



Developmental Engagement ' Site-Visit Guidelines '



Adopted version of QAA Handbook for Egypt
January 2007.



List of contents

Introduction	3
Developmental Engagement	4
Annexes	
Annex A Specification for Peer Reviewers and Criteria for their Appointment and Deployment, and Criteria for Team Composition.....	11
Annex B Code of Conduct for Peer Reviewers.....	15
Annex C Roles of Institutional Representatives/Facilitators in Internal Reporting, Developmental Engagements and Accreditation.....	17
Annex D Guidelines and Templates for Course Specifications and Annual Course Reports.....	20
Annex E Guidelines and Templates for Programme Specifications and Programme Reports.....	36
Annex F Guidelines and Template for the Annual Faculty Self Evaluation Reports....	56
Annex H Outline typical site-visit schedule.....	72
Annex I Prompts for Institutions, Reviewers, Students and others participating in Reviews in Developmental Engagement and Accreditation.....	78
Annex J Protocol for Feedback on Outcomes to Institutions.....	89
Annex K Protocol and Prompts for Meetings between Reviewers and Staff during Developmental Engagements and Accreditation Reviews.....	92
Annex L Protocol and Prompts for Meeting between Reviewers and Students during Reviews for Developmental Engagement and Accreditation.....	95
Annex M Prompts for Reviewing Assessed Student Work.....	98
Annex N Protocol for Class Observation.....	100
Annex O Criteria for a Successful Review and the Evaluation of the Process.....	104

Annex Q Structure of Developmental Engagement Report.....	107
Annex Q1 Guidelines for Writing Review Reports.....	110
Annex S Visit Secretaries.....	120
Annex T Template to assist in the review of action plans: use one for each action plan Analyzed.....	123
Annex T1 Framework for the Development of Guidelines for Preparing and Implementing Action Planning towards Accreditation by the Agency.....	127
Annex U Template: Developmental Engagements follow-up process.....	130

Introduction

This is a special edition of *the Quality Assurance and Accreditation Hand book* for the use of all those taking part in Developmental Engagement 2007. It contains the essential element of *Hand book* including:

- **Part 4: Developmental Engagement**
- **Annexes which inform the effective conduct of Developmental Engagement.**

This version takes account of the experiences gained in the first phases of Developmental Engagements; it now incorporates supplementary guidance developed in cooperation with institutions and peer reviewers.

i. Purposes and outcomes of developmental engagements:

32. Developmental engagements will take place during the transitional period. Institutions may wish to use the opportunity to evaluate their quality assurance systems and their programmes with a view to identify strengths and areas for further improvement. This part of the Handbook provides guidelines for the engagements and a provisional timetable.
33. In addition to internal projects, some of which may be funded by the QAAP, which will wish to arrange external peer reviews. Institutions are invited to participate in these peer review engagements by submitting to the QAAP their annual self-evaluation report and discussing with the QAAP the appropriate timing of a site-visit.
34. These developmental engagements provide an opportunity for institutions to develop and test, in co-operation with the QAAP, the effectiveness of the institution's quality assurance systems, the robustness of the evidence base and the reports that they generate in those systems. The QAAP will agree on a suitable schedule, compose a peer review team (annex A), appoint a review chair, invite the institution to nominate a facilitator (annex C) and the Universities to provide visiting secretaries.
35. The benefits to an institution of participating in a developmental engagement include, in addition to the opportunities to test, develop and refine internal review processes: the dialogue with peers; receiving external structured comment; and the written review report, which should offer an agenda for further improvement. All of these may assist further with the institution's arrangements to identify strengths and areas require further improvement, enhance the programmes and disseminate good practice.
36. The developmental engagements and the outcomes will not lead to accreditation. However, the conclusions reached will include a judgment on: the extent to which the quality assurance systems in place are effective; and the quality and academic standards of the programmes.
37. The outcome of each developmental engagement is a set of conclusions agreed by the visiting review team, conveyed in an oral feedback at the end of the site visit (annex J) and supported by a detailed review report (annex Q). The report will remain confidential.

ii. Evaluative framework:

38. The evaluation of the academic activity and the quality assurance systems follows broadly the same structure as the templates for annual self-evaluation reports and accreditation and uses the criteria for accreditation (annex P). The framework for evaluation and the report given below is designed to be sufficiently flexible to serve all institutions that have developmental engagements. However, the framework, with its standard structure and key criteria, also ensures that the developmental engagement method is applied consistently and fairly in all cases.

Part 4

Academic Standards

• **Intended learning outcomes:**

"The ILOs are the knowledge, understanding and skills which the institution intends for its programmes that are mission-related and reflect the use of external reference standards at appropriate level."

• **Curricula**

"The curricula for the programme facilitate the attainment of the stated intended learning outcomes."

• **Student assessment**

“A set of processes , including examinations and other activities concluded by the institution to measure the achievement of the intended learning outcomes of a course / programme. Assessments also provide the means by which students are ranked according to their achievements. The students are well informed on the criteria by which they are assessed and given appropriate structured feedback that supports their continuing learning.”

- **Student achievement**

“Levels of students’ achievements are maintained with due regard to the use of external reference points, moderation and evaluation of achievement.”

Quality of Learning Opportunities

- **Teaching and learning**

“There are effective teaching and learning, informed by a shared, strategic view of learning and the selection of appropriate teaching methods; and due attention is paid to the encouragement of independent learning.”

- **Student support**

“Academic and pastoral support for the students ensures that they can progress satisfactorily through their programme and are informed about their progress.”

- **Learning resources**

“The institution’s facilities for learning are appropriate and used effectively.”

“The institution’s staff (academic and support, technical and administrative members) are adequate and meet the requirements of the academic standards and strategies for learning and teaching.”

“The staff of the institution are competent to teach, facilitate learning, and maintain a scholarly approach to their teaching and to their discipline.”

Research and Other Scholarly Activity

- **Effectiveness of plans and the scale of activity**

- **Distinguishing features**

- **How the activities relate to the other academic activities in the institution**

“The institution’s organisation of research and other scholarly activity, and any related teaching and supervision of doctoral students, is appropriate to the institution’s mission.”

Community Involvement

- **The contribution it makes**

- **The range of activities, and how it relates to the institution’s mission and plan**

- **Examples of effective practice**

“The institution, informed by its mission, makes a significant contribution to the community it serves, to society and to the wider environment.”

The Effectiveness of Quality Management and Enhancement

- **Governance and leadership**

- **Quality assurance systems**

- **Self-evaluation, improvement plans and the impact of earlier improvement plans**

“Governance, management and quality assurance systems are sufficient to manage existing academic activities and respond to development and change.”

“The academic leadership in the institution provides a sound and sustainable basis for academic activities to flourish in an atmosphere conducive to promoting

learning.”

“Self-evaluation, internal reporting and improvement plans are open, transparent, focused and supportive of continuing improvement.”

“The institution has mechanisms for receiving and processing the views of those with a legitimate interest in its activities (the range of stakeholder groups).”

“Effective and prompt action is taken to promote strengths, address any weaknesses and demonstrate responsibility and accountability.”

iii. Guidelines on the conduct of developmental engagements:

Planning for the site-visit

- 39.** Initial planning commences in the institution, with its preparation of the internal annual course, programme and faculty annual reports. Some institutions may also wish to prepare their first periodic strategic self-evaluation review report (annex G) before asking for a developmental engagement. The institution may if it wishes also write an additional brief self-evaluation report in preparation for the peer review, which may highlight key developments since the annual faculty self-evaluation report was produced.
- 40.** The institution and the QAAP will wish to consider the timing of a site visit and the size and composition of the peer review team needed. The institution will be invited to nominate a senior member of the institution, or from another institution within the university, to facilitate the process of developmental engagement and peer review. The role of the facilitator is set out in annex C. Also, the Universities will be requested to provide visit secretaries to support the visiting review team during the site visit. The role of the visiting secretaries is set out in annex S.
- 41.** The QAAP will compose a provisional review team and send the information to the institution inviting it to comment on suitability. The reviewers will offer appropriate expertise, but the review chair need not necessarily bring subject expertise. The team size and the selection of expertise will be informed by the specification and criteria set out in annex A, together with information supplied to the Agency by the institution on the profile of the programmes.
- 42.** When considering the provisional team, the institution has no veto on the team members, nor can it nominate reviewers; however, the institution will be invited to confirm that the expertise in the team is appropriate and that it is not aware of any potential conflict of interest (annex A). When the QAAP has confirmed the review team, it will send the names and addresses to the institution, which will send the copies of the advance documentation directly to the reviewers not later than six weeks before the scheduled visit. At the same time, the institution will send two hard copies for the QAAP and an electronic version of the most recent self-evaluation reports by e-mail or floppy disk to the QAAP.
- 43.** The review chair is responsible for contacting the review team members and the representative of the institution who is leading the developmental engagement, at least four weeks before the scheduled site-visit. The peer reviewers are required to read the course, programme and faculty reports as well as any strategic review report and prepare an initial commentary in line with the guidance offered by the review chair. The initial commentaries should be sent to other team members including the review chair not later than one week before the first day of the site-visit. The facilitator is also entitled to see these initial commentaries.

Preliminary visit

- 44.** The review chair will arrange with the institution a suitable date for him or her to attend a preliminary visit to the institution. The purposes of this visit are:

- To confirm the arrangements for the developmental engagement.
- To provide initial feedback on the adequacy of the evaluative information contained in the advance documentation and request any additional information.
- To confirm the supporting documentation to be available for the site visit, including the sample of students' assessed work.
- To agree on the timetable for the site-visit based on the typical timetable (see annex H) and taking account of local circumstances.
- To agree on the logistics including a base room for the visiting reviewers.
- To ensure that the facilitator understands the method and to brief him on his role.
- To ensure that the visit secretary understands her/his duties .

Site visit

- 45.** The site-visit will normally be arranged, using the typical outline visit schedule (annex H), over three days.
- 46.** The site-visit invariably includes time for meetings (annexes J, K and L). The meetings with students and with staff are essential elements of the developmental engagements. Some meetings are best pre-arranged and some may be arranged at short notice. The reviewers will also wish to devote sometime to reading the documentation provided and making notes. The sample of students' assessed work forms a vital part of this supporting documentation. Reviewers will wish to scrutinise the sample together with the question sheets, marking schemes and any written comments and feedback to students (annexM).
- 47.** The reviewers, after considering their preliminary reading of the documentation and their initial written commentaries, may decide to include observation of a small sample of classes in the schedule. The purpose of observing classes is to collect evidence by direct observation of the quality of the teaching and learning and to draw reasonable inferences on, for example, the appropriateness of the teaching methods and the classroom facilities. The purpose is not to appraise the performance of academic staff. Any evaluations made will not be personalised nor over-generalised. The full protocol for class observation is given in annex N.
- 48.** The institution will be expected to provide a suitable room for the visiting reviewers that is sufficient for the size of the team and the range of supporting documentation. The room should offer worktables, coffee machine, water and light refreshments. It would also be helpful to include a PC and printer and, if appropriate, a web terminal. The visiting team will also need access to photocopying. The base room should also be secure to protect the documentation. In addition, the institution will need to arrange access to suitable meeting rooms during the site-visit in line with the schedule of meetings.
- 49.** The institution will wish to ensure that all documents are readily available to the reviewers. These will normally consist of:
 - Programme approval (validation) documents
 - Programme handbooks
 - Student handbooks
 - Learner support material (a sample may be sufficient)
 - Records of staff-student liaison committee or the equivalent for the last year
 - Assessment criteria together with guidance and rules of marking or equivalent
 - Samples of students' assessed work representing all levels and a sample of programmes
 - Examination board minutes for at least three years

- External evaluators' reports for the last three years if applicable
 - Student feedback summaries
 - Outcomes of consultations, surveys and other engagements with students
 - Recruitment and progression data including employment
 - Staff CVs including summary lists of research, conference papers and publications
 - Examples of the output from recent community service activity
 - Staff development programme and reports
 - Professional, statutory and regulatory body reports if relevant
- 50.** The reviewers will meet regularly as a team and at least once a day will hold a Formal meeting to assess its progress, review the evidence base and the priorities for further enquiries. The facilitator is entitled to attend these meetings. The final team meeting on the last day will review the evidence, satisfy itself that the enquiries address the criteria and prompts provided in annex I that are appropriate to the self-evaluation, agree a generic comment on the quality of the self-evaluation and its supporting evidence, and make judgments that include a set of conclusions. The facilitator is not present at this judgment meeting.
- 51.** Each peer reviewer, for the specific areas of responsibility assigned and under the guidance of the review chair, will compile a record of the evidence base and will draft a section or sections of the review report during the site-visit. The review chair is responsible for co-ordinating the reviewers' writing, ensuring that the information is shared in the team and preparing the first draft review report in line with the published structure (annex Q).

iv. Guidelines on the reporting of outcomes Judgments

- 52.** Using the criteria of QAAP together with other guidelines and templates provided in the annexes to this Handbook, the reviewers will work closely with the institution to evaluate whether, were this to be a review for accreditation, the institution would have met the criteria and if not what further improvements are required. The reviewers will evaluate the academic standards, the quality of the learning opportunities, the research and other scholarly activity, the community involvement and the effectiveness of quality management and enhancement, including a comment on the progress made in developing quality assurance systems.
- 53.** The judgments under each heading will be presented in the review report using the programme specification(s), the annual self-evaluation report(s), the evaluation framework and the criteria *For each heading (component) under Academic Standards in the framework, reviewers will give a positive or negative outcome. If the reviewers give a positive outcome on all four components, the outcome for Academic Standards as a whole will be positive. If any one component in this aspect has a negative outcome, the outcome for Academic Standards as a whole will be negative. For each component under Quality of Learning Opportunities in the framework, reviewers will give a positive or negative outcome. If the reviewers give a positive outcome on all components, the outcome for the Quality of Learning Opportunities as a whole will be positive. If any one component in this aspect has a negative outcome, the outcome for Quality of Learning Opportunities as a whole will be negative. For Research and Other Scholarly Activity, reviewers will give one generic outcome, positive or negative. For Community Involvement, reviewers will give one generic outcome, positive or negative. For each component under The Effectiveness of*

Quality Management and Enhancement in the evaluation framework, reviewers will give a positive or negative outcome. If the reviewers give a positive outcome on all components, the outcome as a whole will be positive. If any one component in this aspect has a negative outcome, the outcome for The Effectiveness of Quality Management and Enhancement as a whole will be negative.

Sample of text reporting conclusions

Conclusions

The developmental engagement at [institution] included a site visit by reviewers in [month/year]. The reviewers, on the basis of the self-evaluation report and supporting documentation and the additional evidence derived from the site-visit, conclude that the [institution] [is ready to receive an accreditation visit] OR [is not yet ready to receive an accreditation visit].

The strengths include:

[List key points]

Matters that deserve to be addressed before an accreditation visit are:

[List key points in a way that the institution has a clear indication of the matters that it should address]"

Oral feedback on outcomes

54. The site visit ends with a feedback meeting chaired by the review chair and attended by the Dean or equivalent head of the institution, the President or their representative and such other members of the institution as are invited by the President or the Dean. All reviewers attend the meeting, but the presentation of the findings is made on their behalf by the review chair in line with the protocol (annex J).

After the site-visit

55. The team will produce a review report using the structure in annex Q. The report will take a narrative form and focus on evaluation (including key strengths and any weaknesses or issues to be addressed) rather than description. It will be evidence-based and where appropriate will offer examples of good practice. The report should be factually correct, clear, concise, fair and balanced. The conclusions should match the reasoning in the main text. The review report will be produced in both Arabic and English. As an indication of length, it is

envisaged that the English version of the report will normally convey the necessary evaluative information in around 5,000 words (maximum 20 pages).

56. The report is addressed to the institution, copied to the QAAP and, where relevant, the institution's university. The review chair will prepare draft 1 shortly after (that is, normally within two weeks) the site-visit and send it to the review team for comments. The team is expected to respond constructively and promptly (that is, within two weeks) to this draft, supplying, if required, additional clarification, information or examples. The review chair will use the responses to prepare draft 2, which he will send to an independent editor (normally another experienced review chair) to read and comment on the draft. This includes checking that its structure complies with annex Q that the judgments are clear and supported by evidence, that the conclusions are in line with the main text of the report and that the evaluations are fair and balanced. The review chair will consider points raised and modify the draft report accordingly. This stage will not normally take more than two weeks.

The review chair then sends the draft 3 reports to the institution with a covering letter, inviting comments on factual accuracy, approximately eight weeks following the end of the site-visit. The institution is expected to respond within two weeks and send a considered response to the review chair. The editing of the report, taking due account of the institution's response, will be undertaken by the review chair. This editing process will normally enable the review chair to send

the draft 4 versions to the QAAP within 12 weeks of the site-visit.

57. The QAAP at this stage will take responsibility for the ultimate quality of the report and will wish to satisfy itself that the report is competent. The QAAP may wish to engage a professional editor at this stage. However, the conclusions reached by the peer reviewers in a competent report will not be changed. If the QAAP requires further editing such as the inclusion of additional evidence, the review chair will be asked to assist. It is envisaged that the review report production will be complete approximately 20 weeks following the site-visit. The report will not be published but the QAAP will send printed copies with a covering letter to the institution.
58. The QAAP will invite all participants in each review to contribute to the evaluation of the engagement using a questionnaire based on the criteria for successful reviews (annex O).
59. The institution will be responsible for preparing its action plan for further development, informed by its mission, its self-evaluation report(s), the review report and the QAAP's published criteria for accreditation. This may include if it wishes any application for funding by the QAAP to assist the successful outcome of its plan. The action plan should include intended outcomes, any measures of success and an estimate of the time needed. A copy of this plan should be sent to the QAAP within eight weeks of receiving the review report.
60. The QAAP will arrange with the institution for any necessary further review activity in the light of the review report and the action plan it receives from the institution.

v. Developmental engagements during the transitional period:

The transitional period provides the opportunity for institutions to undertake projects to enhance the systems and processes that support its arrangements for quality assurance. Developmental engagements will be arranged by the QAAP to support these projects. The process and outcomes will provide further qualitative information and valuable experience in the processes for the institution preparing its application for accreditation. The QAAP will invite institutions to discuss with it the timing of these developmental engagements.

**ANNEX A
SPECIFICATION
FOR PEER REVIEWERS
AND CRITERIA
FOR THEIR APPOINTMENT
AND DEPLOYMENT,
AND CRITERIA FOR TEAM
COMPOSITION**

Specification for Peer Reviewers and Criteria for their Appointment and Deployment, and Criteria for Team Composition

1. Peer review is an essential part of the quality assurance and accreditation process in Egypt. This annex sets out the criteria for the appointment of reviewers, the person Specification for reviewers and review chairs and criteria for the composition of review Teams.

Introduction

2. Review by peers means that the institution has a reasonable expectation that the visiting reviewers should hold, or have recently held, equivalent professional positions to those with whom they conduct their enquiries in the institution. They should have the confidence of the institution and, when offering professional opinion on their area of expertise, they are credible in the eyes of the institution. Peer review also offers safety in numbers for the process, in that the team as a whole provides a degree of protection for the institution and the QAAP from one person's eccentric views.
3. The effective contribution of peer reviewers is underpinned by the application of criteria for their appointment, equal opportunities for all reviewers, experience of the same training and support in the quality assurance and accreditation process. In addition, the specification for the composition of review teams offers transparency to the process of arranging reviews.

Recruitment, training and visit allocation

4. Reviewers are recruited and trained in line with standard operating procedures and published criteria to ensure that they make an effective contribution to the process. The criteria for appointment are:
 - All reviewers actively engaged in the schedule of engagements should meet the specification (see below)
 - All reviewers allocated to a review have successfully completed the training
 - Reviewers are provided with the Quality Assurance and Accreditation Handbook together with supporting materials and guidelines
 - Reviewers will be allocated to reviews that are within their competence
 - Reviewers will make themselves available with the agreement of their organisation for not less than three reviews during an academic year
 - Reviewers will make themselves available for the whole of the scheduled review
 - Reviewers will not be assigned to a review where either they, or the institution, believe there to be a potential conflict of interest (see below, Composition of a team))
 - Reviewers take a professional interest in the process and the advancement of academic affairs.

