 31 August 2024 for all programmes.
17. The Panel made a recommendation regarding the PILOs of the Associate of Science in Airport Operations and Aviation Logistics (AOAL) and Associate of Science in Aviation and Pilot Studies (AVPS) programmes. The Panel also presented some observations and advice in the report for the College's consideration. The College will actively consider the advice to further improve its teaching and learning effectiveness and strengthen its quality assurance mechanisms.

2 The programmes include Associate of Arts in Cultural Studies, Associate of Business Administration in International Business Management, Associate of Science in Aviation and Pilot Studies, Associate of Social Science in Legal Studies, and Associate of Science.

3 The normal validity period for a two-year programme is three years. Because of the demonstrated quality of our programmes and the robustness of our QA system, a validity period of four years is given.

4 The Panel recommended relevant PILOs of the AOAL and AVSP programmes to cover elements of aviation safety/safety management to reflect more comprehensively such aspects covered in the programme curriculum.

Appendix 3 QAC Website on Sharing of Good Practices for Sub-degree Programmes



Quality Assurance Committee
Office of the Provost

Home Biography Our Team Academic Matters Senate Committees & University Reports Academic Personnel Guidelines & Reporting Systems Associated Offices

- Terms of Reference
- Constitution & Membership
- Meeting Schedule
- Members Area
- Information for Students
- Sharing of Good Practices
- Quality Audits
- Quality Assurance Policies and Guidelines
- Quality Audit Steering Group Members Area

2018-19 Summary of Annual Programme Reports/Annual Report – Good Practices

Undergraduate Programmes

- [College of Business](#)
- [College of Engineering](#)
- [College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences](#)
- [College of Science](#)
- [Jockey Club College of Veterinary Medicine and Life Sciences](#)
- [School of Creative Media](#)
- [School of Energy and Environment](#)
- [School of Law](#)

Associate Degree Programmes

- [College of Engineering](#)
- [Community College of City University \(CCCU\)](#)

Professional Doctorate and Taught Postgraduate Programmes

- [Chow Yei Ching School of Graduate Studies](#)

Appendix 4 Extract from CCCU Programme Handbook of Associate of Business in Finance Services 2019/20 - Review of Course Grades and Appeal Procedure

5. Teaching, Learning and Assessment

Review of Course Grades

Requests for review of course grades are governed by Academic Regulation.

Informal Resolution

- a. For review of course grades via informal resolution, the Course Examiner will only consider requests on grounds of administrative error in recording or calculating the mark or result, or other circumstances that impact the course grade awarded.
- b. A student should contact the Course Examiner within 5 working days of the announcement of grades by the College with a view to resolving the matter informally.
- c. If a revision to the student's course grade is considered necessary, the Course Examiner should make a recommendation to amend the grade and seek the endorsement of the Chair of the Assessment Panel. Any grades thus amended will be reported to the Assessment Panel at its next meeting.
- d. The decision on the informal review will be communicated to the student by the Course Examiner no later than 13 working days following the announcement of grades by the College.
- e. Other than disagreement with the academic judgement of Course Examiners which does not constitute valid grounds for formal review by virtue of AR11.7 (see website), if the student's concerns regarding course grades as stipulated in AR11.2 (see website) cannot be resolved by informal means, the student may seek resolution via the formal procedures outlined below. However, informal review is not a pre-requisite for the formal procedure.

Formal Procedures for Review

- a. Disagreement with the academic judgement of Course Examiners does not constitute a valid ground for formal review. For formal review of course grades, only requests with the following grounds will be considered:
 - there has been a procedural irregularity in the assessment process; for example, the assessment was not conducted in accordance with the Academic Regulations or with the arrangement prescribed for the course;
 - there exist circumstances that impact the course grade awarded that the student was unable to bring them to the attention of the Course Examiners prior to the assessment for valid reasons.
- b. Any request for review of course grades must be made in writing to the Associate Dean of the Faculty offering the course within 22 working days of the announcement of grades by the College. The written application must:
 - state the grounds on which the request for review is made;
 - include a description of the relevant facts; and
 - provide supporting evidence.
- c. Upon receipt of the formal request for review, the Associate Dean of Faculty will determine whether or not a prima facie case for review has been established. If, in the view of the Associate Dean of Faculty, there is no prima facie case, then the request