Personal specification

5. Reviewers need to have sufficient status and reputation for their views to be respected in the academic community. They also need to bring to the process a high order of skills in communication and evaluation. All candidates for the role of reviewer will be invited to submit a CV and write a letter in English that sets out how they meet the specification and the contribution they feel they can make to the process as a reviewer. The QAAP will acknowledge all submissions and subsequently notify candidates of the outcome.
6. The following points represent a core specification:

Essential

- Academic expertise in one or more discipline that appears in the schedule for

- review within the Agency's medium term plans
- Current or recent academic experience including successful teaching practice and at least five years teaching and/or research and/or community projects within the last ten years.
 - Those in professional practice in a relevant discipline who have recent, direct experience of academic activity may also be considered
 - Current or recent experience in quality management and improvement projects or systems which have made an impact
 - Proven abilities in communications in Arabic and English including: listening; joining group discussion; respecting the views of others; leading (chairing) group discussion; rapid reading with understanding; and concise clear writing to tight deadlines
 - Competence in the use of and interpretation of number including: the accurate analysis of data sets; verification and reconciliation techniques; presentation of valid data in support of a judgment
 - Proven ability in evaluation including: appraisal of the context; identifying logical and irrational argument; making sound judgments based on facts; adjusting judgments in the light of additional information or well-argued alternative views in a professional context; and a willingness to justify judgments
 - A favorable disposition to the national initiatives to improve the quality and academic standards of higher education

Desirable

- IT skills, including the use of laptops or notebooks, internet and intranet, preferably in MS word
- Current or recent experience in moderation of marking, external examining and/or formal validation of graduate attainment
- Effective practice in curricula developments, including the writing of outcome-related curricula documents, action plans for programme/course improvements or strategies for learning, teaching and assessment
- Acknowledged track record in research and other scholarly activities
- Recognised contributions to society or the community within the normal range of academic activities (e.g. projects, consultancy, teaching, coaching or mentoring)
- Advisory or interventionist functions as internal or external consultant or change agent in higher education or related professional fields.

Review chairs

7. Review chairs will meet all the above requirements, except relevant academic activity in the discipline under review, and in addition will need to demonstrate:
- Recent experience in internal and/or external review methods
 - Proven qualities of leadership and the management of people and information in task groups or projects
 - Abilities to implement procedures and protocols consistently yet fairly to accommodate local circumstances
 - Effective chairing of reviews and meetings including thorough planning, collaboration with other key participants and time management
 - Ability to assess the evidence available and the validity of emerging judgements
 - Ability to write cogently to deadlines and edit the writing of reviewers to meet the specification for the review report
 - Ability to evaluate the review and make constructive suggestions for the continuing

improvement of the method

- On request, additional contributions to the process through, for example, conferences, editing the review reports generated by others, trawling reports in order to draft overview or summary reports, and the preparation of materials for briefing reviewers and institutions.

Composition of a review team

8. The QAAP will create review teams for each review in line with its standard operating procedures. The Agency will work with the institution to ensure the composition of an appropriate team and inform the institution of the proposed team prior to its confirmation. However, the final allocation of reviewers is made by the Agency to ensure the independence of the review process.
9. The key criteria for the composition of the team are as follows:
 - Teams are composed of reviewers who meet the above requirements
 - The minimum number of reviewers will be three plus a review chair. The size of the team will vary according to the scale and complexity of the institution's academic activity
 - The team will be led by a review chair who may or may not have relevant expertise in the discipline
 - The profile of the team reflects the profile of the main academic activities of the institution
 - The team cannot cover every specialist teaching and research interest in the institution, but the Agency, guided by the institution, will seek to provide a balance of interests in the principal academic activities
 - Where appropriate, a team may include a reviewer from professional practice
 - Where appropriate, a team may include a reviewer who offers relevant regional and international perspectives
 - Potential conflicts of interest in the team will be avoided, and the QAAP will seek the cooperation of reviewers and the institution to this end.

ANNEX B
CODE OF CONDUCT
FOR PEER REVIEWERS

ANNEX B CODE OF CONDUCT FOR PEER REVIEWERS

Introduction

1. The QAAP wishes to ensure that the peer review process makes a full contribution to its quality assurance and accreditation process. The role of the peer reviewer is complex and demanding. The contribution the reviewer can make in assisting institutions to continue to develop their quality assurance systems and improve their standards is considerable.
2. This note offers guidance to the reviewers and other participants in the peer review process on the standards of conduct expected.
3. The QAAP will monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the review process. It will train and support the reviewers it appoints to the role, and the code of conduct will feature in this training.

Code of conduct

4. The reviewer is expected to:
 - Take all reasonable steps to know and understand the published quality assurance and accreditation process and in particular the methods of developmental engagements and accreditation.
 - Ensure that they remain up to date with any developments in the published method, including attending conferences and workshops arranged for peer reviewers by the Agency.
 - Conduct their roles and activities in reviews in a way that fully respects the published method and protocols, including reaching justifiable evidence-based judgements.
 - Undertake their part in a review in a way that respects the mission of the institution they are visiting and avoids bringing to the process any prejudices.
 - Show courtesy to all colleagues with whom they work in the review team and in the institution, including respect for their views and opinions.
 - Complete the assignment on time and to a high professional standard, drawing upon the Handbook and the guidance provided in the review.
 - Respect the confidences shared in the course of the review, so that they do not divulge any information on the self-evaluation, the findings of the review team or the conduct of the review to any other institution, any member of the public or the media.
 - Contribute, as requested by the QAAP to the evaluation of the process by offering constructive comment on their experiences as a reviewer.

ANNEX C
ROLES OF INSTITUTIONAL
REPRESENTATIVES/
FACILITATORS
IN INTERNAL REPORTING,
DEVELOPMENTAL
ENGAGEMENTS
AND ACCREDITATION

Roles of Institutional Representatives/Facilitators in Internal Reporting, Developmental Engagements and Accreditation

Introduction

1. The QAAP wishes to invite the institutions to nominate a suitable senior member of academic staff to represent the institution and facilitate the peer review process when developmental engagement and accreditation visits take place. The facilitator must be briefed on the role by the Agency. The QAAP will make suitable arrangements for this briefing to take place before the site-visit. This annex provides information on the roles, activities and the person specification for the facilitator.

Roles and activities

2. The facilitators will work both with the team in the institution responsible for preparing for the peer review process, and with the review chair and reviewers. They take no part in the decision-making processes of the review team in reaching judgments. They will take a professional approach in facilitating the process. They should not be directly involved in the day-to-day operations of the institution's academic activities and, if the institution is part of a university, they may be from another faculty or college within the university. Their "loyalty" is to the integrity and effectiveness of the peer review process.
3. The role is demanding of time and the facilitator should ensure that they are available without distractions for the preliminary visit and throughout the site-visit. The facilitator is expected:
 - To ensure factual accuracy in the documentation produced internally for the developmental engagement and accreditation visit.
 - To ensure that appropriate supporting evidence is available to the visiting review team and is accessed by the review team.
 - To support the preparations for the site-visit in partnership with both the visiting review chair and the person assigned by the institution to lead the institution's part in the review, and to verify for the institution and the review chair that the proposed timetable for the site-visit is suitable.
 - To attend the preliminary meeting arranged by the review chair.
 - To attend the daily meetings of the review team and any of the meetings arranged during the site-visit between reviewers and academic staff. By attending these meetings, they will gain understanding of the lines of enquiries and the development of the review team's approach to making judgements. Such insights may be shared with colleagues in the institution to facilitate the sharing of useful information that supports the peer review process. However, the facilitator should avoid speculating on the possible outcomes of the review. They should remain passive on the range of evaluations that the peer reviewers compile in the course of the visit and should not divulge them to members of the institution during or after the review.
 - To clarify, during the site-visit, any matters concerning the context in which the institution conducts its academic activities and to assist the review team in determining how they can seek further clarification in the institution on matters addressed in or omitted from the annual self-evaluation report or the periodic strategic review report.
 - To attend the final oral feedback meeting.
 - Following each review visit, to provide a debrief for the institution, to ensure that the benefits of the review process are captured in the institution's arrangements for further development and continuing improvement. To be responsible for the

- preparation of the institution's evaluation of the peer review, following the site-visit.
4. It should be noted that the facilitator will not attend the meeting(s) between peer reviewers and students or other stakeholders. He will not attend the final meeting of the review team on the last day when it makes the judgements and agrees to the conclusions.

Person specification

5. The institution may nominate one person per engagement or accreditation and will inform the QAAP. The facilitator should be a senior, experienced member of academic staff, and should not be currently engaged in the teaching, assessment or management of the academic activities in scope.
6. In nominating the facilitator, the institution should be satisfied that the person:
 - Has knowledge and experience of quality assurance initiatives within an institution
 - Has sufficient knowledge of the mission, any recent engagement in developments and the methods of working in the institution
 - Has the skill to intervene constructively in sensitive situations.

Briefing and support

7. The QAAP will produce further guidance and arrange for the facilitator to be briefed on the published method and the role.
8. After briefing, the facilitator should also:
 - Have knowledge and comprehension of the published method and the part to be played by the quality assurance and accreditation process in education reform
 - Understand the role and contribution of the facilitator.
9. The QAAP believes that institutions will wish to ensure that the facilitators engaged in the conduct of the peer review process are also able to make a positive contribution to the development of quality assurance systems in the institution.

**ANNEX D
GUIDELINES
AND TEMPLATES
FOR COURSE
SPECIFICATIONS
AND ANNUAL
COURSE REPORTS**

Guidelines and Templates for Course Specifications and Annual Course Reports

Preface

1. The objective of these guidelines is to assist higher education institutions in compiling course specifications and the associated annual course reports in accordance with international standards for assuring their quality. It is one of the sets of guidelines produced by the Quality Assurance and Accreditation Project (QAAP).
2. The forms for course specifications and reports have been prepared with the Cooperation of consultants from the United Kingdom. The guidelines and templates were developed in association with representation of institutions in January and June 2004.
3. Each section of the guidelines has been divided into two parts. The first part contains the general rules presenting the basic requirements which educational institutions will have to meet and the practices, which they will have to follow in order to assure the quality of their provision. The second part is a collection of basic elements, which are suggested for each section. The general rules as well as the titles of the basic elements are shadowed in grey to distinguish them.
4. In order to prevent any misunderstanding, each item of these guidelines is accompanied by an explanation of the meaning of the item and its connection with the basic requirements and practices, which have to be put into place to assure the quality of their provision.
5. The course specification template contains eight main items. These are: basic information; the overall aims of the course; its intended learning outcomes (ILOs); the course content; teaching and learning methods; student assessment methods; a list of books and references and the facilities required for teaching and learning.
6. The course report template contains eleven main items. These are: basic information; statistical information; topics taught; methods of teaching and learning; student assessment methods; constitution of examination committees, including the role of the external evaluator; administration constraints; student evaluation; comments of external evaluators; enhancement proposals; and finally, a formal action plan.
7. The course specification has to be provided when the faculty academic by-laws document is authorized. The course report should be provided within two weeks after the publication of students' results.
8. The course specification template is given in annex (1).
9. The course report template is given in annex (2).
10. The published documents of the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education in the UK and the accrediting agency for mid and west USA universities were used for guidance when these guidelines were prepared.

Introduction

11. Recent developments in science and in other fields, have resulted in the enhancement of education standards and quality becoming one of the most important challenges facing all nations. Such enhancement enables nations to cope with the consequences of globalization policies. Thus, education has become a matter of national strategic concern for both developing and developed nations. The need is to fulfill the main aim of education, which is to provide society with graduates capable of meeting its professional and research needs and of effectively participating in drawing-up and implementing the intended policies and plans of investment.
12. Egyptian higher education quality reform policies have been developed to assure the production of graduates conforming to internationally recognized standards.

Implementation of these policies will increase the skills of graduates and enhance their Competitive capacity in the national and regional labour market. For these reasons, the Quality Assurance and Accreditation Project (QAAP) was included in the 25 projects agreed upon by the National Higher Education Conference in 2000. The (QAAP) has also been chosen as one of the six higher education (HE) development projects implemented by the end of the year 2002. The academic programmes are considered to be the core of the educational system. It is therefore essential that all programmes are specified according to international standards and on the basis of intended learning outcomes (ILOs). It is also essential to demonstrate, by means of an annual report, that the operation of the programmes has resulted in the specified quality and standards being achieved. This must be done with reference to the standards and benchmarks that are carefully chosen by the HE institution in accordance with its mission. These guidelines have been prepared through the (QAAP) aiming at satisfying certain performance standards. They also aim at standardising the concepts among faculty members when compiling the course specifications and reports covered by these guidelines.

Glossary

Some of the terms appearing in these guidelines and / or used in writing course specification and course report in the higher education institutions may have more than one meaning according to its context. This might cause confusion in understanding, and consequently affect the compilation of specifications and reports. It is very important for the reader of these guidelines to be aware of the meaning, in this context, of the terms used. Therefore, this section defines the terms used in the compilation of course specifications and reports.

Academic standards:

Specific standards decided by the institution, and informed by external references and including the minimum knowledge and skills to be gained by the graduates from the programme and fulfilling the stated mission of the institution.

Accreditation:

The recognition accorded by the Agency to an institution which can demonstrate that its programmes meet acceptable standards and that it has in place effective systems to ensure the quality and continuing improvement of its academic activities, according to the criteria published by the Agency.

The impact of accreditation at course and programme level will be to require an assurance of the existence of a specific quality level in accordance with the institution's mission, the objectives of the programme(s) and the expectations of similar academic institutions, the students and the labour market.

Benchmarks:

Reference points with which to compare the standards and quality of a programme. Therefore, benchmark statements represent general expectations about the standards of achievement and general attributes to be expected of a graduate in a given subject area.

Course aims:

A collection of the course-specific goals that are derived from the overall objectives of the education programme. They are written in a general manner concentrating on the knowledge, skills and attitudes that the course intends to develop in the students.

External evaluator:

An external experienced person in the field of specialization who is invited to review the structure and content of a programme, its relevance to the ILOs, the standards and appropriateness of student assessments and attainment against the specification, and also evaluating the existing learning resources and whether or not they satisfy the programme requirements. The institution is responsible for specifying the evaluators' role and appointing them.

Institution:

A faculty or higher institute providing HE programmes leading to a first university degree (B.Sc. or B.A.) or a higher degree.

Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs):

The ILOs are the knowledge, understanding and skills which the institution intends for its programmes that are mission-related; reflect the use of external reference standards at appropriate level.

Internal system for quality management:

The system adopted by the institution to improve the level of the educational programmes and other elements affecting them. Such an outcomes-related system involves precise specifications for quality, the identification of good practice as well as of learning deficiencies and obstacles, performance follow-up, suggestions for development and enhancement, and the systematic review and development of processes for establishing effective policies, strategies and priorities to support continuing improvement.

Peer reviewer:

A person who is professionally equal in calibre and subject specialism to those delivering the provision but not from the same institution, without any conflict of interest, who can contribute to the review of an educational programme either for internal quality assurance (QA) or for accreditation purposes.

Programme evaluation:

The methods used to obtain the opinions of the stakeholders of the programme, including students, faculty members, the graduates, and the governing council, etc with the aim of improving and developing the programme to cope with the advances in subject matter and the needs of society and the environment.

Strategic objectives:

A collection of institution-specific objectives that are derived from its mission. They are written in a general manner concentrating on the knowledge and skills that the institution intends to develop in its students.

Student assessment:

A set of processes, including examinations and other activities concluded by the institution to measure the achievement of the intended learning outcomes of a course / programme. Assessments also provide the means by which students are ranked according to their achievements. The students are well informed on the criteria by which they are assessed and given appropriate structured feedback that supports their continuing learning.

Teaching and learning methods:

The methods, which are used by teachers to help students to achieve the ILOs for the course. Examples would be: a case study to teach students how to analyse information and reach a decision; writing a review paper for the students to gain the skills of self-learning and presentation; practical sessions for the students to gain practical skills and executing experiments to train the students to analyse the results and reach specific conclusions.

GUIDLINES FOR COMPILING A COURSE SPECIFICATION

General precepts

1. The institution should have a file for each course "Course File" containing the course specification, samples of previous examination sheets, results of student evaluation of the course as well as the percentages of students dropping out, passing and failing the course. The file should include any other relevant information.
2. The institution should ensure the existence of two copies of the course file, one for the course lecturer and the other for the head of the department or program coordinator. This will help in performance follow-up.
3. The institution should provide a system for course evaluation.
4. The Department Council should approve the course specification when preparing/reforming/developing an educational programme and before authorization of the programme by higher authority or, in case of reviewing a course to cope with novel topics or to add/delete some of programme academic standards.

A-Basic Information:

1- Programme title:

Write the title of the programme(s) which contain the course, and identify if major/minor elements, where relevant

2- Department offering the programme(s):

Write the name of the department responsible for the programme(s).

3- Department responsible for the course:

Write the name of the department responsible for teaching the course.

4- Course code:

Write the code (the letter(s) and the number that identify the course in the faculty by-laws). If there is no code, leave the space blank.

5- Year/Level:

Write the year of the programme for the students in the case of a daily scheduling system or the level in a credit-hour system.

6- No. of hours/units:

Referring to the faculty by-laws, write the number of weekly contact hours of the course for the daily scheduling system and credit hour units for credit hour system divided into lectures, exercises and lab.

7- Authorization date of course specification:

Write the year in which the course specification has been authorized.

B- Professional Information

1- Course aims:

Overall course aims should be expressed as the outcomes to be achieved by students

2- Intended Learning Outcomes from the course:

Express the ILOs of the course in terms of:

a- Knowledge and understanding

The main information to be gained and the concepts that should be understood from the course.

b- Intellectual skills

Explain the intellectual skills, which the course will assist in developing in the students such as: analysis, capability for creative thinking, problem identification and solving,etc

c- Professional skills

These skills are demonstrated by the ability of the student, after completing the course, to apply and adopt the topics into professional applications.

d- General and transferable skills

Skills of a general nature, which can be applied in any subject area, including: written and oral communication, the use of new technological tools, ICT, group working, problem solving, management, . . .etc.

3- Course content:

Write in the main course topics, the number of semester hours allocated for teaching each topic for lectures as well as for seminars, tutorials, exercises, laboratory work, etc. The topics should comply with the content written in the faculty by-laws.

4- Teaching and learning methods:

Identify the methods used in delivering the course such as lectures, discussion sessions, information collection from different sources, practical, research assignment, field visits, case studies. ...etc.

5- Student assessment:

- Write down the assessment methods used, such as written examinations (mid-term, regular, at the end of term), class activities (reports, discussions, practicals...etc). Match the methods used with the course ILOs (item No. 3).
- Time schedule: specify the date for each assessment in the semester/year span.
- Weighting system: identify the percentage of marks allocated to each assessment tool mentioned above
- Formative only assessments are those, which do not contribute to the overall grading system, but are important in the learning process.

6- List of text books and references:

- a- Lectures notes: When notes are available, specify whether they are prepared in the form of a book authorized by the department or are handed out to the students part by part.
- b- Essential books (Text books): When the lecturer uses one book that covers most of course contents, specify the book.
When the lecturer uses more than one book, which contains parts of the course, specify the books and the topics covered by each.
- c- General references, journals, periodicals, newspapers, web sites, which enrich the learning process should also be listed.
The references that should be identified in the above items should be written in a standard way (publisher, edition, year, author(s)...etc). Refer also to locations for reading or buying the specified references.

7- Facilities required for teaching and learning:

The facilities include: appropriate teaching accommodation, including teaching aids,

laboratories, laboratory equipment, computers etc., facilities for field work, site visits etc., which are necessary for teaching the course.

GUIDELINES FOR WRITING COURSE REPORTS

General precepts

1. The academic institution should have a file for each authorised programme containing the specification of its courses. Two copies should be available, one with the academic coordinator and the other with the vice dean for education and student affairs.
2. The institution should provide the necessary mechanisms to ensure continuous reviewing and updating of the programmes including readjustments of the structure, adding/deleting specific skills from the courses, ILOs...etc.
3. The institution should have clear academic standards and benchmarks for each education programme.
4. At the end of the semester/year, the lecturer/coordinator of a course should submit a course report to the head of the department.

A-Basic Information:

1- Course title and code:

Write the title and the code (the letter(s) and the number that identifies the course in the faculty by-laws). If there is no code, leave the space blank.

2- Programme:

Write the title of the programme(s) to which the course contributes.

3- Year /Level:

Write the programme year(s) of the students attending the course in the case of a daily scheduling system or the level in credit-hour systems.

4- No. of hours/ units:

Referring to the faculty by-laws, write the number of weekly contact hours of the course for the daily scheduling system and credit hour units for credit hour system divided to lectures, exercises and lab.

5- Teaching staff:

Write the name(s) of lecturer(s) teaching the course.

B- Statistical Information

6- No. of students starting the course:

Write the number of students starting the course at the beginning of the semester.

7- Results of students' assessment:

Write the number and percentage of pass students as well as fail students.

8- Distribution of passed students according to:

Fill in the allocated space, the number as well as the percentage of students for each grade.

C- Professional Information

1- Course topics taught:

In the first column of the table, write the topics actually covered in the semester/year. In the second column of the table, write the actual hours spent in covering each topic. In the third column, write the name of the lecturer covering each topic. Write in the space provided the percentage of the specified topics actually covered. State the reasons for the failure to cover any of the specified topics. If topics, not included in the course specification, were taught, justify this action.

2- Teaching and learning methods:

Tick in the appropriate rectangle, the method used. Write any comments.

Lectures	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practical training/lab	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion sessions.....	<input type="checkbox"/>
Class activities.....	<input type="checkbox"/>
Case studies	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other assignments.....	<input type="checkbox"/>

3- Student assessment:

a- Methods of assessment

Tick in the appropriate place the method(s) used.

b - State the rules applied for the selection of the examination committee.

State the names of the members of the examination committee.

c- State the involvement of the external evaluator in:

- The match between the examination and the topics taught.
- The existence of grading criteria in examination sheets
- The allocation and distribution of marks and weighting
- Effectiveness of the overall assessments in measuring the achievement of the intended learning outcomes (ILOs).

4- Facilities and teaching materials:

Tick the boxes provided to indicate whether or not the facilities for learning and teaching materials are adequate. If there are any inadequacies, identify them, together with any problems in the delivery of the course or achieving the ILOs, which resulted.

5- Administration constraints:

State any administrative constraints related to teaching and learning (lack of: some facilities or funds, teaching aids, site visits, qualified personnel for laboratory and administration). Also mention any management problems or regulations, which impeded the delivery of the course and the achievement of the ILOs.

6- Results of course evaluation by students:

State the main points resulting from the analysis of students' evaluation of the course, and the response to any criticisms by the faculty members delivering the course, together with their proposals for dealing with those issues.

7- External evaluator's comments:

State the issues raised by the external evaluator and the responses from the faculty members delivering the course, together with their proposals for dealing with those issues.

8- Course enhancement:

a- List the issues identified in the action plan from the previous year and whether or not they have been dealt with effectively. When issues have not been effectively dealt with, give reasons and include in the current year's action plan.

Write the issues not handled from those raised in the previous report and the reasons for overlooking such issues.

b- Action plan for programme enhancement over the next academic year.

List:

- 1- Issues and actions required
- 2- Time schedule
- 3- Person(s) responsible for the successful achievement of the specified action.

The action plan is fundamental to the success of the quality system. It appears at the end of the report, because it is the result of all of prior analysis. Enhancement can only take place if issues are identified and then acted upon and resolved. The action

plan identifies the issues, prioritizes them and dictates the necessary action to be taken. It is also clearly places the responsibility for the implementation of the action and the resolution of the associated issues, in a given time scale on named individuals.

APPENDIX D1
TEMPLATES FOR COURSE
SPECIFICATIONS

Templates for Course Specifications

University...

Faculty...

Course specifications

- Programme(s) on which the course is given
- Major or minor element of programmes
- Department offering the programme
- Department offering the course
- Academic year / Level
- Date of specification approval

A- Basic Information

Title:

Code:

Credit Hours:

Lecture:

Tutorial:

Practical:

Total:

B- Professional Information

1 – Overall aims of course

.....
.....
.....

2 – Intended learning outcomes of course (ILOs)

a- Knowledge and understanding:

- a1-
- a2-
- a3-

b- Intellectual skills

- b1-.....
- b2-.....
- b3-.....

c- Professional and practical skills

- c1-.....
- c2-.....
- c3-.....

d- General and transferable skills

- d1-.....
- d2-.....

3- Contents

Topic	No. of Hours	Lecture	Tutorial/Practical

4- Teaching and learning methods

- 4.1-.....
- 4.2-.....
- 4.3-.....
- 4.4-.....

5- Student assessment methods

- 5.1..... to assess
- 5.2..... to assess
- 5.3..... to assess
- 5.4..... to assess

Assessment schedule

- Assessment 1..... Week
- Assessment 2 week
- Assessment 3..... Week
- Assessment 4..... Week

Weighting of assessments

- Mid-term examination %
- Final-term examination %
- Oral examination. %
- Practical examination %
- Semester work %
- Other types of assessment %
- Total 100%
- Any formative only assessments

6- List of references

- 6.1- Course notes
.....
- 6.2- Essential books (text books)
.....
- 6.3- Recommended books
.....
- 6.4- Periodicals, Web sites, etc
.....
.....
.....

7- Facilities required for teaching and learning

.....

Course coordinator:

Head of Department:

Date: / /

APPENDIX D2
TEMPLATES FOR
ANNUAL COURSE REPORTS

Templates for Annual Course Reports

University..... Faculty..... Department.....

Course Report

A- Basic Information

1. Title and code:
2. Programme(s) on which this course is given:
3. Year/ Level of programmes
4. Units/Credit hours:

Lectures Tutorial/Practical Total

5. Names of lecturers contributing to the delivery of the course

- i
 - ii
 - iii
- Course co-ordinator
- External evaluator

B- Statistical Information

No. of students attending the course: No. %

No. of students completing the course: No. %

Results:

Passed: No. % Failed: No. %

Grading of successful students:

Excellent: No. % Very Good: No. %

Good: No. % Pass: No. %

C- Professional Information

1 – Course teaching

Topics actually taught	No. of hours	Lecturer

Topics taught as a percentage of the content specified:

>90 % 70-90 % <70%

Reasons in detail for not teaching any topic

.....
.....
.....

If any topics were taught which are not specified, give reasons in detail

.....
.....
.....
.....

2- Teaching and learning methods:

Lectures:

Practical training/ laboratory:

Seminar/Workshop:

Class activity:

Case Study:

Other assignments/homework:

If teaching and learning methods were used other than those specified, list and give reasons:

.....
.....

3- Student assessment:

Method of assessment

Percentage of total

Written examination

Oral examination

Practical/laboratory work

Other assignments/class work

Total

Members of examination committee

.....
.....
.....

Role of external evaluator

.....
.....
.....

4- Facilities and teaching materials:

Totally adequate

Adequate to some extent

Inadequate

List any inadequacies

.....
.....

5- Administrative constraints

List any difficulties encountered

.....
.....
.....

6- Student evaluation of the course: Response of course team

List any criticisms

.....
.....
.....
.....

7- Comments from external evaluator(s): Response of course team

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

8- Course enhancement:

Progress on actions identified in the previous year's action plan:

Action	State whether or not completed and give reasons for any non-completion
--------	--

.....
.....
.....

9- Action plan for academic year 200X – 200Y

Actions required	Completion date	Person responsible
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Course coordinator:

Signature:

Date: / /

ANNEX E
GUIDELINES
AND TEMPLATES
FOR PROGRAMME
SPECIFICATIONS AND
PROGRAMME REPORTS

Guidelines and Templates for Programme Specifications and Programme Reports

Introduction

1. The purpose of these guidelines is to assist higher education institutions to prepare a specification for each academic programme in their institution and to write a report on the operation of the programme according to international standards for assuring its quality. It is one of the guidelines produced by the Quality Assurance and Accreditation Project (QAAP) following consultations in higher education and should be used together with the guidelines on course specifications and reports (Handbook annex D) and annual faculty self-evaluation reports (Handbook annex F).
2. The published documents of the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education in the UK (QAA) and the accrediting agency for mid and west USA universities were used as guidance material for the preparation of these guidelines. The templates for programme specifications (E1) and reports (E2) contained in the appendices have been prepared with the cooperation of consultants from the (QAA) and following consultations with representatives of higher education institutions in Egypt. distinguish them.
3. Each section of the guidelines is in two parts. The first part contains the general rules presenting the basic considerations and practices that the educational institution should provide to assure the quality of its performance. The second part is a collection of basic elements that are suggested for each section.
4. Each item of these guidelines is accompanied by an explanation of the meaning of the item and its connection with the basic considerations and practices which the institution should provide to assure the quality of its performance. This should prevent any misunderstanding of the concepts and also to help in writing programme specifications and reports.
5. The programme specification form contains the following main items: basic information; aims; intended learning outcomes (ILOs); curriculum structure and contents; courses in the programme; contents of courses; regulations for progression and completion of the programme; student assessment; academic standards; benchmarks; programme evaluation; and the action plan.
6. The programme report template contains the following main items: basic information; statistics; professional information including academic standards; learning quality management for programme development; and the action plan.
7. The academic programme specification has to be provided for the faculty academic bylaws document to be authorized. The annual programme report should be provided at the end of the academic year no later than mid July, to permit time for the preparation of the annual faculty academic report and for the compilation of the action plan for the next academic year.
8. The Programme Specification template is given in appendix E1. The Program Report template is given in appendix E2.

Context

9. The enhancement of educational standards is one of the most important challenges facing all countries worldwide. Such enhancement enables nations to be capable of implementing economic reforms driven by globalization. Egypt's Education Reform Programme has recognized the priority for the economy and society of assisting institutions to make all their academic programmes in higher education of comparable

standard to the best in the world. Such enhancement will help to fulfill the main educational aim, which is to provide society with graduates capable of achieving its professional and research needs and of effectively participating in developing and implementing the intended national policies and plans of investment.

10. In order to assure the production of graduates according to internationally recognized standards, all institutions need to develop appropriate internal systems to specify the quality of their academic programmes, specify the intended outcomes in terms of the attributes of their graduates, to review and report routinely on their performance against the specification and to take steps to identify matters that need to be addressed as part of a process of continuing improvement. Such action will increase the skills of graduates and enhance their competitive capacity in the national and regional labour market. This is the reason for including the Quality Assurance and Accreditation Project (QAAP) as one of the 25 projects agreed upon by the National Higher Education Conference in 2000. The (QAAP) has also been chosen as one of the six higher education (HE) development projects to be implemented by the end of the year 2002. Academic educational programmes are considered to be the core of the educational system.
11. Hence, it is important to specify any programme according to international standards and on the basis of its intended learning outcomes (ILOs). It is also important to prepare an annual report on the performance of the programme during its implementation. This must be done with reference to the standards and benchmarks that are to be carefully chosen by the HE institution in accordance with its mission. These guidelines have been prepared due to the aim of the QAAP to satisfy performance standards. They are also aimed at unifying the concepts among the faculty members when compiling programme specifications and reports.

Glossary

12. Some of the terms appearing in these guidelines and/or used in writing programme specifications and programme reports in the HE institution may have more than one meaning according to its context. This might cause confusion in understanding and consequently affect the compilation of specifications and reports. It is very important for the reader of these guidelines to be aware of the meaning, in this context, of the terms used. Therefore, this section defines the terms used in the compilation of course specifications and reports.

Academic Standards

Specific standards decided by the institution, informed by external references and including the minimum knowledge and skills to be gained by the graduates from the academic programme and fulfilling the stated mission of the institution.

Accreditation:

The recognition accorded by the Agency to an institution which can demonstrate that its programmes meet acceptable standards and that it has in place effective systems to ensure the quality and continuing improvement of its academic activities, according to the criteria published by the Agency.

The impact of accreditation at course and programme level will be to require an assurance of the existence of a specific quality level in accordance with the institution's mission, the objectives of the programme(s) and the expectations of similar academic institutions, the students and the labour market.

Benchmarks:

Reference points with which to compare the standards and quality of a programme.

Therefore,

benchmark statements represent general expectations about the standards of achievement and general attributes to be expected of a graduate in a given subject area.

Aims

A collection of the goals that are derived from the mission statement and which in turn inform the detailed intended learning outcomes objectives ILOs of the educational programme and specific course objectives. They are written in a general manner, expressing the broad purposes and intent. In educational programmes and courses, they catalogue the knowledge, skills and attitudes to be developed in the students.

External evaluator

An external experienced person in the field of specialization who is invited to review the structure and content of a programme, its relevance to the ILOs, the standards and appropriateness of student assessments and attainment against the specification, and also evaluating the existing learning resources and whether or not they satisfy the programme requirements. The institution is responsible for specifying the evaluators' role and appointing them.

Institution

A faculty or higher institute providing HE programmes leading to a first university degree (B.Sc. or B.A.) or a higher degree.

Intended learning outcomes (ILOs)

The knowledge, understanding and skills which the institution intends to have been gained by the students completing the programme. For the purposes of quality assurance systems, these should be expressed as outcomes rather than as a traditionally written syllabus.

Internal system for quality management

The system adopted by the institution to improve the level of the educational programmes and other elements affecting them. Such an outcomes-related system involves precise specifications for quality, the identification of good practice as well as of learning deficiencies and obstacles, performance follow-up, suggestions for development and enhancement, and the systematic review and development of processes for establishing effective policies, strategies and priorities to support continuing improvement.

Peer reviewer

A person who is professionally equal in calibre and subject specialism to those delivering the provision but not from the same institution, without any conflict of interest, who can contribute to the review of an educational programme either for internal quality assurance (QA) or for accreditation purposes.

Programme evaluation

The methods used to obtain the opinions of the stakeholders of the programme, including students, faculty members, the graduates, and the governing council, etc with the aim of improving and developing the programme to cope with the advances in subject matter and the needs of society and the environment. Self-evaluation is central to internal

quality assurance systems. External reviews, for example in connection with an application by an institution for accreditation, will use the self-evaluation reports as a starting point and lead to an evaluation report.

Strategic objectives

A collection of institution-specific aims and objectives that are derived from its mission. Objectives are written in a general manner focusing on the portfolio of academic programmes and the medium and long term aims of the institution.

Student assessment:

The different types of assessment including examinations or semester activities that the teacher sets to ensure that the students have achieved the ILOs.

Teaching and learning methods:

The methods which are used by teacher to help students to achieve the ILOs for the course. Examples would be: a case study to teach students how to analyse information and reach a decision based on available evidence; writing a review paper for the students to gain the skills of self-learning and presentation; practical sessions for the students to gain practical skills; and executing laboratory or field-work experiments to train the students to gather information, analyse the results and reach specific conclusions.

GUIDELINES FOR WRITING A PROGRAMME SPECIFICATION

General precepts

The institution should ensure that all its departments have internal mechanisms for periodic review and reporting of the educational programmes provided by the institution.

The institution should make sure that there is a system to ensure continuous improvement, in accordance with the current national and international conditions.

The institution should define and apply the academic standards for its programmes in line with its mission, using appropriate external reference points, and ensure that the students gain the minimum knowledge and skills that fulfill the programme aims and the intended learning outcomes.

The institution should specify the external reference points (benchmarks) used to define and compare its academic standards.

A- Basic Information

1. Programme title:

Write programme title

2. Programme type:

Write whether the programme is single (has the specialty of one department), joint (has two specialties) or multidisciplinary (has more than two specialties). Specialties may be in different departments in one faculty or more than one faculty.

3. Faculty

Write the name of the faculty responsible for the programme. In the case of joint or multi-disciplinary programme, write the name of the faculty which has the main responsibility for the programme.

4. Department

Write the name(s) of the department(s) providing the programme

5. Assistant co-ordinator

Write the name

6. Co-ordinator

Write the name

7. External evaluator(s)

Write the name(s) of the external evaluator(s)

8. Last date of programme approval:

Write down the year in which the programme was last authorised.

B- Professional Information:

1. Programme aims:

Write down the programme aims in a general way specifying the most important knowledge skills and attitudes which the students should gain after completing the programme

2. Intended learning outcomes (ILOs):

When completing this item, the complete ILOs for the programme should be given so that the courses comprising the programme can be justified by the programme ILOs which they satisfy. Also, each ILO should be given a code or number so that it can be easily referred to. The (ILOs) include, without limitation, the following:

a. Knowledge and understanding:

Meaning the basic information and understanding the graduate should have gained upon completing the programme.

b. Intellectual capabilities:

Meaning the intellectual capabilities gained by the graduate after completing the programme such as: the ability to select from different choices – concluding and discussing – innovation, specifying problems and finding solutions - etc.

c. Professional and practical skills :

Meaning the capability to use academic material in professional applications, which should be gained by the student upon completing the programme. Examples of such capabilities include: use of remote sensing maps – laser applications – ability to diagnose an illness – writing a treatment prescription – managing water resources – performing an engineering design – designing a computer program - etc.

d. General and transferable skills:

Meaning the different general or transferable skills that should be gained by the student upon completing the programme. These are non-subject-specific skills such as:

Computing skills
Communication skills
Management skills
Working in a group
Problem solving.

3. Academic standards:

Write a specification of the academic standards for the programme which indicate what the graduate should have achieved on completion of the programme. Reference should be made to external references such as benchmark statements.

4. External references for standards (Benchmarks):

Meaning the collection of measures applied by the academic community to ensure that the graduates have fulfilled the academic standards and the academic quality level specified in the institution mission.

5. Curriculum structure and contents:

a- Programme duration:

Write the minimum number of years required to complete the programme and obtain the degree.

b- Programme structure:

The following points have to be covered:

- (i) Number of hours required to complete the programme (including lectures, exercises, lab. and others).
- (ii) Distribution of the hours given in (i) as compulsory, elective, and optional.
- (iii), (iv), (v), (vi) and (vii) number of hours and the percentages of the total number of programme hours classified respectively as:
 - basic sciences courses
 - social sciences and humanities courses
 - specialized courses
 - other courses and
 - practical/field training

(viii) Programme levels (for the credit hours system):

If the programme has different levels, state the levels and the requirement for transfer from the lower, level to the higher, level.

Also state whether or not certificates are awarded for completion of each level.

6. Programme courses:

6.1 First Year / Semester

for the first column of the table:

write the code number of the course and its title

for the second column of the table.

write the course title

for the third column of the table

write the number of units in the course

for the fourth, fifth and sixth columns of the table

write in the number of hours/week for each of the given activities

for the final column

write in the programme ILOs (by number) which are achieved by the course in question

For semester systems, write no. of hours/week and for credit hours system, write no. of units (as distributed into lectures, labs and exercises)

Note: Use separate tables for each of:

1. Compulsory courses
2. Elective courses
3. Optional courses

AND

Construct similar tables for each year / level / semester

Note: There will be a need to amend the table to specify any pre-requisites.

7. Programme admission requirements:

Write the general criteria and rules for the admission of students to the programme, and from which level the programme starts.

8. Regulation for progression and programme completion

Identify the rules and bylaws for moving from one year/level to the next year/level in semester/credit hours system. Also, identify the rules for withdrawal or transfer from another programme or another faculty.

9. Programme evaluation:

Write the way by which the programme is regularly evaluated. List also the concerned stakeholders of the programme doing the evaluation, and mention the methods used

for evaluation, including the function of an external evaluator.
All course specifications should be included as appendices.