- will be dismissed and the decision conveyed to the student no later than 32 working days following the announcement of grades by the College. The decision of the Associate Dean of the Faculty to dismiss the request is final.
- d. If, in the view of the Associate Dean of Faculty, there is a prima facie case, then he/she will refer the matter to the Faculty Grade Review Committee for consideration. If the student does not show up for the interview, the Committee will consider the student's request for formal review of course grade on the basis of the information and documents provided by the student and other information available to the Committee. The Committee may interview the student and staff members concerned. The Committee will record its proceedings and resolutions.
 - e. If the Committee determines that the case is substantiated, the decision will be conveyed to the Assessment Panel to decide the action to be taken. The Assessment Panel will report back to the Faculty Grade Review Committee any decisions taken on cases referred via this procedure.
 - f. The decision on the formal review will be communicated in writing to the student by the Associate Dean of Faculty with a brief statement of the reasons for the decision. The decision should be conveyed to the student no later than 54 working days following the announcement of grades by the College.

Appeal Procedures

- a. Formal requests for review of course grades should normally be resolved at the faculty level. A student may only appeal against the decision of the Faculty Grade Review Committee on the basis of procedural irregularity in the review process within 10 working days following receipt of the decision on the formal review. A student may submit an appeal in writing to the Vice President (Academic). The appellant should clearly indicate the grounds for appeal, and provide evidence in support of the appeal. The Vice President (Academic) will determine whether or not a prima facie case for appeal has been established. If, in the view of the Vice President (Academic), there is no prima facie case, then the appeal will be dismissed and the decision conveyed to the student normally no later than 10 working days following receipt of the appeal. The decision of the Vice President (Academic) to dismiss an appeal is final.
- b. If, in the view of the Vice President (Academic), there is a prima facie case, he/she will refer the matter to the College Academic Review Committee for consideration.
- c. If the College Academic Review Committee determines that the case is substantiated, the decision will be conveyed to the Assessment Panel to decide the actions to be taken. The Assessment Panel will report back to the College Academic Review Committee any decisions taken on cases referred via this procedure.
- d. The College Academic Review Committee should record its proceedings and resolutions. The decision on the appeal will be conveyed to the student in writing normally no later than 27 working days following receipt of the appeal case by the Vice President (Academic) and is final.
- e. The College Grade Review Committee will submit a report of formal requests for review of course grades considered to the Academic Board annually. The College Academic Review Committee will submit an annual report to the Academic Board on all appeal cases received by the College Academic Review Committee.

Students are strongly advised to refer to the most up to date regulations on the College website at www.uowchk.edu.hk > Current Students > Rules and Regulations > Academic Regulations for Associate Degree Programmes.

Appendix 5 Student Participation in CCCU Co-curricular Activities

Number of Student-times Participation in CCCU Co-curricular Activities

Type of Activities	2017/18	2018/19
Internships, Fieldwork, and Industry-Linked Projects	2,200	1,900
Student Ambassador Scheme	41	41
Career Advisory, Resources and Training Services / Student Centre	762	989
Study Abroad Scheme	830	730
CCCU Quality Campus Life Fund	2,270	2,847
Total:	6,103	6,507

Appendix 6 Highlights on Feedback Collected from SCOPE Focused Group Meetings on Student Development Unit (SDU) Activities and English Enhancement Programme (EEP)

a. *Communication*

- To ensure student activity and EEP information reaching the AD students via Canvas messages and the Programme Leaders' connection.
- To publicize more extensively to the AD students of the SDU and EEP websites.

b. *SDU activities and English enhancement courses*

- The AD students are not interested in SCOPE-wide student activities. The demand on EEP courses is higher than the SDU activities. The ADFPM students are interested in workshops that can add value to their career. ADMS students only wish to improve the library facility provision for them. ADVN students are interested in the EEP courses if they are not in work placement. Hence the focus will be more on EEP.
- The EEP topics can include:
 - Oral presentation skills;
 - Job-related writing and listening skills.
- For course scheduling, it is suggested that:
 - September to November; January to March; June.
 - Evening classes (7-9 pm); Saturday morning

Appendix 7 Extract from SCOPE’s Advanced Diploma in Veterinary Nursing Annual Programme Report - Placement-related Analysis

CITY UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG School of Continuing and Professional Education Annual Programme Report