GUIDELINES FOR WRITING PROGRAMME REPORTS

General precepts

The institution should make sure that there are mechanisms which guarantee the submission of the programme report by a specified date.

The institution should make sure that there are policies and mechanisms which guarantee a real response to requirements for programme development.

The institution should make sure that the policies and mechanisms used for programmes evaluation are transparent and true.

The programme report must take account of all of the information provided in all of the course reports. This information should be integrated to form the programme report.

The programme report(s) in turn form the basis of the annual faculty self-evaluation report.

A- Basic Information

- Programme Title:
Write the programme title and specialty.
- Tick the type of programme
- Department responsible
- Enter name of programme co-ordinator
- Enter name(s) of external evaluator(s)
- Specify the year of operation

B- Statistics

- 1- No. of admitted students: Identify the number of the students who joined the programme from those admitted to the institution. Thus for programmes where students start in their first university year, enter the numbers for that year. Where the programme is a specialization starting in the third year, enter the number of students enrolled in that year.
- 2- This can be calculated from the number of students admitted to the programme current year as a percentage of the number of students admitted in the previous year.
- 3- For each year/level/semester of the programme, enter the number of students passing and express also as a percentage of those starting.
- 4- Enter the number of students, who completed the whole programme and express as a percentage of the number who started.
- 5- Enter the number and percentage in each grade.

C- Professional Information

Academic standards:

Define the academic standards that have been achieved compared with those that were identified by the institution upon planning and endorsing the programme. Also, in order to show to what extent the programme design, structure and organization are in accordance with the academic standards and programme aims, the coordinator should cover the following points:

- How well matched to the ILOs are the programme and its courses? – identifying any

courses that appear to be especially effective or ineffective.

- What are the trends in academic standards worldwide, and are the external reference points used for the specification still valid?
- The strengths and weaknesses in the relevance of the subject matter, for example in drawing on recent and current research activity.

1- Intended learning outcomes by graduation:

In order to evaluate the programme, design a table similar to that for ILOs in programme specifications. This table should include the learning methods and the ILOs that have been achieved by each of the mentioned methods. The ILOs are referred to by their code number in the programme specification. Also, the coordinator must include the comments of external reviewers (if any) about learning methods of different courses.

2. Achievement of programme aims

Evaluate the extent by which the achievement of the programme ILOs has facilitated the achievement of the programme aims.

3- Assessment methods

Report on the assessment methods used as defined in the course reports. State whether or not overall the assessment methods effectively demonstrate that the students achieved the range of the ILOs specified for the programme. Discuss any need for modification of assessment methods.

Comment on whether or not the assessments have measured that programme aims have been achieved and propose any remedial action necessary if they have not.

4- Student achievement

Comment on the statistics quoted in Section B. Consider the performance of students at all levels. Indicate whether the achievement percentages are acceptable, and, if this is not the case, propose any measures to be taken. Comment also on whether the grades achieved were appropriate in the light of the academic standards of the assessments.

Comment also on the first destinations of students after graduating as defined in Section B6.

Quality of Learning Opportunities

5- Teaching and learning

Evaluate the quality of the teaching and learning process which has been carried out.

Quote evaluations by stakeholders, including students from all levels.

6. Student support

Comment on the quality of both academic and pastoral/personal support provided to students. Consider the effectiveness of any personal and group tutorial systems. Was adequate support provided for outstanding students and those with disabilities? Was there special provision to support students who were at risk dropping out as well as those whose performance was outstanding and who could benefit from a greater challenge?

7- Learning resources

a. Faculty members:

Number of faculty members and their assistants, and the ratio of the numbers of faculty members and the number of students for each year/level of the programme.

b. The specialisms of the faculty members who taught the different courses and how they fit with the programme requirements. State any deficiencies in specialisms.

c. Is there a programme handbook and does it contain all of the information, which students might need. Availability and students awareness of its contents.

Comment on:

Sufficiency of details in handbook about programme rules (admission, progression, completion, ...etc)

Any other details considered by the programme coordinator

d. Libraries:

Comment on:

The availability of the required textbooks, periodicals, video aids, etc in a number sufficient for all students. Comment also on their currency and suitability for the programme requirements;
the working areas, working hours, number & efficiency of staff;
the flexibility and appropriateness of the rules for facilitating borrowing.

e- Laboratories:

Comment on:

Sufficiency, efficiency and currency of equipment, instruments, materials and the number of students per experiment; matching between the experimental work performance to that given in course specifications; number and qualifications of laboratory technicians; the extent of availability of laboratories to students for self learning.

f- Computer laboratories:

Comment on:

number of laboratories, number of machines, currency, availability of suitable software, access to the internet, suitability of facilities to assignments required by students and faculty members;
hours of availability of computing facilities, technician support, help desks etc;

g- Fieldwork/Training:

Comment on:

Matching of achieved field training to that stated in programme specification;
evaluation of the training in regard to period, timing, place, suitability to intended skills outcomes, number and percentage of students who completed training;
obstacles and constraints (if any) for field training noted by training supervisors or directors of training sites;

h- Other programme needs.

Identify any other programme needs and comment on their availability and quality in a similar way to the above.

8- Quality Management:

Comment on:

a- Existence of periodical internal quality evaluation of the programme.

b- The effectiveness of the system management and administrative obstacles impeding achievement of program intended learning outcomes. Steps taken by the faculty/university administration after receiving preceding programme report (to overcome deficiencies).

The coordinator's evaluation on the efficiency of the institution arrangements to identify good practice and to eliminate or minimise identified deficiencies.

Reaction of administration to suggestions proposed in the preceding year's report for developing the programme.

c- The extent of activating faculty bylaws and university regulations by administrators including those concerned with students attendance and commitment of staff members to complete course reports, etc.

d- External evaluator(s) for external evaluators, comment on:

- Choice criteria
- Their specialty and experience
- Commitment toward reporting on different issues of the programme.
- Their accounting for tools and outcomes of evaluation by the

- stakeholders (employees, senior students, alumni, professional syndicates, etc.)
- e- Summary of stakeholders' evaluations.
 - f- Response of faculty/institution administration to preceding year's external evaluators reports and stakeholders evaluations.

9- Proposals for programme development:

- State the proposals for programme development based on course and programme specifications, academic standards and benchmarks and stakeholders' evaluations.
- Proposals should include:

- a- Programme structure
- b- Courses
- c- Staff development

10- Progress of previous year's action plan

Include a copy of the previous year's action plan, and comment on the completion or non-completion of the specified actions, with reasons for any non-completion. Reconsider actions not completed and decide whether to include in the current year's action plan either in a similar form or modified in the light of the experience of the current year.

11- Action plan

List all actions brought forward from previous year, together with all actions arising from the analysis of the current year's operation of the programme.
Specify action, individual responsible and completion date.

All course reports should be attached a

APPENDIX E1
TEMPLATE
FOR PROGRAMME
SPECIFICATION

TEMPLATE FOR PROGRAMME SPECIFICATION

University..... Faculty(s).....

Programme Specification

A- Basic Information

- 1- Programme title:.....
- 2- Programme type: Single Double Multiple
- 3- Department (s):.....
- 4- Coordinator:.....
- 5- External evaluator(s).....
- 6- Last date of programme specifications approval:.....

B- Professional Information

1- Programme aims

.....
.....
.....
.....

2- Intended learning outcomes (ILOs)

a- Knowledge and understanding:

- a1-
- a2-
- a3-.....
- Etc.

b- Intellectual skills

- b1-
- b2-
- b3-.....
- Etc.

c- Professional and practical skills

- c1-
- c2-
- c3-.....
- Etc.

d- General and transferable skills

- d1-
- d2-
- d3-.....
- Etc.

3- Academic standards

3a External references for standards (Benchmarks)

.....
.....
.....

3b Comparison of provision to external references

.....
.....
.....
.....

4- Curriculum Structure and Contents

4.a- Programme duration.....

4.b- Programme structure

4.b.i- No. of hours per week: Lectures

4.b.ii- No. of credit hours: Compulsory

4.b.iii- No. of credit hours of basic sciences courses:

4.b.iv- No. of credit hours of courses of social sciences and humanities

4.b.v- No. of credit hours of specialized courses:

4.b.vi- No. of credit hours of other courses:

4.b.vii- Practical/Field Training:

Lab./Exercise	<input type="text"/>	total	<input type="text"/>
Elective	<input type="text"/>		Optional
No.	<input type="text"/>	%	<input type="text"/>
No.	<input type="text"/>	%	<input type="text"/>
No.	<input type="text"/>	%	<input type="text"/>
NO.	<input type="text"/>	%	<input type="text"/>

4.b.viii- Programme Levels (in credit-hours system):

5- Programme courses

5.1- Level/Year of Programme...1..... Semester...1.....

a. Compulsory

Code No.	Course Title	No. of Units	No. of hours /week					Programme ILOs Covered (By No.)
			Lect.	Lab.	Exer.			

b- Elective – number required

Code No.	Course Title	No. of Units	No. of hours /week					Programme ILOs Covered (By No.)
			Lect.	Lab.	Exer.			

c- Optional – number required

Code No.	Course Title	No. of Units	No. of hours /week					Programme ILOs Covered (By No.)
			Lect.	Lab.	Exer.			

5.2 Repeat for all higher years/semesters /levels

6- Programme admission requirements

.....
.....

7- Regulations for progression and programme completion

First Year/Level/Semester

.....
.....

Second Year/Level/Semester

.....
.....

Etc.

8- Evaluation of programme intended learning outcomes

Evaluator	Tool	Sample
1- Senior students		
2- Alumni		
3- Stakeholders (Employers)		
4-External Evaluator(s) (External Examiner(s))		
5- Other		

Annex 1

Attach course specifications

APPENDIX E2
TEMPLATE FOR
PROGRAMME REPORT

Template for Programme Report

Programme Report

A- Basic Information

- 1- Programme title:.....
- 2- Programme type: Single Double Multiple
- 3- Department (s):.....
- 4- Coordinator:.....
- 5- External evaluator(s).....
- 6- Year of operation:.....

B- Statistic

- 1-No. of students starting the programme.
- 2-Ratio of students attending the programme this year to those of last year
- 3-No. and percentage of students passing in each year/level/semester
- 4-No. of students completing the programme and as a percentage of those who started
- 5-Grading: No. and percentage in each grade
- 6-First destinations of graduates

Give percentages of the graduating cohort who have

- i. Proceeded to appropriate employment
- ii Proceeded to other employment
- iii Undertaken postgraduate study
- iv. Engaged in other types of activity
- v. Unknown first destination

Academic Standards

1- Achievement of programme intended learning outcomes

Course	Programme ILOs (By No.)			
	K, U *	IS **	P.S ***	G.T.S ****

* Knowledge and Understanding

** Intellectual Skills

*** Professional and Practical Skills

**** General and Transferable Skills

Commentary (quoting evaluations from external evaluator and other stakeholders)

.....
.....
.....
.....

2. Achievement of programme aims

Commentary(quoting evaluations from external evaluator and other stakeholders)

.....
.....
.....

3. Assessment methods

Commentary(quoting evaluations from external evaluator and other stakeholders)

.....
.....
.....

4. Student achievement

Commentary(quoting statistics from Section B and evaluations from external evaluator and other stakeholders)

.....
.....
.....

Quality of Learning Opportunities

5. Quality of teaching and learning

Commentary on the quality of teaching and learning (quoting evaluations by stakeholders including students)

.....
.....
.....

6. Effectiveness of student support systems

Commentary on both academic and pastoral/personal support for all students

.....
.....

7. Learning resources

a. No. and ratio of faculty members and their assistants to students

.....
.....

b. Matching of faculty members' specialization to programme needs.

.....
.....

c. Availability and adequacy of programme handbook

.....
.....

d. Adequacy of library facilities.

.....

.....
e. Adequacy of laboratories

.....
f. Adequacy of computer facilities

.....
g. Adequacy of field/practical training resources

.....
h. Adequacy of any other programme needs
.....

8. Quality management

a. Availability of regular evaluation and revision system for the programme
.....

b. Effectiveness of the system
.....

c. Effectiveness of Faculty and University laws and regulations for progression and completion
.....

d. Effectiveness of programme external evaluation system:

i- External evaluators
.....

ii- Students
.....

iii- Other stakeholders
.....

e. Faculty response to student and external evaluations
.....
.....

9. Proposals for programme development

a. Programme structure (units/credit-hours)
.....
.....

b. Courses, deletions and additions and modifications
.....
.....

c. Staff development requirements
.....
.....
.....

10. Progress of previous year's action plan

Action Identified	Person Responsible	Progress of action, state if completed and any reasons for non-completion
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

11. Action plan

Action required	Person Responsible	Completion Date
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Annex

Attach all course reports as annexes

ANNEX F
GUIDELINES AND
TEMPLATES FOR
ANNUAL FACULTY SELF
EVALUATION REPORTS

Annex F

Guidelines and Template for the Annual Faculty Self Evaluation Reports

A. Preface

- 1- This document is one of a series published by the Quality Assurance and Accreditation Project (QAAP).
- 2- The objective of this document is to guide higher education institutions in the preparation of their annual report for internal auditing, and external review as an element of a process to assure quality of educational programs.
- 3- Each section of this document is structured into a series of precepts, identifying the policies and procedures which an academic institution is expected to have in order to assure the quality in its performance. Accompanying the precepts, outline guidance is provided to assist in the writing of the report; the precepts are contained in gray shaded boxes in order to be easily recognized.
- 4- The guidance accompanying the precepts offers the institution a framework for writing the report. The institution has the choice of discussing any of the guidance briefly or extensively according to their views of how best to achieve the objectives of the report.
- 5- Appendix F1: Contains the template for the report.

B- Introduction

New advancements in science and other academic areas have made the upgrading of the quality of education one of the most important challenges facing all countries of the world in order to cope with changes made necessary through the onset of globalization. Accordingly, education is a main priority in both developed and developing countries, as a strategic issue at the national level. This is because the main goal of education is to provide societies with graduates qualified to meet their professional and research needs. Those graduates are also expected to contribute effectively in drawing-up and implementing development policies and plans.

Within this framework, state policies are reformulated in order to upgrade the quality level of higher education. This is to ensure that higher education graduates meet internationally accepted standards, and that their knowledge and skills enable them to compete in local and regional job markets. Furthermore, one of the corner stones of the "National Conference for Education Reform 2000" was the establishment of the National Quality Assurance and Accreditation Project, (QAAP) which was later selected as one of six developmental projects to be implemented nationwide.

The project has adopted a policy for internal quality management and assurance of educational programmes in higher education institutions. This is carried out through annual reports based on programme and course reports drafted by educational institutions with the purpose of identifying any shortcomings, and proposing development plans to overcome them, and also providing monitoring mechanisms for their implementation.

These guidelines were prepared by the QAAP to assist higher education institutions in the preparation of their Annual Reports, in such a way as to monitor the achievement of its aims and objectives and those of the programmes for which it is responsible. Familiarity with the guidelines will also help faculty members to perform quality enhancement process in an effective way.

C- Definitions of terms used in the guidelines

Some of the terms used in these guidelines and/or used in writing the annual report may

have different meanings according to the context in which they are used. Therefore, because of possible ambiguities that may reflect on the content of the report and the understanding of its user, it was felt necessary to provide the reader with the intended meaning of these terms. In the following, we provide definitions of the terms found in this guideline.

Accreditation

The recognition accorded by the Agency to an institution which can demonstrate that its programmes meet acceptable standards and that it has in place effective systems to ensure the quality and continuing improvement of its academic activities, according to the criteria published by the Agency.

The impact of accreditation at course and programme level will be to require an assurance of the existence of a specific quality level in accordance with the institution's mission, the objectives of the programme(s) and the expectations of similar academic institutions, the students and the labour market.

Academic standards

Specific standards decided by the institution, and informed by external references and including the minimum knowledge and skills to be gained by the graduates from the programme and fulfilling the stated mission of the institution.

Benchmark

Reference points with which to compare the standards and quality of a programme. Therefore, benchmark statements represent general expectations about the standards of achievement and general attributes to be expected of a graduate in a given subject area.

Course/ programme aims

Overall course aims should be expressed as the outcomes to be achieved by students completing the course as significant, and assessable qualities.

General precepts

Principles / regulations, related to the components of the annual report, which the educational institution must have as part of the policies covering its operations.

Institution

A faculty or higher institute providing HE programmes leading to a first university degree (B.Sc. or B.A.) or a higher degree.

Intended learning outcomes (ILOs)

The ILOs are the knowledge, understanding and skills which the institution intends for its programmes that are mission-related; reflect the use of external reference standards at appropriate level.

Internal system for quality management

The system adopted by the institution to improve the level of the educational programmes and other elements affecting them. Such an outcomes-related system involves precise specifications for quality, the identification of good practice as well as of learning deficiencies and obstacles, performance follow-up, suggestions for development and enhancement, and the systematic review and development of processes for establishing effective policies, strategies and priorities to support continuing improvement.

Job market

The availability of professional, research oriented or other fields of employment, a graduate is qualified to join upon graduation

National Academic Reference Standards(NARS)

A set of reference standards produced by sector committees to guide faculties in designing their programmes to meet internationally recognized academic standards

Mission

A brief statement clearly identifying the educational institution's duty and its role in the development of the surrounding society and the nation, all in light of its strategic goals.

Peer reviewer

A person who is professionally equal in calibre and subject specialism to those delivering the provision but not from the same institution, without any conflict of interest, who can contribute to the review of an educational programme either for internal quality assurance (QA) or for accreditation purposes.

Report

The annual report of the faculty prepared on the basis of reports of its educational programme

Stakeholder

Those groups which have a legitimate interest in the educational activities of the institution both in respect of the quality and standards of the education and also in respect of the effectiveness of the systems and processes for assuring the quality. An effective strategic review process will include the key stakeholder groups. The precise range of stakeholder groups and their differentiated interests depend upon the mission, the range of educational activities in the institution and local circumstances. The range is usually defined by a scoping study. Examples of groups with a legitimate interest include current students, alumni, intending students, staff in the institution, the employing community, the sponsors and other funding organisations and, where appropriate, professional organisations.

Strategic objectives

A collection of institution-specific objectives that are derived from its mission. They are written in a general manner concentrating on the knowledge and skills that the institution intends to develop in its students.

Students' assessment

A set of processes, including examinations and other activities conducted by the institution to measure the achievement of the intended learning outcomes of a course / programme. Assessments also provide the means by which students are ranked according to their achievement.

Teaching and learning methods

The methods, which are used by teachers to help students to achieve the ILOs for the course. Examples would be: a case study to teach students how to analyse information and reach a decision; writing a review paper for the students to gain the skills of self-learning and presentation; practical sessions for the students to gain practical skills and executing experiments to train the students to analyse the results and reach specific conclusions.

I. Mission

General precepts

- 1- Every institution must have a written and well-publicized mission, stemming from the university mission. All types of activities of the institution are carried out with reference to its mission.
- 2- The mission statement must be clear and inclusive. It is with reference to the mission that the selection of the educational programmes which the institution decides to

provide will be justified. The mission statement should also define the role of the institution in research and in its contribution to the community. The mission should also determine the intended geographical sector served by the institution.

1- Existence of a mission for the institution

- Does the institution have a mission?
- If a mission statement exists, is it inclusive, publicized, and known to stakeholders?
- If the institution is preparing its mission statement now, when is it expected to be completed and published? What methods are proposed to publicize it?

2- The mission statement

- If a mission statement exists, it is necessary to present the exact statement since programme aims and intended learning outcomes are measured with reference to the mission

3- Reviewing / updating the institution mission

- Is the mission reviewed periodically?
- If the mission is reviewed regularly, what was the date (month / year) of the last review?

4-Strategic objectives

- Strategic objectives of the institution, which are approved by the relevant institutional council, should be given. Give also the number and date of the council meeting at which approval of the strategic objectives was granted.

II. Governance and Administration

General precepts

1. The institution should ensure that an effective relationship between top management and faculty staff members exists.
2. The institution should ensure that its policies and procedures assure the clarity and transparency in the decision making process.
3. The institution should ensure that the organizational structure has a degree of flexibility allowing for the changing of priorities and the reviewing of policies according to the institution's requirements
4. The institution should have procedures to deal with students complaints and resolve them effectively.
5. The institution should have procedures allowing students to submit, individually or collectively their complaints without fear of harm or disadvantage and with the assurance that privacy and confidentiality will be respected.
6. The institution should ensure that the office(s) responsible for dealing with students' complaints is (are) fair with respect to applying the bylaws, and treat students equally.
7. The institution should ensure that the office responsible for resolving students' complaints addresses the issues and offers solutions in a timely manner.

1- Organizational structure

- Description of the organizational structure
- Defining academic duties and responsibility

2- Selection of academic leadership

- What is the method of appointment of senior management (Dean, Vice-Dean, Heads of Department)?
- What is the method of appointment of academic leaders (programme – coordinators)?
- What are the criteria for appointment and the period of appointment?
- What are the duties and responsibilities? Are they approved by the institution council?

3- Effectiveness of policies, systems and practices

- Adequacy of policies for improvement and enhancement
- Adequacy of practices to achieve improvement plans
- Efficiency of the administrative system to achieve the intended goals
- Efficiency of the administrative system to deal with students problems

4- Responsiveness to changing priorities and emerging needs

- Response of the top management to changes
- Availability of a priority system to respond to change and review policies
- Mechanisms used to cope with changes
- Managing resistance to change
- Methods used to disseminate the vision for development

5- Contribution of recent improvement / enhancement activities to the strategic objectives and plans

- Types of recent quality improvement / enhancement activities
- Contribution of recent improvement / enhancement activities to the strategic objectives and plans.

6- Review of the impact of previous improvement plans

- Availability of an internal auditing system for the results of the previous improvement plans
- Mechanisms used in the internal auditing system
- Procedures for updating the improvement plans, and the extent of their effectiveness.
- Willingness and support of the top management in updating the previous improvement Plans

III. Faculty Staff Members

General precepts

- 1- The institution must have a vision for its requirements of staff members and teaching assistants
- 2- The institution must have policies and mechanisms for the professional development of the faculty staff and the teaching assistants in line with the future plans for the operation of the institution.

1- Statistics

- Number of staff members and teaching assistants distributed according to their academic degrees.

2- Adequacy of members and profiles of staff members to achieve the institution mission and strategic objectives in each of the following

- Educational programmes
- Research
- Community services
- Percentage of shortage / surplus of staff members in each discipline
- If a shortage / surplus exists, what are the institution's policies for meeting the shortage or dealing with the surplus?

3- Staff development to meet the needs of the mission and strategic objectives

- Is there a strategy for staff development?
- What are the policies and how available are training programmes for developing the capabilities of faculty staff members?
- What are the policies and how available are training programmes for developing the capabilities of other staff (technical, administrative etc.)?

- What other methods are adopted by the institution to develop the capabilities of all staff members. and how effective are these methods?

4- Review of the policies implemented to develop capabilities of staff members

- What actions have actually been implemented as a result of the improvement policies suggested in previous years?
- Which of the improvement policies suggested in the previous year have not been implemented? What are the obstacles that caused the non-implementation of those policies?

IV: Educational Programmes

General precepts

- 1- Academic institutions should ensure that their responsibilities for the standards and quality of their educational programmes are discharged effectively through their procedures which include:
 - The design of programmes
 - Monitoring / reviewing of programme development
- 2- Academic institutions should clearly define (and provide justification for) the academic standards and the quality of the learning opportunities of its educational programmes
- 3- Academic institutions should ensure that the roles and responsibilities of the different bodies involved in designing and reviewing their programmes (departments, department councils, educational development committee, faculty, university and sectoral committee) are clearly defined.
- 4- Academic institutions should have monitoring procedures:
 - To ensure that programmes remain current in the light of developing knowledge in the discipline and practice in its application.
 - To evaluate the extent to which the intended learning outcomes are being attained by students in accordance with the programme academic standards referenced to the mission.
- 5- To make available the necessary publications, presenting clearly, the regulations governing the educational programmes and procedures for admission and withdrawal.
Note: The discussion under this section should take account of all of the programme reports for the academic year. The findings from these reports should be integrated into each of the sub-headings, below. It is not necessary to provide the detailed information contained in these reports, but they should all be attached to the faculty annual report as an annex.

1- Statistics

In this section, provide overall statistics for the institution. The statistical details for individual programmes will be contained in the programme reports

- Number of graduates for the current academic year (of each programme and of the institution)

1- Percentage of graduates in each grade

- List of available educational programmes
- Number of students registering in each programme
- Indicators for admission in the different programmes.

Comment on these overall statistics, identify any poorer than expected performances, suggest reasons and propose remedies.

Identify also any better than expected performances and identify areas of good practice which might contribute to this performance and are capable of being replicated in other programmes.

2- Educational programmes framework

- Number of credit hours or courses per programmes
- Percentages of courses forming the different components of the academic structure of the programme:
 - Basic sciences
 - Social sciences and humanities
 - Specialization
 - Computer sciences
 - Practical training
 - Others

V: Academic Standards

In the following sections, using the information provided in the programme reports, comment on the overall achievement of academic standards.

Identify any examples of high programme achievement, together with examples of good practice which could be replicated in other programmes. Also identify any examples of programmes falling short of the reference standards, give reasons and proposed remedies

1. Academic standards compared with reference standards

- General standards and their relationship to the reference standards including NARS
- To what extent is the programme current to recent academic developments?
- Have the aims of the programmes been achieved, if not why not?
- Have the programme intended learning outcomes (ILOs) been achieved, if not why not?
- How appropriate are the design and structure of the curricula in achieving reference standards? Are there any recommendations for improvement?

2- Student assessment

- Are different types of assessment used in order to assess student performance effectively in respect of the achievement of all of the intended learning outcomes for courses and programmes, if not, why not?
- Does the language used in assessments coincide with that of teaching, if not why not?
- Are students provided with grading criteria for assessments, so that they are aware of what is required of them, if not why not ?
- Was the examination grading system appropriate, if not why not?
- Are students given effective feedback from their assessments so that they can learn from them, if not why not?
- Does the institution have policies and procedures for the constitution of examiners boards?
- Were there external evaluators, if not why not?
- If so, what were their comments in respect of the appropriateness of the assessment methods used with reference to the intended learning outcomes, the academic level of the assessments with reference to the external references, the appropriateness of the gradings awarded and the fairness and efficiency of the assessment methods and procedures?
- Did any difficulties arise as a result of the examination scheduling system?

- Are there effective procedures for reviewing examination results in the event of students' complaints?
- Are the systems and timing of the notification of results of assessments appropriate?

3- Student retention and progression

From the statistics produced in the programme reports, comment on the retention and progression rates for all levels. Identify programmes where retention and progression rates are high and identify the reasons and any elements of good practice, which could be replicated in other programmes. Similarly, identify programmes where retention and progression are disappointing. Indicate reasons and make proposals for improvement.

4. Student achievement, including employment opportunities and take-up

From the statistics produced in the programme reports, comment on the achievement of students, in respect of the number and percentages of final grades. Identify programmes where achievement is high and identify the reasons and any elements of good practice, which could be replicated in other programmes. Similarly, identify programmes where achievement is disappointing. Indicate reasons and make proposals for improvement.

What is the vision of the academic institution with respect to the employment opportunities for the graduates in relation to:

- The availability of appropriate employment opportunities
- Appropriateness of the opportunities to the academic qualification
- Which new specialisms are required by the job market, which are not currently included in the educational programmes of the institution. Is the institution producing graduates in specialisms, in excess of the job market requirements?
- Propose any remedial measures which might be required.

5. External evaluation of the performance of students and the academic standards achieved

- Opinions of external evaluators
- Opinions of other stakeholders, employers, industrial representative

VI: Quality of Learning Opportunities

General precepts

- 1- Institutions should ensure that their facilities and resources are adequate to achieve the intended learning outcomes.
- 2- Institutions should have policies that assure students that they have equal rights in the allocation of resources.
- 3- Institutions should have policies to enable students to participate in all aspects of the academic social life of the institution.
- 4- Institutions should provide services to help students to interact with their colleagues and the academic environment.
- 5- Institutions should have policies to ensure the quality of learning opportunities to disabled students and to high achievers.
- 6- Institutions should provide services to support disabled students and help them to be committed to and participate in the academic life.

1- Teaching and learning

- What are the strategies for teaching and learning in the different programmes?
- Which methods are used to help students to achieve the intended learning outcomes?
- What are the students' opinions of the quality of teaching and learning?

- What means exist for helping students' independent learning and self evaluation?

2- Student support, academic and pastoral

- What are the systems for academic support?
 - What is the tutorial system, for groups and for individual students?
 - Do individual students have a member of faculty as a personal tutor?
 - Are faculty members available for timetabled tutorial sessions?
 - What facilities exist to identify, at an early stage, students, who are at risk of failure? What measures are taken to support them?
 - What facilities exist to support outstanding students to enhance further their academic achievement?
 - Are there individual programme handbooks?
- What are the systems for pastoral support?
- Does the tutorial system provide adequate pastoral support?
- Is there a student handbook (guide) to show the educational schedules, regulations and instructions of the different departments, participation in students activities, and available services? .
 - Facilities and services for students with disabilities to help them to participate in academic social life.
 - Facilities services for outstanding students.
 - Students activities and accommodation and health services.
- Are there any means of financial support for students?

3- Learning resources

- Adequacy of the Faculty, technical and administrative staff (numbers – qualifications).
- The Library
 - Accommodation (study space, ventilation, lighting)
 - Working hours
 - Adequacy of textbooks and periodicals (availability, number,)
 - Adequacy of services (searching internet, electronic library).
- Computing facilities (number, software, internet,etc.).
- Laboratories and equipment.
 - Adequacy of equipments to the needs of the practical sessions and research work.
 - Adequacy of laboratories (spacing, lighting, and ventilation).
- Teaching halls.
 - Adequacy of halls (number of seats, space, lighting, and ventilation).
 - Adequacy of audiovisual aids (number and capacity).

4- Student feedback on courses

- Is there a system for course evaluation on the part of the student?
- What is the response of the faculty staff to the evaluation system?
- To what extent does the institution comply with the system of evaluation?
- To what extent does the system of evaluation participate in the development of the academic programmes?

VII: Quality Management and Enhancement

General precepts

Institutions should have policies for quality management and enhancement. These should ensure precise identification of teaching and learning obstacles, suggestions for enhancement, modification of policies and setting of priorities according to the real needs of the institution and the students, following the implementation of enhancement policies

1- The institution's strategy for enhancement.

- What is the institution's strategy for enhancement?
- What are the mechanisms of the enhancement strategy?
- What are the enhancement procedures concerned with?
 - What are the mechanisms for monitoring the effectiveness of teaching and learning in the institution
 - What are the committee structures for monitoring the effectiveness of teaching and learning
 - What are the mechanisms for disseminating and implementing policies

2- The extent of implementing the university's policies and regulations

3- The extent of the engagement with the stakeholders to gain the community's trust in the

academic programmes

- What are the policies, plans and mechanisms in this respect?
- Which are the collaborative bodies?
- What is the extent of the response to the stakeholder's views in the enhancement of the academic programmes?

4- The extent of the effectiveness of the internal review system for quality assurance.

- The quality of the annual programme reports
- The extent to which the academic departments adhere to the enhancement plans
- The responsiveness of the academic faculty staff to the enhancement plans
- Are the course and programme reports rigorously completed including feedback from students and external evaluators

5- The issues from any external review report

- Does the institution have any policies and / or procedures for the assessment of overall student performance? If so, does this occur by:
 - Peer reviewers report
 - External evaluators comments
 - Stakeholders, including students, feedback
 - Others (specify)?
- What are the concerns and comments of the external reviewers (if any)?
- What are the issues for which agreed actions are taken?
- What are the issues for which no actions are taken? and why?

6- Review of the last enhancement plans for improving the quality of education.

- What are the enhancement policies that are being implemented?
- What are the enhancement policies that have not been implemented?
- What are the obstacles to implementation?

7- Action Plan for the coming year

- Is there such a plan?
- Does it provide for clearly specified actions?
- Are individual responsibilities for the completion of the actions clearly specified?
- Are there target dates for the completion and are they adhered to?

VIII: Research and Other Scholastic Activities

General precepts

- 1- Institutions should adopt defined policies that ensure freedom for research and creativity

for the faculty staff.

- 2- Institutions should have a committee for research administration, planning , implementation and enhancement.
- 3- Institutions should have policies for the development of research skills of the faculty members.
- 4- Institutions should have a database of conducted and published research.

1- Research plans

- Do academic departments have an endorsed and documented research plan?
- To what extent are the academic departments integrated and coherent in setting the research plans?
- What are the mechanisms used for the assessment and acceptance of research?
- Are the research plans reviewed regularly? And what is the timing of any review?
- To what extent do the topics of the research plans conform with recent subject area developments?
- Are there available policies and procedures for the construction of research plans?

2- Participation of faculty members in research activity

- Number and proportion of research-active faculty members
- Number and proportion of participating faculty members with other academic departments, colleges, universities.
- To what extent are the interests and specialisms of the faculty members matched to the implementation of the research plans?
- What are the policies for encouraging the faculty staff to conduct collaborative research?
- Are there available policies and plans for the enhancement of the research skills of the faculty staff?

3- Awards offered by the institution

- Diplomas /Masters /Doctorates

4- Awards given by the institution in the current academic year.

- Number of Diploma/Masters/Doctorates awarded
- Are there any departments/sections, which are relatively inactive in this area?
Give reasons and propose remedies

5- Sources and amount of research funds.

- Total budget allocated for research activity from the university/private sector/public sector /NGOs / other sectors.
- What are the regulations for the distribution of the research budget?
- To what extent does the research budget facilitate the implementation of the research plan?
- Number of collaboration research protocols with different sectors.

6- Published research in conferences and periodicals.

- Number of publications in research conferences (national/ international).
- Number of publications in research periodicals (national/ international).

7- Contribution of faculty members in seminars and conferences

- Number of contributions by faculty members in research conferences (national/ international)
- Number of contributions by faculty members in seminars and workshops.

8- Reviewing of the last recommendations for research enhancement

- Which are the enhancement policies that are being implemented?
- Which are the enhancement policies that have not been implemented?
- What are the reasons or obstacles preventing implementation?

9- Propose an action plan for the coming year, with clearly stated responsibilities and timescales.

IX: Community Involvement

General precepts

Institutions should have:

- Clear policies for community services
- Mechanism(s) to measure the real needs of the community

1-Contribution of the institution in community, society and environmental affairs.

- Number of community service units within the institute
- Community services at national level
 - Training programmes
 - Workshops and seminars
 - Conferences
 - Technical services
 - Others
- Community services at international level
- Technical consultations
- What is the evaluation mechanism of the institution for the impact of community services?
- What are the mechanism(s) that the institution uses to assess the real community needs?

2- Evaluation of end users for community services quality.

- What are the mechanisms applied to measure the opinion of end users on the impact of institutional community services?
- What are the opinions of end users in the quality of institutional community services?

3- Review of the last recommendations for community services enhancement.

- What are the enhancement policies that are being implemented?
- What are the enhancement policies which have not been implemented? What are the obstacles to implementation?

4- Propose an action plan for the coming year, with clearly stated responsibilities and timescales.

X: Consolidated Developmental Plans

Consider all of the proposals for action and development arising from all sections of the report. These should be carefully prioritised, taking into account the time and resources required for each action/development. The suggested plan for development of each criterion should be stated according to its priority, with clearly defined outcomes, responsibilities and timescales.

XI: Proposals for the Improvement of the Process of Review and Reporting.

Make any proposals or suggestions for the improvement of the process of selfevaluation and annual reporting, together with constructive comments on the templates and guidelines that support reviews at course, programme, and faculty level, following early experiences.

APPENDIX F1
TEMPLATE FOR
ANNUAL FACULTY SELFEVALUATION
REPORTS

Template for Annual Faculty Self-Evaluation Reports

Preambles

This template lists the main and sub-headings for the production of the report. The report requires an analysis of the year's activities of the institution in the three areas covered by the institution's mission, educational programmes, research and other scholarly activity and community involvement. In each of the three areas, the analysis should review the activities in the previous academic year against the actions planned for that year to conform with the Mission Statement. A set of action plans should then be drawn up to guide the activities for the coming academic year.

I. Mission

- 1- Existence of a mission for the institution
- 2- The mission statement
- 3- Reviewing / updating the institution mission
- 4- Strategic objectives

II. Governance and Administration

- 1- Organizational structure
- 2- Selection of academic leadership
- 3- Effectiveness of policies, systems and practices
- 4- Responsiveness to changing priorities and emerging needs
- 5- Contribution of recent improvement / enhancement activities to the strategic objectives and plans
- 6- Review of the impact of the previous improvement plan

III. Faculty Staff Members

- 1- Statistics
- 2- Adequacy of members and profiles of staff members to achieve the institution mission and strategic objectives
- 3- Staff development to meet the needs of the mission and strategic objectives
- 4- Review of the policies implemented to develop capabilities of staff members

IV: Educational Programmes

- 1- Statistics
- 2- Educational programme framework

V: Academic Standards

- 1- Academic standards compared with reference standards
- 2- Student assessment
- 3- Student retention and progression
- 4- Student achievement, including employment opportunities and take-up
- 5- External evaluation of the quality of performance and academic standards achieved by students/graduates

VI: Quality of Learning Opportunities

- 1- Teaching and learning
- 2- Students support
- 3- Learning resources
- 4- Student feedback on courses

VII: Quality Management

- 1- The institution's vision for enhancement.
- 2- The extent of implementing the university's policies/ regulations.
- 3- The extent of the engagement with the stakeholders to gain the community's trust

in the academic programmes.

- 4- The extent of the effectiveness of the internal review system for quality assurance.
- 5- The issues arising from any external review report.
- 6- Review of the last enhancement/action plan for improving the quality of education.
- 7- Action plan for the coming academic year.

VIII: Research and other scholastic activities

- 1- Research plans.
- 2- Participation of faculty members in research activity.
- 3- Awards offered by the institution.
- 4- Current awards offered by the institution.
- 5- Sources and level of research funds.
- 6- Published research in conferences and periodicals.
- 7- Contribution of faculty members in seminars and conferences.
- 8- Review of the last recommendations for research enhancement.

IX: Community Involvement

- 1- Contribution of the institution in community, society and environmental affairs.
- 2- Evaluation of end users for community services quality.
- 3- Reviewing of the last recommendations for community services enhancement.
- 4- Action plan for the coming academic year.

X: Consolidated Developmental Plans

XI: Proposals for the improvement of the process of internal annual review and reporting including the effectiveness of the templates and the accompanying guidelines at course, programme and faculty levels.

Annex H

Outline typical site-visit schedule

Site Visit Schedule

Preliminary Meeting: approximately one month before the scheduled site-visit, held at the institution. Persons attending will normally include the review chair, the facilitator and the Dean. A member of the QAAP and a representative of the University's Quality Assurance Centre may also be present. The review chair will take notes of the meeting and circulate them to the review team and facilitator.