Section 1 Background information

Title of programme(s)	Advanced Diploma in Veterinary Nursing
Title of award(s)	Advanced Diploma in Veterinary Nursing
Partner institution (if any)	NA
Taught by	<input type="checkbox"/> Non-local staff <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local staff <input type="checkbox"/> both
Mode of study	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Full-time <input type="checkbox"/> Part-time
Programme duration	2 years
Programme Leader	Queeny Yuen
Reporting period	from 01/01/2019 to 31/12/2019
Intake(s) covered	Cohort 2017, 2018 and 2019

Section 3

➤ Observations on Work Placement/ Internship (if any)

Provide the number of work placement/internship and student participants for recent three academic years.

Academic Year	Year 1 Animal Care & Welfare Work Placement	Year 1 Summer break & Year 2 Clinical Practice Work Placement
	No. of Placements spaces / students placed	No. of Placements spaces / students placed
Cohort 2018	36	31
Cohort 2017	21	17
Cohort 2016	37	36

Work placement on the ADVN programme is compulsory, therefore, placement spaces MUST be sufficient to cater to the entire cohort. Students attend a total of up to 24 – 26 weeks of placement; split into 6 weeks of Animal Care & Welfare (ACW) placement (in Year 1) and up to 20 weeks of Clinical Practice (CP) placement (in Year 1 Summer break and Year 2). ACW host centres are primarily animal welfare organisations where each can take between 1 – 4 students at any one time / per rotation. CP Hosts are veterinary clinics; many can only host 1 student at a time / per rotation.

Animal related work placement is generally difficult to come by, because a) students are perceived as high risk to health & safety and b) there is stiff competition for spaces posed by students from other programmes (HK & overseas, e.g. veterinary medicine students from CityU and universities in Australia). The PL conduct risk assessments to make overall decisions about work placement in the ADVN programme. In such assessments, the PL investigates and recognises when the risk levels in

/ for certain areas of animal work are unacceptable for ADVN students and therefore cannot press on ahead in these areas identified where risks are of unacceptable levels. Professional Liability insurance is also purchased to provide coverage to students and tutors involved in onsite monitoring of students conducting work placement. Incidents projected which may invoke insurance intervention include loss of a client's pet, damage to a host centre medical equipment, causing injury to self, host centre staff and / or patients etc.

Work placement on the ADVN programme is strictly non-paid. Students are required to complete a skills log, containing the Day-One skills for Veterinary Nurses (based on Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons RCVS, UK, for Veterinary Nurses) in order to graduate. To ensure students complete the skills log and have a positive and safe placement experiences, the following interventions are in place:

1. Work placement Tutorial (pre-, mid- & post rotation) in classroom
2. VN tutorial regular onsite visits
3. Placement handbook & forms / paperwork to guide students through each placement rotation
4. Work placement Assessment Tasks; Skills log, diary, reflection reports & behaviour tool assessment.
5. ADVN mobile phone hotline, for students, VN tutors & host centre staff to get in touch any time to report incidents, file complaints / voice displeasure, request back-up, provide advice etc.

General feedback examples:

ACW placement

- Students enjoy very much, as they work in organisations in husbandry with a strong team culture; they feel they are part of the team and are helpful to the team. They also enjoy the close contact / interaction with the animals
- Host Centres often refer to students as being very polite, helpful and can really help the staff. VN Students are always welcome back.

CP placement

- Students find CP placement much more challenging, as the clinical work settings is much more sophisticated and stressful. Animals are patients, ie sick and require medical care / surgical intervention; students may be as confident about being able to help, as the pace of work is fast and performance of skill is demanding.
- Host mentor feedback varies immensely with individual students' performance, ranging from offering a job to the student at the end of a placement rotation to asking a student to leave the clinic mid-rotation. Generally, and historically (from the days of VN students on CP placement from the BSc(Hons) VN programme by RVC UK & PolyU), VN students are perceived as more practical and helpful compared to other students that may be attending placement from other programmes / institutes.
- When VN tutors visit / discuss with host centres work placement, a crucial message to deliver to students AND host mentors is: setting appropriate expectations for student's capability. Students are novices and the aim of placement is for students to reach '*competence*' level, as opposed to entering, or exiting, a placement rotation being *proficient*, which staff of the clinics would be. Also, students on placement are supernumerary, not to be perceived as a head-count in the company.
- A major concern shared by all the VN tutors is SAFETY; for the students, host clinic staff members, clients, patients, and the actual premises.