Agenda:

1. Introductions, reviewers who will visit and any clarification of the roles (annexes A, B and C in the Handbook) and published method for the development engagement.
2. Faculty Annual Self-Evaluation Report: does it comply with the template? (a report for the most recent academic year, supported by programme specification(s), course specifications, the most recent annual programme report, course reports for every course offered in the appropriate academic year, action plans within the programme and course reports consolidated into a coherent action plan for the faculty). The review chair should give the institution clear information about any gaps or inconsistencies in the information provided that must be put right before the site-visit, record this in the note of the meeting together with the institution's response. The site visit should not take place if these documents have not been satisfactorily completed.
3. Additional supporting documentation required (with reference to the Handbook paragraph 49) and the access required to the sample of assessed student work (control room access).
4. Proposed schedule for the site-visit: pre-arranged meetings and who should attend; prompts and aide-memoires for the meeting provided in the Handbook (paragraphs 46 to 47 and annexes I, J, K and L). The possibility of class observations and information on classes being held during the site-visit will also be considered. The Faculty is asked to arrange the scheduled meetings, or to suggest an alternative. The Facilitator will confirm the final arrangements and the review chair will finalise the visit schedule and circulate it before day 0 to reviewers, the QAAP office and the institution.
5. Arrangements for base room and logistics (visit secretary, desktop PC, printer and photocopier, indexing and access to additional supporting documentation, and refreshments for the reviewers).

Initial Team meeting

The chair organises a team meeting before the visit. The chair will also, before Day 0, collate written contributions, covering all of the sections, from the team members to produce a first review report Draft 0. This is compiled from reviewers who will have read the complete FAR, made their analysis and prepared for their allocated section(s) draft paragraphs using the aide-memoire in annex I and report template. The meeting will be supported before and after by e-mail contact between reviewers. Draft 0 forms the basis of continued report writing and re-drafting throughout the site-visit.

Day Zero

This should be arranged so that if possible the team should be able to meet for three hours with the facilitator present. The meeting will include a guided introduction to the base room and its documentation. It should discuss all of the preliminary contributions to obtain a consensus of opinion on all sections, agree the lines of enquiry and who is to chair and record each scheduled meeting and any other activities. The review chair will also supply printed forms from annexes M (review of assessed work) and N (class observations) to the reviewers.

Day 1

0815-0830 Team arrives at Faculty

0830 - 0900 Welcome and brief introductions by the institution's senior representative (Dean) to the visiting reviewers.

0900 - 0915 Meeting of Chair and Facilitator with University President or nominee and other senior staff including the Dean.

0915 -1100 Meeting of reviewers with the Faculty: Academic Standards

This meeting will seek to establish how the faculty defines its academic standards, its Intended Learning Outcomes and the design and content of the curricula. The institution will be invited by the reviewers to clarify the overall shape of the programmes. The reviewers will wish to explore the uses made of external reference points with particular reference to the national academic reference standards (NARS) and any other external recognition.

The curriculum should be explored in detail. It should establish clearly how the various courses seek to achieve the overall programme ILOs and how the intended learning objectives are delivered. It should establish how academic progression for the individual student is secured over the entire programme.

1130 - 1400 Reviewers will visit the Control room

This visit is to enable the reviewers to scrutinise a sample of the examination papers set and the students' marked examination scripts, as well as the marks and grades awarded and the record sheets. This scrutiny is to allow reviewers to make judgements on the academic standards actually achieved by the students, as well as the appropriateness of the assessment and the marks and grades awarded.

1400 - 1430 Meeting between reviewers and selected staff on research and other scholarly activity

1430 – 1500 Meeting between reviewers and selected staff on community involvement

1500 – 1600 Meeting of all reviewers with representative group of current students The students should be a representative group across the educational programmes who are at various stages of their programme. The protocol and agenda are in the Handbook (annex J).

1600 – 1700 Learning Resources tour(s) This should include the library and all facilities used by the students, including a representative sample of study areas and IT. Individual reviewers may wish to return to these individually to explore detailed provision in specialist fields.

1700 – 1800 Meetings with groups of recent graduates, and some employers of graduates and those who have supplied any summer training or internships. This meeting should allow team members to produce any modifications to their earlier contributions to be given to the visit secretary on the morning of Day 2

1800 – 1900 Review team meeting: review of day 1 and progress check in preparation for meeting at 0830 day 2 on the evidence base and schedule of meetings.

Day 2

0830-0900 Meeting with Dean or nominee and facilitator to consider evidence base and progress, and to check the day's programme. Introduction of visit secretary (orientation, personal introductions and tasks).

0900-1100 Meeting with appropriate (all) faculty members on Assessment and Achievement.

This meeting will seek to clarify the assessment strategy, the range of assessment methods and how assessment relates to ILOs. It will also explore marking, verification and moderation and how feedback is given to students. Achievement in terms of students attaining the ILOs, moderation, the evidence of retention and progression throughout the programme and the employment record/destinations of graduates will also be explored.

1100-1200 Meeting with current students undertaking projects (say, 8 - 12 students)

This provides an opportunity to talk to individual students in depth about their projects and the level of guidance, support and arrangements for assessment.

1200-1400 Meeting of reviewers with appropriate Faculty: Quality of Learning Opportunities: teaching and learning, academic and social/pastoral support and use of available resources (e.g. faculty staff, equipment, accommodation, reading, library and internet).

This meeting should seek to establish the overall approach to learning opportunities and also the strategy for learning and teaching. What range of methods do students experience, what is the nature of teaching/practicals/internships etc.. What teaching materials are available and how are they used? How does the institution support the students in their studies and how does it encourage skills development to achieve the range of ILOs (e.g. self-learning)? How is the quality and consistency of teaching and students' academic and personal support assured?

1400 – 1600 This period can be used for individual reviewers to continue to read any documentation provided and work with the visit secretary to prepare notes of evidence and re-draft written paragraphs for circulation at the next review team meeting.

1600 – 1800 Review team meeting: Review evidence base and day 3 schedule, identify (provisionally) emerging strengths and weaknesses and adjust the planned tasks and priorities. Update contributions to report for the visit secretary. Attend any ad hoc meetings which have become necessary and agree points to raise at the 0830 meeting in next day.

Day 3

0830 - 0900 Meeting with Dean or nominee and facilitator to consider evidence base, any gaps to pursue and check or fine-tune the day's programme.

0900 – 1030 Meeting of reviewers with senior members of the university and the Dean and other staff in the faculty: Effectiveness of Quality Management and Enhancement

This meeting will explore the effectiveness of the arrangements in place, including the mission, governance and the impact of any recent developments to the quality assurance system and procedures, and the features addressed (or not) in the action plans and programme and course reports. The wider consideration of enhancement strategies including staff development programmes and their impact, the quality of the developing internal review processes including action planning, reporting and documentation may also be considered here.

1030 – 1300 Time for reviewers to progress-chase any remaining lines of enquiry, attend any ad hoc meetings, make notes to update draft of report for circulation to the team via the visit secretary and prepare for the final team meeting.

1300 – 1600 Final Team meeting. All aspects of the draft report considered in detail, judgements agreed, bullet points for feedback agreed, all continually copied and pasted into the Draft of the report by the visit secretary under the guidance of the review chair.

- 1630. Oral Feedback Meeting to key staff. The institution will decide who should attend this meeting. If it is thought desirable, all Faculty members may attend.
- 1631. 1630 End of site visit. Review team departs.

Immediately after the site-visit

Review chair notifies QAAP of outcomes of the site-visit.

Preparation of Draft 1 Developmental Engagement Review Report by the review chair for circulation to the review team.

ANNEX I
PROMPTS FOR
INSTITUTIONS, REVIEWERS,
STUDENTS AND OTHERS
PARTICIPATING
IN THE PROCESS
ANALYSIS OF SELF-STUDY
AND EVALUATION OF THE
EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMMES

Prompts for Institutions, Reviewers, Students and others Participating in Reviews in Developmental Engagement and Accreditation

Introduction

1. Institutions, reviewers, students and other directly involved in the quality assurance processes may find the following set of prompts useful reference points for development of quality assurance processes and the conduct of reviews. They are based on the template for annual self-evaluation reports (annex F) and the criteria for accreditation (annex P). They may use it for the preparation and analysis of the annual self-evaluation report prior to developmental engagements and the accreditation reviews; collection of evidence during the reviews; meetings between reviewers and staff and students in the institution, discussions with others who have an interest in the academic standards and quality of the programmes and other activities provided by the institution, and for the preparation and compilation of the report of the review.
2. The prompts are neither prescriptive nor exhaustive. The range of activities in the institution, the self-study and annual reports, the nature of the educational programmes together with the statement of aims and the intended outcomes of programmes may all raise issues specific to the provision under scrutiny.
3. The prompts for reviewers are set out under a series of headings. They follow the three principal activities in institutions and also address the development of quality assurance systems and processes:
 - Educational programmes leading to an award
 - Research and other scholarly activity
 - Community involvement
4. The largest of these activities, educational programmes, is also the most complex and the majority of the prompts support the evaluation of these. The prompts are organised to reflect the processes of self-evaluation, internal reporting, developmental engagements and accreditation. The external review at the stages of developmental engagements and accreditation focuses on the setting of academic standards by the subject provider, their achievement by students, the quality of the learning opportunities offered, the contributions made by research and other scholarly activity and community involvement, and the effectiveness of the institution's quality management and enhancement, including progress in the development of quality assurance systems. These essential elements are inter-related and cannot be viewed in isolation. Nevertheless the prompts offer a flexible yet consistent structure for conducting internal and external reviews. The framework for evaluation provides a summary together with the criteria for accreditation:

Framework for evaluation

Academic Standards

- **Intended learning outcomes:**

“The institution has intended learning outcomes for its programmes that are missionrelated, reflect the use of relevant external reference standards, and are at an appropriate level.”

- **Curricula**

“The curricula for the programme facilitate the attainment of the stated intended learning outcomes.”

- **Student assessment**

“There is an appropriate range of assessment methods that enables the students to demonstrate the attainment of intended learning outcomes.”

“The students are well-informed on the criteria by which they are assessed and given appropriate, structured feedback that supports their continuing learning.”

- **Student achievement**

“Levels of students’ achievements are maintained with due regard to the use of external reference points, moderation and evaluation of achievement.”

Quality of Learning Opportunities

- **Teaching and learning**

“There are effective teaching and learning, informed by a shared, strategic view of learning and the selection of appropriate teaching methods; and due attention is paid to the encouragement of independent learning.”

- **Student support**

“Academic and pastoral support for the students ensure that they can progress satisfactorily through their programme and are informed about their progress.”

- **Learning resources**

“The institution’s facilities for learning are appropriate and used effectively.”

“The institution’s staff (academic and support, technical and administrative members) are adequate and meet the requirements of the academic standards and strategies for learning and teaching.”

“The staff of the institution are competent to teach, facilitate learning, and maintain a scholarly approach to their teaching and to their discipline.”

Research and Other Scholarly Activity

- **Effectiveness of plans and the scale of activity**

- **Distinguishing features**

- **How the activities relate to the other academic activities in the institution**

“The institution’s organisation of research and other scholarly activity, and any related teaching and supervision of doctoral students, is appropriate to the institution’s mission.”

Community Involvement

- **The contribution it makes**

- **The range of activities, and how it relates to the institution’s mission and plan**

- **Examples of effective practice**

“The institution, informed by its mission, makes a significant contribution to the community it serves, to society and to the wider environment.”

The Effectiveness of Quality Management and Enhancement

- **Governance and leadership**

- **Quality assurance systems**

- **Self-evaluation, improvement plans and the impact of earlier improvement plans**

“Governance, management and quality assurance systems are sufficient to manage existing academic activities and respond to development and change.”

“The academic leadership in the institution provides a sound and sustainable basis for academic activities to flourish in an atmosphere conducive to promoting learning.”

“Self-evaluation, internal reporting and improvement plans are open, transparent, focused and supportive of continuing improvement.”

“The institution has mechanisms for receiving and processing the views of those

*with a legitimate interest in its activities (the range of stakeholder groups).”
“Effective and prompt action is taken to promote strengths, address any weaknesses
and demonstrate responsibility and accountability.”*

5. The remainder of this annex is divided into two sections that help to set the parameters for the review as a whole. Section 1 offers a structure for the analysis of the annual self-evaluation report or an equivalent self-study. Section 2 consists of detailed prompts to address the range of the review and comprises:
- A set of questions, for gathering information;
 - The key issues for evaluation;
 - An indication of likely sources of information and evidence;
 - An indication of the types of evidence-gathering activity likely to be undertaken during a review;
 - The judgements that reviewers will make on the basis of the evidence.
6. Reviewers and others using the prompts should also refer to the criteria for accreditation in (annex P) and to the framework for evaluation.

SECTION 1

SELF-EVALUATION REPORT ANALYSIS

Intended for internal and external review, the following prompts support the compilation and quality assurance of the self-evaluation report and its subsequent analysis by external reviewers in preparation for the site visit. The template used for the analysis and evaluation is developed from the terms of reference and criteria for self-study published by the National Committee in 2003.

- i. Does the self-evaluation report address all academic activities(educational programmes, research and development and community involvement)?
- ii. Does the self-evaluation report comply with the template?
- iii. Is there a clear mission statement?
- iv. Are the evaluations of each activity informed by a clear statement of aims, and are these aims related to the mission?
- v. Are there programme specifications for each of the educational programmes and for the named programmes within the community involvement activity?
- vi. Is the evaluation supported by evidence and clear references to a supporting evidence base?
- vii. Are data sets in use and are they comprehensive and dependable?
- viii. Do quality enhancement and the review of the impact of earlier improvement plans feature?
- ix. Does the self-evaluation demonstrate a commitment to accountability, and reflect engagements with the range of stakeholder groups?
- x. In terms of the quality and effectiveness of the educational programmes, does the self-evaluation report:
 - Suggest that it arises from established and/or developing internal review processes?
 - Address any collaborative arrangements?
 - Draw upon the course reports and any previous annual or periodic reports?
 - Demonstrate outcomes-related and strategic approaches to quality assurance?
 - Address academic standards?
 - Focus on the students’ learning opportunities and achievements?
 - Adopt an analytical, evidence-based and evaluative approach?
 - Set a realistic agenda for action/improvement?

- xi. Is there evidence that good practice and needs for development are identified, addressed and followed up?
- xii. Under each main heading in the self-evaluation, what are the main strengths, weaknesses and issues that deserve further attention? (This freehand list can be used to inform the discussions that take place during the site visit).

SECTION 2

A: ACADEMIC STANDARDS of EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMMES

Intended learning outcomes

Evaluation of the intended learning outcomes in relation to the broad aims of the provision and to any applicable external reference points.

Reviewers should ask:

What are the intended learning outcomes for a programme?

How do they relate to the overall aims of the provision as stated by the institution?

Are they appropriate to the aims?

How do they relate to external reference points including, where applicable, relevant reference standards and any requirements by professional organisations?

Potential sources of information and evidence will include the self-study, programme specifications, the most recent annual reports, curricular documents, subject benchmark statements, and details of requirements of professional organisations.

Review activities may also include analysis of programme content and discussions with members of the teaching staff. They should then evaluate the intended learning outcomes against the aims of the provision as described in the self-evaluation and against relevant external reference points. As a result of these activities reviewers should be able to judge:

- whether the intended learning outcomes are clearly stated;
- whether they reflect appropriately the overall aims of the provision and relevant benchmark statements or other external references.

Evaluation of the effectiveness of the means by which the subject provider designs curricula that support the attainment of the intended learning outcomes.

Reviewers should ask:

How does the institution ensure that curriculum content enables students to achieve the intended learning outcomes?

How does the institution ensure that the design and organisation of the curriculum is effective in promoting student learning and achievement of the intended learning outcomes?

Sources of information and evidence will include institutional curricular documents and curricular review and validation reports. Reviewers should seek information about levels and modes of study, breadth and depth of study, inter- and multi-disciplinarity, coherence, flexibility and student choice, as well as the role of professional and/or statutory bodies where relevant.

Review activities, may also include discussions with members of the teaching teams, support staff and administrative staff, and discussions with students. They should then evaluate the effectiveness of the way in which the institution plans, designs and approves the curricula.

As a result of these activities reviewers should be able to assess the adequacy of procedures for ensuring that programmes are designed to enable students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

Evaluation of the means by which the intended learning outcomes are communicated to students, staff and others with a direct interest, such as potential employers.

Reviewers should ask:

How are the intended learning outcomes of a programme and its constituent parts communicated to staff, students and external examiners?

Do the students know what is expected of them?

Sources of information and evidence will include course or programme, validation or accreditation documents, and professional and/or statutory body accreditation reports .

Review activities may also include discussions with teaching teams and students. They should then evaluate the way in which subject providers convey their expectations to staff and students. As a result of these activities, reviewers should be able to judge the adequacy of arrangements within the subject for communicating intended learning outcomes.

Curricula

Evaluation of the means by which the institution creates the conditions for the attainment of the intended learning outcomes.

Reviewers should ask:

Do the design and content of the curricula support the attainment of the intended learning outcomes in terms of knowledge, cognitive skills (including practical/professional skills), transferable skills, progression to employment and/or further study, and personal development?

Sources of information and evidence will include subject or programme handbooks and curricular documents, such as module or unit guides, practical or placement handbooks, and further study and employment statistics.

Review activities will also include evaluation of curricular documents and discussions with staff and students. They should then evaluate the design and content of the curriculum for each programme in relation to its potential for enabling students to achieve the intended learning outcomes. As a result of these activities reviewers should be able to judge whether the intended learning outcomes are adequately supported by the curricula.

Evaluation of the breadth, depth and currency of the curricula.

Reviewers should ask:

Is the curriculum content appropriate, in breadth and depth, to each stage of the programme, and to the level of the award and does it secure academic and intellectual progression by imposing increasing demands on the learner, over time, in terms of the acquisition of knowledge and skills, the capacity for conceptualisation, and increasing autonomy in learning?

And also:

Is there evidence that curricular content and design is informed by current research and other scholarly activity, by any changes in relevant occupational or professional requirements and by recent developments in approaches to teaching and learning in the discipline?

Sources of information and evidence will include course or programme specifications, validation or accreditation documents, and professional and/or statutory body accreditation reports.

Review activities may also include discussions with staff, discussions with professional and/or statutory bodies, and discussions with employers (where relevant and possible). They should then evaluate whether the curriculum is appropriate in these respects and whether it is adequately informed by the wider range of academic activities and recent

developments in teaching and learning approaches. As a result of these activities, reviewers should be able to assess the breadth, depth and currency of the curricula.

Assessment

Evaluation of the assessment process and the standards it demonstrates.

Reviewers should ask:

Does the assessment process enable learners to demonstrate achievement of the intended learning outcomes?

Are there criteria that enable internal and external examiners to distinguish between different categories of achievement?

Can there be full confidence in the objectivity, fairness and transparency of assessment procedures?

Does the assessment strategy have an adequate formative function in promoting Student learning, and how (e.g. feedback, further reading tasks)?

Sources of information and evidence will include assessment criteria and guidance to markers, external evaluators reports and procedures for monitoring and recording achievement.

Review activities may also include discussions with teaching teams, students and external evaluators and the analysis of the methods for recording progress and achievement. They should then evaluate whether the overall assessment process and the particular assessment methods chosen are appropriate and effective. As a result of these activities, reviewers should be able to judge whether assessment processes can adequately measure achievement of the intended programme outcomes.

Student achievement

Evaluation of student achievement of appropriate standards.

Reviewers should ask:

What evidence is there that the standards achieved by students / graduates meet the minimum expectations for the award, as measured against the intended learning outcomes, relevant reference standards and any other applicable requirements?

Sources of information and evidence will include the programme specification, external evaluators' reports, examination board minutes, records of pass rates, and samples of student work. Relevant reference standards will be an important point of comparison.

Review activities may also include discussions with teaching teams and the programme leader/group and the examiners. They should then evaluate whether student achievement meets or exceeds the minimum expectations. As a result of these activities, reviewers should be able to judge whether appropriate standards are being achieved.

B. Quality of Learning Opportunities

Teaching and learning

Evaluation of the quality of the teaching delivered by staff and how it leads to learning by students.

Reviewers should ask:

How effective is teaching in relation to curriculum content and programme aims?

How effectively do staff draw upon their research, scholarship or professional activity to inform their teaching?

How good are the materials, including e-learning, provided to support learning?