Overall, Veterinary Nursing work placement is very time consuming, labour intensive and stressful to deliver and monitor, but, also very rewarding when a student - host dyad comes to fruition and upon graduation students are gainfully and promptly employed by the industry.

A work placement coordinator is required in the long-term on the ADVN programme; so that VN placement tutors, who are the VN teachers on the Programme, can focus on VN expert content delivery & development, both in the classroom setting (lectures & clinical skills sessions) and onsite providing work placement support.

Approved by Programme Committee on: (Date) 16 December 2019

Submitted by: Dr. Queeny Yuen (Programme Leader) Date: 16 December 2019

Endorsed by: Dr. Patrick Wong (S&T Section Leader) (Date): 19 December 2019

Appendix 8 CCCU Sample of Supervision Record with a Staff (Relatively Low TLQ Score Case and Follow-up Actions)

Name of Faculty: Faculty of Y
 Name of Supervisor: Dr Z
 Position: Associate Dean

Date	Name of Staff	Issues (including TLQ)	Action to be taken	Expected action completion date
25 Jan 2019	Dr X (Lecturer)	The overall TLQ score of Dr X in 2018/19 semester A dropped to 4.58 on a 7- point scale. Dr X's full year TLQ in 2017/18 was 5.25. The drop was rather significant (0.67, 12.8%). For reference, the Faculty norm in 2018/19 semester A was 5.73.	<p>Dr X was invited to meet with the Associate Dean of the Faculty on 25 Jan 2019. After reviewing the qualitative comments given to Dr X on the TLQs in that semester, it was found that the teaching style and attitude in a new course was the main reason of low TLQ score. After the meeting, Dr X understood the areas for improvements. In addition, a mentor at Senior Lecturer rank was assigned to Dr X to provide guidance.</p> <p><u>Notes on 14 Jun 2019 (After release of TLQ results for 2018/19 semester B)</u> In semester B 2018/19, Dr X was assigned to teach the same course taught in previous semester. The mentor conducted a peer observation of Dr X's teaching. The result of peer observation was conveyed to Dr X and follow-up consultations were conducted throughout the semester. Eventually, the overall TLQ of Dr X in 2018/19 semester B improved to 5.56 (increased by 0.98, 21.4%). For reference, the Faculty norm in 2018/19 semester B was 5.64.</p>	Within semester B 2018/19

Appendix 9 SCOPE Template for Relatively Low TLQ Score Case and Follow-up Actions

Confidential and for internal use only

TLQ Summary Report for TLQ Score Below the Threshold

	Guidelines	TLQ Score	New appointment
1	Qualified for re-appointment	>= 5.00	Re-appointment will be according to the teaching assignment in semester / period / one year
2	Good reasons required (Marginal)	4.50 to 4.99	i) Re-appointment subject to a good reason. ii) Marginal for 2 consecutive years, new appointment is <u>not offered</u>
3	Usually not qualified	< 4.50	New appointment is <u>not offered</u>

Summary of SCOPE Teaching Staff with a low TLQ score (below 5, out of 7) of Q.10 (Overall Evaluation)

Teaching Evaluation Period:

Name of Teacher	FT/PT	Programme Name	Prog Mode	Module Name	Class Type	Q10 Score	Evaluation End Date	Year of reappointment	Comments from the Associate Director & Follow up Actions
ZZZ	PT	BA (Hons) XXXX, YYYY University	FT	xxxxx Management	L	! 4.56	21-Dec-18	2019/20	Not up to 5.0. Required to take 4 hours of staff development courses either from SCOPE or EDGE
EEE	PT	BA (Hons) AAAA, BBBB University	PT	Business xxxxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxxx	T	✘ 4.44	7-Apr-19	2019/20	"Not recommend to teach BABAM, BCAS due to low TLQ score.

The full name of the teaching staff are kept in the actual record but initials are shown in the above example cases. Please keep it confidential and for use in the submission to CityU for quality audit only

Appendix 10 Examples of SDPUs Follow through of EAAs' Suggestions on Programme Enhancement

Programme	EAA's Suggestions	Follow-up Actions
CENG's Associate of Science in Construction Engineering and Management	Reading lists for some subjects rather outdated.	Programme Leader worked with the course leaders to update the reading list.
	High teaching loads involved in running the course, leaving insufficient time for research, scholarly, and personal development.	The College is working closely with the academic unit to explore possible support available.
CCCU's Associate of Science in Creative and Interactive Media Production	To further divide those assessment tasks with 60% weighting of overall score to encourage continuous learning throughout the course.	The Programme Team has updated the assessment tasks of two courses from the programme.
CCCU's Associate of Science in Applied Psychology	To reduce the amount of workload of the course "Abnormal Psychology" (DSS20162) as the current demand appears to be heavier than the other courses of the same programme.	The Programme Leader has reduced the number of words in the written assignment was reduced as advised.
	To increase the weight of the tutorial by reducing the scores to the written exercise and case analysis.	The Programme Team discussed further and deemed it appropriate to keep it unchanged for another year.
SCOPE's Advanced Diploma in Veterinary Nursing	Student attendance is a difficult thing to monitor, enforce and safeguard. occurring & repetitive. But it is absolute that policies are in place and communicated to students clearly and when necessary.	Programme Regulations (detailed in Student Handbook) stipulate that a) students' attendance of each module must be 80% or above. b) for work placement modules students' attendance must be 100%. Students' attendance for a) is always discussed in AP Panel meetings, particularly the students who fail to meet requirement. AP panel discusses, recommends & agrees on a measure for students to make-good; so

		<p>far students meet the make-good requirements</p> <p>Students’ attendance for b) students are constantly reminded throughout the work placement period. Host mentors arrange make-up sessions for absentees. This so far has made sure, in a timely manner, that each student’s attendance is 100%.</p>
--	--	---

Appendix 11 SCOPE Guidelines for EAA (CE Programmes) and EAA Report Proforma



Guidelines for External Academic Advisors (CE Programmes)

The primary role of External Academic Advisors (EAAs) is advising on quality and development of the programme(s) in the School. Programme Teams should apply the following guidelines in the engagement of EAAs.

A) Principles

1. EAAs should contribute to the development of the programme, rather than predominantly focusing on operational matters.
2. EAAs should have substantial relevant experience and expertise relating to the assessment of the programme(s) and should be active in their disciplinary field.

B) Appointment

3. The Director (or delegate) will oversee the EAA appointments to ensure effectiveness of EAA selection.
4. EAA appointments should be submitted to the School Board for approval
5. The appointment period shall normally be up to three years.

C) Role of the External Academic Advisor (EAA)

6. Advise on the design, content and organization of the programme/ module and its ability to achieve the intended learning outcomes in terms of current knowledge and understanding, subject-specific skills, professional skills, and preparation for employment or further study.
7. Review evidence concerning students' achievements of intended learning outcomes and advise on strengths and weaknesses, based on the evidence.
8. Advise on how to enhance the programme's competitiveness and developments in education and related industry.
9. Advise on the overall standard of student performance and learning accomplishments.

D) Reporting

10. *Sharing of findings.* EAAs will principally share their findings through annual written reports. Programme Teams are required to maintain an active dialog with EAAs for continuous enhancement and document EAA feedback.
11. *Report.* The annual written report of the EAAs should consist of the EAAs' qualitative

assessments of the programme/ module under advisement, focusing on the main areas outlined in the EAA report.

12. *Distribution*. Programme Teams should arrange for the reports of EAAs to be fully discussed in the Programme Committee Meetings. Since reports from EAAs are essential inputs for staff seeking to maintain the quality and level of assessment of modules, they should be made widely available to academic staff, especially Programme Leaders.
13. The EAA's annual report together with the follow-up actions taken by the programme team should be included in the Annual Programme Report.



External Academic Advisors Report Form (CE Programmes)

Please read before completion and submission of report

1. To help improve the programme, please provide your views on the academic standard, curriculum design and structure, attainment of learning outcomes and any areas for enhancement. Please also name the good practices and innovation, if any. Your views on how to enhance the programme competitiveness and developments in education, student employment, and industry are most welcome.
2. Be specific in each section of the report if comments relate to all modules or if they relate to a specific module.
3. Please do not name or otherwise identify any individuals.
4. Complete all sections. If the section is not applicable, please put N/A.
5. Please use WORD file for your report, and email to the programme team concerned before the deadline.
6. The School may use extracts from your report where appropriate.