Is there effective engagement with and participation by students?

Is the quality of teaching maintained and enhanced through effective staff development, peer review of teaching, integration of part-time and visiting staff, effective team teaching and induction and mentoring of new staff?

How effectively is learning facilitated in terms of student workloads?

Sources of information and evidence will include student questionnaires, internal review documents, staff development documents, subject or programme handbooks, and academic staff appointment documents.

Review activities may also include direct observation of teaching and practical workshop sessions, discussions with staff, and discussions with students. As a result of these activities reviewers should be able to make an overall judgement about the quality of teaching and learning opportunities and the extent to which teaching and learning contribute to the achievement of the intended learning outcomes. They should then evaluate the overall effectiveness of the teaching and learning activities, including:

- the breadth, depth, pace and challenge of teaching;
- whether there is suitable variety of appropriate teaching methods;
- whether there are suitable opportunities for guided and independent learning by students;
- the effectiveness of the teaching and learning of subject knowledge; and
- the effectiveness of the learning of subject-specific, transferable and practical skills.

Student support

Evaluation of the quality of student progression and academic support.

Reviewers should ask:

Is there an appropriate overall strategy for academic support, including written guidance, which is consistent with the student profile and the overall aims of the provision?

Are there effective arrangements for admission and induction, which are generally understood by staff and applicants?

Are arrangements made to identify and support students with special learning needs, including distinguished students?

If the language of teaching is not Arabic, do students have an adequate level of skills in the language? Do students receive adequate foreign language support to support their learning (for example, to enable them to access up-to-date textbooks, technical literature, the Internet)?

How effectively is learning facilitated by academic guidance, feedback and supervisory arrangements?

Are the arrangements for academic tutorial support clear, effective and generally understood by staff and students?

Are students involved in the social activities of the institution?

Are students who are studying off-site or on internships receiving academic support?

Sources of information and evidence will include subject or programme handbooks, student questionnaires, internal review documents, recruitment data, and progression data.

Review activities may also include discussions with admissions staff, discussions with teaching staff, and discussions with students. They should then evaluate whether the arrangements in place are effective in facilitating student progression towards successful completion of their programmes. As a result of these activities, reviewers should be able to judge the effectiveness of the recruitment arrangements, the strategy for student support and the progression of students.

Learning resources

Evaluation of the quality of learning resources and their deployment.

Reviewers should ask:

Is the staff resource level and its deployment appropriate?

Is the collective expertise of the academic staff suitable and available for effective delivery of the curricula, for the overall teaching, learning and assessment strategy, and for the achievement of the intended learning outcomes?

Are appropriate staff development opportunities available?

Is appropriate technical and administrative support available?

Sources of information and evidence will include staff CVs, internal review documents, external evaluators' reports, and staff development documents.

Review activities may also include direct observation of teaching, discussions with teaching teams, and discussions with students. As a result of these activities reviewers should be able to judge whether there are appropriately qualified staff that are contributing effectively to achievement of the intended outcomes. They should then evaluate the effectiveness of the deployment of academic and support staff in support of the intended learning outcomes.

Reviewers should ask:

Is there an overall strategy for the deployment of learning resources?

How effectively is learning facilitated in terms of the provision of physical resources?

Is suitable teaching and learning accommodation available?

Are the subject book and periodical stocks appropriate and accessible?

Are suitable equipment and appropriate IT facilities available to learners, including internet and intranet access?

Sources of information and evidence will include equipment lists, library stocks, and internal review documents including the annual reports.

Review activities may also include direct observation of accommodation and equipment, discussions with staff, and discussions with students. Reviewers should then evaluate the appropriateness of the physical learning resources available, and the effectiveness of their deployment.

As a result of these activities, reviewers should be able to judge how effectively the physical learning resources are deployed in support of the intended outcomes.

C: Research and other Scholarly Activity

Reviewers should ask:

How effective is the Research plan for department?

Does it reflect the institution's mission and the available resources?

Does the programme of activity match the plan?

Are there examples of the impact of earlier plans?

What is the scale of output in terms of publications, conference papers, new courses/programmes, and community involvement?

Are there any distinguishing features such as strategic alliances with sponsors and other organisations, or themed activities?

How do the research and other scholarly programmes relate to the educational programmes and community involvement – are there reciprocal influences and benefits?

Sources of information and evidence will start with the self-study, and extend to the range, or in the case of a large programme, a sample of the range, of output.

Review activities may include a discussion with academic staff who are principally concerned with research and development activity.

D: Community Involvement

Reviewers should ask:

What is the contribution of faculty to the community, society and the environment at local, regional, and national levels?

Is the range of activities, including consultancy, in line with the mission and the institution's strategic plan and is it realistic in terms of the available resources?

Are there examples of mutual exchange and benefit between community involvement and other academic activities?

Does the institution engage with, and take account of the views of clients and the range of stakeholders?

Are there examples of effective practice in the impact and updating of the previous improvement plan?

Sources of information and evidence will include the self-study, the most recent annual report, examples of recent projects together with any recent reports of engagements with client groups and the range of stakeholder interests.

Review activities will include scrutiny of the evidence base provided and note-making of key features and any good practice. Reviewers may wish to meet a small representative group of clients or stakeholders to confirm the value of the process and verify the conclusions reached by the institution in its self-study.

E: The Effectiveness of Quality Management and Enhancement

Evaluation of the institution's mechanisms and procedures for setting goals, developing quality assurance systems including improvement planning, and monitoring, reviewing and improving the academic standards achieved and the quality of learning opportunities in programmes.

Reviewers should ask:

Are the arrangements for governance, leadership and management effective?

What examples are there of leadership?

How does the institution review and seek to maintain and enhance standards?

How effective are the current arrangements for internal review and reporting?

Is the data set as presented in the annual self-evaluation report adequate in measuring the contribution and the effectiveness of the programmes?

To what extent is the institution successful in developing its quality assurance systems?

Are the arrangements for improvement (or action) planning effective?

Does the quality of the self-evaluation and supporting internal reports (e.g. course reports) reflect the institution's commitment to quality assurance?

How widely has the institution invited and captured the views of the range of stakeholder interests?

What is the impact of earlier improvement plans?

Sources of information and evidence will include the annual self-evaluation, other internal and external evaluator's documents, records and analysis of statistical data, arrangements for representation of students, use made of qualitative feedback from students and staff, summary reports of recent surveys, external evaluators' reports, professional and/or statutory body accreditation reports, examination board and other committee minutes.

Review activities will include an evaluation of the adequacy of the mechanisms and procedures used and the effectiveness of their implementation by the institution. Reviewers may also include analyses of information, practices and procedures, discussions with teaching teams and discussions with a representative group of graduates, employers and others with an interest.

As a result of these activities reviewers should be able to assess the capacity of the institution to set goals, review and calibrate their standards, ensure quality and promote enhancement.

ANNEX J
PROTOCOL FOR FEEDBACK ON
OUTCOMES TO INSTITUTIONS

Protocol for Feedback on Outcomes to Institutions

The site visit will conclude with a meeting at which the visiting reviewers will provide an oral report of the main activities and findings. The institution is invited to choose who attends. The meeting is likely to require between one and two hours, depending on the personnel attending. The review chair will chair the meeting and deliver the oral report. The agenda for the meeting should include:

1. Thanks to the institution and the subject staff – courteously, with any helpful, fair and balanced comments from the reviewers on the availability and organisation of information, the quality of the self-evaluation report, quality of dialogue in the course of the review and level of co-operation of staff.
2. Reminder of the method
 - **Centrality of institution’s responsibility for quality assurance and the development of systems that include quality specifications and systematic reviews and reports.** Intended Learning Outcomes; peer review; based on the Handbook, with consistent agenda of questions to be addressed – judgements are not based on personal preferences of review team; all judgements are agreed team judgements, not judgements by individuals; the use of the published criteria for accreditation. Brief report on the scope (including any collaborative provision), the range of evidence and activities during the site-visit.
 - **Academic standards in educational programmes** consists of four closely interdependent elements:
 - Intended learning outcomes
 - Curriculum
 - Assessment
 - Student achievement
 - **Quality of learning opportunities** includes three relatively discrete areas:
 - Teaching and learning
 - Students support (including academic support)
 - Learning resources
 - **Research and other scholarly activity**
 - **Community involvement**
 - **The effectiveness of quality management and enhancement**
 - The effectiveness of the mechanisms at subject and university level which ensure that standards and quality are maintained and enhanced, and progress on the development of effective quality assurance systems.
3. **Judgements to be made, the recognition of strengths, the identification of weaknesses, omissions, any issues identified in the course of the review**

Announcement of the judgements made under each heading:

 - o Academic standards
 - o Quality of learning opportunities
 - o Research and other scholarly activity
 - o Community involvement
 - o Effectiveness of quality management and enhancement

Summary of the main strengths and issues under each heading; in particular, for academic standards, clarification of overall judgement in terms of the four elements. For developmental engagements, recommendations for the institution to address any omissions or issues to meet accreditation criteria and the proposed recommendation to the Agency. For accreditation, overall outcomes with recommendation to be made to the Agency.

4. Any clarification of the main issues reported. (But no discussion on judgements).
 5. Timetable for written report (to be sent to Head of University and Head of institution).
- Close

ANNEX K
PROTOCOL AND PROMPTS
FOR MEETINGS BETWEEN
REVIEWERS AND STAFF

Protocol and Prompts for Meetings between Reviewers and Staff during Developmental Engagements and Accreditation Reviews

Purposes and conduct of meetings

1. Meetings between staff and visiting reviewers are frequent during a site visit. The schedule of formal meetings should be agreed before the site visit begins. It may, however, be desirable to arrange an ad hoc meeting during the review to address an emerging issue. The time and place of the meeting, its focus, who is expected to attend and if necessary any special agenda, should be discussed and agreed by the review chair and the institution's point of contact. The institutional facilitator is invited to attend all meetings involving staff.
2. Meetings are a desirable means of conducting open dialogue and can be the most efficient way of augmenting or clarifying information already provided. They should, however, be kept to the minimum to complete the assignment. The review chair may chair the meeting or assign one of the reviewers to lead it. One of the reviewers will take notes of the matters addressed, the key contributions and any responses. Shortly after a meeting the reviewers will reflect on the discussion, aggregate the information derived from it with other information, and consider the completeness of the evidence base and any need for further discussions.
3. The focus of the meeting will derive from the framework for evaluation, the self-evaluation report(s), the analysis of the self-evaluation report by the external reviewers guided by annex I, the template for the annual self-evaluation report in annex F and the prompts in annex I. In all meetings, the review chair or a nominated reviewer will lead the discussion but staff attending must feel able to raise any points they believe to be important and relevant.

The most significant meetings

4. The following meetings will normally be essential parts of the review site visits.

Introductions on day 1:

Personal introductions followed by the review chair reminding those present of the purpose of the review, the main activities and the arrangements for reaching and communicating the reviewers' conclusions.

Academic standards in educational programmes:

Addressing the five inter-related components as set out in the template for the annual Self-evaluation report and the prompts, starting with the self-study and exploring supporting information and any gaps or opportunities to enlarge and clarify.

Quality of learning opportunities:

Either one or separate discussions on approaches to learning and teaching, student support and learning resources. Specialist staff such as the librarian in the discipline or head of student support services may wish to join relevant discussions, though it is important for all participants to keep the focus of the meetings on the institution's programmes and not be drawn into auditing university-wide matters. The exchange on learning resources will also be supplemented by direct observation and sampling of the range of facilities.

Research and other scholarly activity:

At least one meeting will address the contribution and the output of this activity. In addition, the reviewers may wish to meet a small group of clients or strategic partners to explore

further the evaluations made in the annual self-evaluation report.

Community involvement:

A meeting with the leader of this academic activity will be arranged to explore the self-evaluation and the items listed in the template and prompts. In addition, the review chair may request a meeting or telephone discussion with one or more clients or client groups who can testify to the contribution the activity makes to the community, society and the environment.

Effectiveness of quality management and enhancement:

At least one meeting will address the robustness of the systems, the development of improved processes and the impact of recent changes. The opportunities for all staff to make a quality contribution to the preparation of programme specifications, self-evaluation reports and action planning should also feature. The university's contribution in regulating the institution and overseeing the application and development of systems in the institution will feature and therefore a member of the most senior university staff may wish to attend this discussion.

Daily meetings between the review team and a small core team of staff:

These ensure the timely exchange of information on the progress of the review, an opportunity to clarify, adjust and confirm arrangements on a daily basis, and prompt attention to any emerging questions or issues concerning either the conduct of the review or the quality of information available to the visiting reviewers. They are not intended to rehearse or anticipate the findings of the review team, though the reviewers may on occasions wish to explore and test an interim evaluation or hypothesis, or to advise the staff of a pattern of conclusions emerging in a particular aspect of the review, thus giving the staff an opportunity to gather further information to clarify the position or satisfy the reviewers.

Feedback meeting:

Please refer to (annex J) for the protocol and agenda for the final meeting between the visiting review team and the institution.

ANNEX L
PROTOCOL AND PROMPTS
FOR MEETINGS BETWEEN
REVIEWERS AND STUDENTS

Protocol and Prompts for Meeting between Reviewers and Students during Reviews for Developmental Engagement and Accreditation

Purposes and conduct of meetings

1. The views of students represent an important part of the evidence collected by the review process. The reviewers will be seeking to focus on key points emerging from their reading of the self-evaluation report and supporting information. They will wish to reflect on the expressed views following the meeting and consider the full range of information when making their judgements.
2. The list of prompts below should be used to plan the meeting beforehand and the lines of enquiry should be selective, based on the self-evaluation report and information emerging earlier in the review site-visit. The meeting should not normally take longer than 60 minutes. One of the review team will take notes of the areas addressed and the responses. In the notes, comments will be generalised, recognising alternative views, and not ascribed to individuals.
3. The meeting should be pre-arranged to include a representative group of students across all levels with a range of modules within the educational programme(s). It may include members of students' councils, but should not be "packed" with politically active students. The review chair normally chairs the meeting. The ideal numbers are approximately 15 – 20. The institutional facilitator and members of staff of the faculty should not attend.
4. Dialogue should be constructive and should avoid personalising criticism of staff. Questions from reviewers should be open and unbiased. One apparently extreme opinion may be checked out around the whole group for a consensus or dissention. The review team may decide to break a large group into smaller groups after the introduction, with one reviewer leading each.

Structure of meeting

Introduction

The review chair will introduce the visiting reviewers and provide a brief summary of the purposes of the visit and the review method. Ideally they should have already seen a copy of this agenda. Students should be invited to introduce themselves by name, programme, year/level and reasons for choosing programme/institution.

Have any students present been involved in the institutions annual review and reporting process recently or the preparation of the self-evaluation report (possibly known to them as self-study) (see also final section below)

Academic standards (intended outcomes, curriculum, assessment, achievement

Clarity of stated aims, intended learning outcomes and what is assessed when.

Match between curriculum and expectations (for example, flexibility, choice and content).

Relevance of the curriculum (knowledge and skills) to prospective career/further study.

Any examples of exposure to current or recent research and community service by staff in the institution.

Opportunities for practical, vocational experience, internship and projects where appropriate.

Student timetable and workload.

Sense of attainment of intended learning outcomes.

Perceptions of added-value (gain in knowledge and skills, with particular reference to sustainable or independent learning and new insights).

Quality of learning opportunities

Teaching and learning

Range of teaching and learning methods experienced

Students' views on quality of teaching

Course materials, including learning packs

Guidance and support for independent study

Support

Admission and induction procedures

Quality of written information and guidance on the programme

Access to tutors and arrangements for academic and personal advice

Support during periods of practice, study abroad, work experience and other off-site experience

Facilities for disabled and outstanding students.

Feedback on assessed work

Quality of information given to students on their progress and any areas that may require additional study

Match of careers advice and guidance to career aspirations.

Learning resources

For all this section, how well are they used? (For example, is there an insistence that learning tasks and assessed assignments have to demonstrate their use?)

Library services (opening hours, practical access, and user support, availability of stock – standard texts, journals and wider reading) and do you USE them?

IT provision (opening hours, practical access, searching, user support, availability of terminals, internet and intranet, e-mailing) and do you USE them?

Specialist equipment, including relevant software – and do you USE it?

Teaching halls, including laboratory or studio provision

Recreational facilities – and do you USE them?

Space for study, or other independent learning, including practical projects, common rooms, refectory, social areas – and do you USE them?

Effectiveness of quality management and enhancement

Ways in which students' views are sought and frequency

Representation on council or committees

The degree to which students' views are influential, with examples of action, impact and feedback

Students' contribution to the self-evaluation report (self-study)

In brief, in the students' view, what works (strengths), what should be improved, and are they confident that the quality management process captures these features?

Conclusion

Students should be given the opportunity to raise points not covered by the reviewers' questions.

The review chair will thank the students for their contribution.

ANNEX M
PROMPTS FOR REVIEWING
ASSESSED STUDENT WORK

Student Work Review Note

Institution.....
 Programme.....
 Date.....
 Subject

Module/Course title

Level/Year of study

Number of items of work in the sample.....

Relation of the sample to the spread of student marks for the course

Nature of student work:
 Essay

Examination Script

Lab or Workshop Project

Other (please specify)

Academic standards: does the assessment match intended learning outcomes for the module/programme; are the standards set appropriate to the level of study; do they reflect the national reference standards or equivalent (e.g. professional requirements)?
 This work demonstrates/does not demonstrate the achievement of the intended learning outcomes in respect of academic standards.

Student achievement: are the intended learning outcomes appropriately achieved at the level indicated by the grade/class awarded?
 This work demonstrates/does not demonstrate the achievement of the intended learning outcomes in respect of student achievement.

Quality assurance and staff input: are the marking criteria clear and consistently applied; is there evidence of moderation of marking; is the quality of the feedback appropriate?
 This work demonstrates/ does not demonstrate that these are effective quality assurance system in respect of student assessment.

Overall Comments: identify in particular, and indicate in boxes below, any evidence that relates to academic standards, quality opportunities (QLO) and the effectiveness of quality management and enhancement (QME).

Overall grade

Academic standards	
Quality of learning opportunities	
Quality management and enhancement	

ANNEX N
PROTOCOL FOR
CLASS OBSERVATION

Protocol for Class Observation

Purposes of class observation

1. Teaching and learning in classes lie at the heart of educational programmes. Peer review can make a significant contribution to the enhancement of the quality of education when applied effectively to the evaluation of teaching and learning. As part of the review process, both for internal quality assurance and for the external reviews arranged by the Agency, reviewers may wish to observe a sample of classes and evaluate the contribution they make to the attainment of the stated intended learning outcomes (ILOs). The integrity of teaching and learning in classes should be highly valued and reviewers need to be sensitive to the possible impact of intervention. Any observation of classes must respect this integrity and follow the protocol set out in this annex.
2. The purpose of observing classes is to collect evidence by direct observation of the quality of the teaching and learning and to draw reasonable inferences on, for example, the appropriateness of the teaching methods and the classroom facilities. The purpose is not to appraise the performance of academic staff. Any evaluations made will not be personalised nor over-generalised. When inferences are drawn from a sample of classes, these should be checked against other sources of evidence such as annual reports and discussions with academic staff and students.

Peer review in internal systems

3. As part of the development of internal systems for quality assurance, institutions may wish to develop suitable processes and protocols for peer review of teaching and learning. This protocol may assist them. Any internal peer review of teaching and learning should have a clear purpose that distinguishes between, on the one hand staff appraisal systems (where information on staff performance is gathered and used to inform management decisions on performance, rewards and needs for further staff development) and, on the other hand peer review processes that give insights into current practice, effectiveness and potential for enhancement. The outcomes of internal peer review may be used as part of the evidence base in quality assurance systems but, when presented or summarised for self-evaluation reports or for external review, the information should not identify individual staff or students by name.