Thank you for your continued support and contribution to the School's quality assurance and enhancement processes.

External Academic Advisors Annual Report

(To be completed by the Programme Team)

Name of External Academic Advisor	Dr/Mr/Miss/Ms XXXX
Programme Title & Code	Advanced Diploma in Management Studies (193-40271)
Academic Year	2019/2020 (Semester A, B and Summer)
Module Title & Code	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business Communication (SPE20301) • Introduction to Marketing (SPE20005) • Principles of Accounting (SPE20003) • Business Law (SPE20008) • Economics for Business (SPE20009) • Principles of Management (SPE20004) • Business Statistics (SPE20001) • Electronic Commerce (SPE20303) • International Business (SPE20007)

Section 1: Summary

Are the academic standards set for the programme appropriate?	*Yes / No
Are the assessment(s) sound and fairly conducted?	*Yes / No

Section 2: Main report

Academic standard	
Module assessment(s)	
Programme management and curriculum development	
Overall comments/ Other observations	

Signature and Name of EAA : _____ (_____)

Date of submission: _____

Appendix 12 CCCU EAA Annual Report Template



External Academic Advisor's

Name of External Academic Advisor : «Name_»
 Faculty: «Division»
 Programme: «Programme»
 Academic Year : 2018-19

External Academic Advisors play an important role in the maintenance of academic quality and standards. The External Academic Advisor's report is an integral part of the UOWCHK/CCCU's academic monitoring and review procedures. The purpose of the report is to help the College satisfy itself that the Faculty is maintaining the international standard of the award for which it is responsible. External Academic Advisor reports should be frank and open but should avoid references to either individual staff or students. The College is not only anxious to identify problems but also examples of good practice. It would therefore be helpful if you could formulate your comments with this in mind.

The report has two sections. Section 1 provides a signed assurance that the academic standard of the relevant student assessment is being maintained. This assurance may be qualified, or unqualified. When a qualified assurance is provided, External Academic Advisors are asked to note these qualifications. Section 2 is a free format report. External Academic Advisors are at liberty to cover any important issues. A checklist of issues is attached to assist External Academic Advisors in writing their reports.

Please return the report to the President on behalf of the Academic Board at the end of the academic year.

Thank you for your assistance.

Please return the report to the following
 address: Ms Jennifer Ng
 President
 UOW College Hong Kong/Community College of City
 University Tat Chee Avenue Kowloon
 Hong Kong
 (Fax: (852) 3442-0555)

Section 1

I, «Name_», *External Academic Advisor* for:

«Division» assure the Senate of the City University of Hong Kong that the academic standard and assessment of the courses/programme(s) that I have reviewed are being maintained at the international level for similar courses/programme(s). This assurance is *unqualified/qualified* * as

Qualifications

(Signature)

(Date)

* Please delete where inappropriate

Section 2

A. Resources and Support

1. the quality of briefing provided by the University/ Faculty/College/ Department/ Division/School
2. the adequacy of the assistance given to you to enable you to fulfil your role, e.g. information on courses, delivery of materials for review etc.

B. Assessment Arrangements

1. the fairness of the assessment
2. the effectiveness of the assessment strategy in the courses you have moderated, in particular the balance between examination and coursework, and load on students
3. the coverage of the syllabus
4. for projects or dissertations, the appropriateness of the topics, the standard and consistency of marking across projects/dissertations, etc.
5. the quality of examination papers
6. the quality of grading.

C. Academic Standard Demanded

1. the level of students' knowledge, analytical skills, communication skills, intellectual skills, etc., demanded by the assessment
2. the academic level demanded in relation to comparable courses elsewhere
3. the academic level demanded compared with that of previous years

D. Academic Standard Attained

1. as exhibited by the assessments, the strengths and weaknesses of the students' knowledge, analytical skills, communication skills, intellectual skills, etc.
2. the academic standard attained by the students in relation to comparable courses elsewhere
3. the academic standard attained by the students compared with that of previous years
4. the standard of the students' project reports or dissertations

E. Overall Comments and Suggestions

1. the curriculum design and structure
2. the appropriateness of the syllabus
3. advice on programme enhancement, including the curriculum, syllabus, teaching and learning strategies, assessment, etc.
4. good practice to be disseminated