Peer review in external reviews

4. For external reviews arranged by the Agency (in developmental engagements or accreditation reviews) the reviewers will determine the need for, and the number of classes in the sample for class observation, after considering their preliminary reading of the documentation and their initial written commentaries. The time available for observations is limited and the visiting reviewers have many calls upon their time during a site-visit. If the institution is able to present summative evidence of the outcomes of class observations undertaken as part of earlier internal review, this evidence can be helpful to the visiting reviewers. They may be able to reduce the size of their sample of observations to a degree that allows confirmation or verification of the outcomes of the internal review. The institution will need to make available to reviewers a schedule of classes. It can expect to be consulted at an early stage of a site visit (giving at least a day's notice) on the sample of classes that is of interest to the reviewers and on the practical considerations such as the language

of instruction, accessibility or any special sensitivity.

Sampling

5. The range of classes available should be considered together with the programme and course specifications when identifying a sample for observation. Large and small group teaching, practical sessions and workshops, directed individual learning, the integration of skills within curricula, and distance learning may be included. Internships will not normally be included in the sample.

Evaluation

6. Reviewers will evaluate the clarity of the classes' stated objectives and their relationship with the intended learning outcomes stated in the course and programme specifications; the extent to which the class contributes to the specifications; the appropriateness of the selected teaching methods and the levels of participation by the students, the effectiveness of the teaching of subject knowledge, including references to wider reading and to recent and current research activity; the effectiveness of the development of relevant subject-specific, transferable and practical skills; and the appropriateness of the facilities (accommodation, equipment, use of texts and other teaching aids).

Good practice

7. Before observing a class, the peer reviewer should read any existing background information, such as the course and programme specifications and the student or course handbook, and meet the lecturer briefly for up to about 10 minutes. The purpose of this preparation is to establish the context for the class, its place in the sequence of the teaching programme, its objectives, and the lecturer's intentions for the chosen methods of teaching and learning. At this meeting, the reviewer should also confirm that the lecturer understands the protocol and in particular the purpose of the observation.
8. The peer reviewer will not normally attend a class for less than 45 minutes or for more than one hour. In the case of a long session of up to three hours, the reviewer may arrange with the lecturer to attend in short spells at the beginning, middle and end. The reviewer is strictly an observer and in no circumstances should intervene or take part in any way in the teaching or group activity.
9. The reviewer may arrange with the lecturer to hold a brief discussion (not more than a few minutes) shortly afterwards in a private place to share reflections on the effectiveness of the class. The discussion can clarify any points that arise and will provide an opportunity for the member of staff conducting the class to offer a self-evaluation of the effectiveness of the session if they wish.
10. The reviewer should complete a record for the class observation shortly afterwards, using the standard observation note below.

The use made of the evaluation

11. The evaluation made by the reviewer will form part of the evidence base for the review, in due proportion to the size of the sample and the time devoted to class observations as a fraction of the whole review schedule. The evaluation will be considered within the review team, but will not be divulged to the institution in a way that identifies the individual member of staff. The institution should not seek

to use the evidence base from class observations as a means to appraise staff performance.

12. The following note is designed to support the systematic recording of evidence. It may be more acceptable for the reviewer to complete it after the observation.

<p>Observation note (For use in all teaching and learning sessions – including lectures, tutorials, practical and students’ independent learning sessions)</p>
<p>Institution Subject / Programme / Course Reviewer Date / session / time</p>
<p>Length of observation (minutes)</p>
<p>Level/year/mode, e.g. FT/PT Number of students present</p>
<p>Type of activity, e.g. lecture, practical</p>
<p>Are the learning objectives planned for this session clear and are they appropriate to the ILOs for the course and the programme? (e.g. knowledge and understanding, key skills, cognitive skills, and subject-specific, including practical/professional skills)?</p>
<p>Are the teaching methods and range of activities appropriate?</p>
<p>Is the content appropriate for the ILOs and to the level of study? (Knowledge and skills development in terms of currency, accuracy, relevance, use of examples, level, match to student needs)</p>
<p>Do the opportunities for the students to participate, match the programme and course specifications’ expressed aims to develop independent learning?</p>
<p>Are the facilities appropriate and are they used effectively? (Accommodation, equipment, use of websites, texts and other teaching aids)</p>
<p>Please summarise the session's overall effectiveness in contributing to (i) the learning objectives for the class and (ii) the programme and course specifications: (e.g. indicate:- appropriate; ineffective; matters that should be enhanced; example of good practice)</p>

ANNEX O
CRITERIA FOR
A SUCCESSFUL REVIEW
AND EVALUATION
OF THE PROCESS

Criteria for a Successful Review and the Evaluation of the Process

Arrangements for Evaluation

1. The QAAP will establish standard procedures for the systematic evaluation of all external reviews arranged by it. The institution, the review chair and the reviewers will all routinely be asked to evaluate each external review by completing a short questionnaire. The structured comments will be analysed and where necessary the QAAP will take action to follow up any difficulties highlighted. In addition, the QAAP will collate the structured comment to compile regular summary reports indicating the main features of the review process in practice, including the overall levels of satisfaction expressed by the participants, together with examples of good practice, areas for improvement and suggestions for review of the review process identified by them.

Criteria for a successful review

2. The criteria for a successful review that informs the arrangements for the review and its evaluation are as follows:
 - The institution has in place or is developing robust internal systems including course and programme specifications, annual internal reviews with annual reporting and a culture of self-evaluation. These features of internal review provide a sound basis for the external review.
 - The timing of the external review is appropriate
 - The team profile matches in broad terms the profile of the academic activities in the institution
 - There is due attention to detail in planning and preparation, by -
 - The QAAPy: its procedures for working with the institution and the reviewers are applied consistently and appropriate support for the external review is provided as required
 - The institution: it ensures that the evidence base generated by internal review and reporting systems is available on time to the visiting reviewers, in line with the published method
 - The reviewers: the team undertakes its preparation for the visit including reading the advance documentation and preparing initial commentaries that inform the conduct of the visit
 - The review chair: makes contact with the review team and the institution in good time to agree the outline programme for the visit, the emerging focus and priorities for the review and its organisation.
 - There is consistency in the application of the published review method and the protocols by all participants in a way that respects and supports the mission and philosophy of the overall quality assurance and accreditation process.
 - Reviewers and representatives of the institution conduct an open dialogue throughout the review that shows mutual respect.
 - The judgements reached by the reviewers are clear, based on the evidence available and systematically recorded.
 - The review report is produced on time in line with the standard report structure and is confirmed by the institution to be factually accurate.
 - The set of conclusions arising from the review are constructive, offering a fair and balanced view of the institution's academic activities in line with its stated mission and aims.
 - The institution is able to benefit from the external review by giving, post-review,

due reflection and consideration to the findings and preparing where appropriate a realistic improvement plan.

ANNEX Q
STRUCTURE OF
DEVELOPMENTAL
ENGAGEMENT REPORT

Structure of Developmental Engagement Report

Title page

NQAAC

(logo)

The National Quality Assurance and Accreditation Committee

Peer Review Report on the Developmental Engagement for

[name of institution]

[Date]

(month/year of engagement)

Preface

A standard brief summary of the method of developmental engagements during the transitional period will be inserted by the NQAAC at final edit stage. The statement will cover the purpose, the central role of internal quality systems, engagement by the institution in development and the self-evaluation report, the site visit by peer reviewers, the framework for evaluation and the report for the institution remains confidential between the institution and the Agency. All review reports will be bi-lingual, presented in Arabic and English versions. They will not be published.

Executive summary

Not more than one page in 10 points. The summary will present the essential information on the occasion of the developmental engagement, the range of the evidence base and activities, the main findings (including any references in the main text to examples of good practice) and the conclusions.

Main text

Introduction

This report presents the findings of the peer reviewers who visited [insert name of institution] on [insert month/year]. The institution prepared its annual self-evaluation report, which formed the basis of this review, in [month/year] as part of its engagement in the development of its quality assurance systems.

Either The [insert name of faculty/college] is one of [insert number] faculties and colleges in the [insert name of university or higher education institution].

Or The [insert name of institution] is a public/private organisation/university/higher education institution established in [insert year].

Its mission is: [insert]

The faculty/institution has [insert number] registered students of which [insert number] are undergraduate and [insert number] are postgraduate students. (Adjust according to the actual situation). There are [insert number] of academic staff supported by [insert number] of technical and administrative staff.

The faculty/college offers the following award-bearing programmes:
[insert list]

Evaluation

Academic Standards of Educational Programmes

Paragraphs address each of the four components, giving evaluation with supporting evidence and, for each component, the judgement.

Either Overall, the academic standards are appropriate.

Or [Name the component(s)] are appropriate. However, the [name component(s)] require further improvement to satisfy the QAAP criterion/criteria.

The Quality of Learning Opportunities

Paragraphs address each of the three components, giving evaluation with supporting evidence and, for each component, the judgement.

Either Overall, the quality of learning opportunities in the educational programmes is appropriate.

Or [Name the component(s)] are appropriate. However, the [name component(s)] require further improvement to satisfy the QAAP criterion/criteria.

Research and other Scholarly Activity

Paragraphs address the key aspects, giving evaluation with supporting evidence and the judgement as follows.

Either Overall, the research and other scholarly activity satisfy the NQAAA criterion.

Or the research and other scholarly activity require further improvement to satisfy the QAAP criterion and make a full contribution to the mission of the institution.

Community Involvement

Paragraphs address the key aspects, giving evaluation with supporting evidence and the judgement as follows.

Either Overall, community involvement satisfies the QAAP criterion and makes a full contribution to the mission of the institution.

Or Community Involvement requires further improvement to satisfy the Agency's publication criterion and make a full contribution to the mission of the institution.

The Effectiveness of Quality Management and Enhancement

Paragraphs address each of the components, giving evaluation with supporting evidence and, for each component, the judgement. This is followed by -

Either Overall, quality management and enhancement are adequate and the engagement by the institution in developing its quality assurance systems is progressing well.

Or [Name the component(s)] are adequate. However, the [name component(s)] require further improvement to satisfy the QAAP criterion/criteria.

Conclusions

The developmental engagement at [institution] included a site visit by reviewers in [month/year]. The reviewers, on the basis of the self-evaluation report and supporting documentation and the additional evidence derived from the site-visit, conclude that the [institution] EITHER [is ready to receive an accreditation visit] OR [is not yet ready to receive an accreditation visit.]

The strengths include:

[List key points]

Matters that should be addressed before an accreditation visit are:

[List key points in a way that the institution has a clear indication of the matters that it should address]"

ANNEX Q1

Guidelines for Writing Review Reports

These guidelines are intended to support peer reviewers and chairs when writing the developmental engagement reports.

Item	Heading	Indicative Content of Guidelines
	Introduction	
1.	What is the Purpose of the Review Report?	The Developmental Engagement Report is intended to provide an evaluation of its undergraduate programme(s), identifying strengths and also matters that should be rectified before an accreditation visit. It offers the institution an agenda for further improvement, although it is for the institution to decide on action that is required, its priorities and how to address any identified needs.
2.	Who is it for and who is the reader?	The Review Report is primarily for the institution. However it is also for the QAAP and for the University so that they are aware of the quality and academic standards of the reviewed programme(s) and can respond appropriately.
3.	Operating principles for producing review reports	The Review report should be evaluative and its judgements based on evidence. There should be no surprises for the institution in the report, which should acknowledge any evaluations already put forward by the institution in its faculty annual self-evaluation report. The Review Report should also be fair, balanced and constructive. Clarity is important. Generally, evaluative reports of this type should for each topic give the judgement, then the supporting evidence and any discussion. Description in the evaluation sections of the Review Report should be kept to the minimum needed for the reader to understand the evaluation and the supporting evidence. Apart from when the format required bullet points, the text should be a narrative that is offering an evaluative account using sentences and paragraphs.
4.	What is the structure?	The structure of the Developmental Engagement Review Report is presented in Annex Q of the Handbook. However, based on Annex Q, the prompts in Annex I of the Handbook and emerging good practice in the first Developmental Engagement Reports, a more detailed guide to the indicative content and structure is provided below.

5.	Characteristics of a good review report	<p>A good report will be well-structured and completely cover the evaluation framework in compliance with the Handbook. It will be evaluative and evidence based. It will demonstrate that the developmental engagement process and the outcome are open, transparent and conducted in the spirit of continuing improvement. Judgements supported by evidence should be presented so that the institution and other readers are clear about the issues being reported. Here should be no apparent contradictions. The same point should not be made more than once, but where appropriate the report may draw attention to related but different perspectives; for example, in drawing attention to the extent to which a programme is satisfying the specified intended learning outcomes under Curriculum, Assessment and the Quality of Learning Opportunities. This approach ensures that the reader is given a coherent account and not given a false view in separate compartments. The report will offer constructive evaluations and not give prescriptions for the institution to adopt uncritically. The main text, the conclusions and the executive summary will be consistent.</p>
----	---	---

6.	The report production process with milestones	<p>The Handbook sets out on page 25 in paragraph 56 the steps for the production of the report. Counting the weeks from the end of the site-visit the schedule is as follows:</p> <p>Week 1 -2: Draft 1 is prepared by the chair from written contributions provided by the peer reviewers during the site-visit and the report-writing meeting that follows.</p> <p>Week 3-4: reviewers in the team respond with written comments and any suggestions for additions or adjustments based on the record of the developmental engagement.</p> <p>Week 4: Draft 2 is prepared by the chair using the comments and sent to the QAAP which will forward it to an independent editor for reading and comments. This stage applies a test of competence to the report based on the features set out in section 5 above. Suggestions for any adjustments will be made to the chair for further consideration.</p> <p>Week 6: Draft 3 is sent to QAAP, which checks the report and sends it to the institution with a covering letter inviting the institution to comment on matters of</p>
----	---	---

		<p>factual accuracy. This is not an occasion to argue over judgements. The institution should respond within two weeks in writing to the QAAP.</p> <p>Week 8: Draft 3 is returned by the institution to the QAAP with any response. QAAP will seek the views of the review chair in considering any response.</p> <p>Week 12: Draft 4 is prepared, allowing for some slippage as draft reports are circulating. The QAAP may engage a professional editor at this stage to ensure that house style and presentation are fully consistent with its policy and house style.</p> <p>Week 20: The final draft 5 will be translated so that there is an English and Arabic version and QAAP will make these available to the institution, review chair and the peer reviewers. The report is not published and will remain confidential within the institution, its university, the QAAP and the peer review team.</p>
--	--	---

7.	The editing process with responsibilities of the reviewers, the review chairs, editors, the institution and QAAP office	<p>The editing process is used to ensure that the review reports are consistently of high quality. All writers contributing to the drafting are asked to play their part in writing well first time to keep editing to the minimum. With a good report with evaluations supported by evidence, the editing will not challenge the judgements and conclusions of the peer reviewers. However a report presenting opinions that cannot be justified will if necessary be returned and subject to editing to ensure that it complies with the Handbook.</p> <p>The independent editor at draft 2 stage will seek to work cooperatively with the chair to ensure a satisfactory draft. The professional editor at draft 4 will confine editing to house style and clarity of presentation, including any need to avoid jargon or obscure terms or abbreviations that may not be clear to a reader. At this stage, the QAAP takes over responsibility for the report.</p>
8.	House style	<p>1. Font: this note uses the QAAP font Times New Roman in 11 point</p> <p>2. Format: MS Word settings for English script should be as follows</p> <p>Alignment justified; Outline level body text</p> <p>Margins Left 0</p> <p>Right 0 Special None</p> <p>Spacing before 0</p>

		<p style="text-align: center;">after 0 Line spacing At least</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Paragraph numbers should be as here 1. Two spaces 4. Conclusions use: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • points as in this paragraph • paragraph references to main text mentions (paragraph 2) or (paragraphs 3 and 14) or (paragraphs 4-6) or (paragraphs 5, 5 and 8). With the full stop at the end outside the parentheses • Points are listed in the order they appear in the main text • Capital initials are used for each word in the point • Only the last point has a full stop; the other points have no punctuation at the end. 5. Use a line space between paragraphs. 6. Upper case initials used for all proper nouns, such as University and Faculty but not for adjectives such as faculty members and not for universities in general. 7. Two spaces after a full stop and before a new sentence such as this. One space after a ; or , 8. Headings and sub headings: have no indent. 9. Bold is used for headings like Intended Learning Outcomes. 10. Title page uses standard QAAP layout and for drafting includes the draft number and the date/version. 11. Page numbers are at foot of page central on all pages except title page. 12. Where abbreviations are used for long titles that recur in the text or for known acronyms the first mention is given in full with the abbreviation following in brackets then the abbreviation is used thereafter. 13. When quoting numbers, single digit numbers are written as a word, that is three and not 3. For numbers of more than one digit, use numerals, for example 35. 14. UK English spelling should be used, as in programme and judgement. Spell out in full words like examination, for example and that is.
--	--	---

The Structure of the Report (see section 4 above)

The structure for the report is given in Annex Q of the Handbook. Additional guidance on the paragraphs needed in normal developmental engagements to address the evaluation

framework is given below under each heading, drawing from the prompts in Annex I and good practice in the first developmental engagements.

Preface

Standard text no paragraph numbering

Executive Summary (aim for 350 words no paragraph numbering)

This report presents the findings of....

Strengths paragraph in narrative form (summarising using Conclusions)

Weaknesses paragraph in narrative form (summarising using Conclusions)

The conclusion reached by the peer reviewers is that the Faculty of xx at zzz University is (is not yet) ready to receive an accreditation visit. (If not ready) Matters that need to be rectified before an accreditation visit are presented in paragraph XX. (OR if ready) Matters that should be addressed before an accreditation visit are in paragraph XX.

Introduction (paragraph numbering starts)

1. This report presents the findings of the peer reviewers who visited the Faculty of xxx, zzz University in mmm, 200n. The institution prepared its Faculty Annual Self-Evaluation Report, Programme Specification(s), Annual Programme Report(s), course specifications and course reports which formed the basis of this review as part of its engagement in the development of its quality assurance systems.
2. The evidence compiled includes: (insert from standard list)
3. The University is public/private and established in (year). Its mission statement is: (insert, copy verbatim)
4. The Faculty mission statement is: (copy verbatim)
5. The Faculty is one of n in the University. It has n departments. There are n students registered including x undergraduates on the programmes included in this review; y on postgraduate programmes; z other. There are n faculty members and an additional x employees including demonstrators and teaching assistants. In addition, the faculty has n clerical, technical, library and other support staff.
6. The following undergraduate programmes are the subject of this developmental engagement: (list in bullet points)

-
-

When the Faculty applies for accreditation all undergraduate and postgraduate programmes and research and community activities, in line with its mission, will be included.

Evaluation

Academic Standards

Intended Learning Outcomes

7. General statement on programme(s) ILOs, how clearly they are stated, their relevance to the mission, and discussion about the extent to which they reflect the aims of the programmes(s).

8. The uses made of external references to confirm the relevance and the academic standards specified, including where relevant any professional requirements and inputs by employers.
9. The organisation of ILOs in terms of the appropriate range of knowledge and skills with examples.
10. Course specifications and the relationships between course ILOs and programme ILOs, including any good practice in mapping all courses against the programme ILOs e.g. using a matrix.
11. The extent to which the ILOs are disseminated among staff and to students.

Curriculum

12. The extent to which the design and organisation of the curriculum facilitates the achievement of the ILOs and reflects the mission statement.
13. The breadth, depth and currency of the curriculum with examples and an indication of the balance given to for example theoretical and practical elements. The place of summer training and/or internships.
14. The extent to which the curriculum secures intellectual progression in knowledge and skills and, if part of the mission and ILOs, the development of independent learning.
15. Examples of the curriculum being informed by recent research or scholarly activity including any relevant examples.

Assessment

16. The assessment strategies in place including the range of methods and their appropriateness in assessing the achievement of the range of ILOs and reflecting the mission statement.
17. The extent to which there is an adequate formative assessment function with mechanisms for providing structured and timely feedback to students.
18. The part played by summative assessment in confirming the achievement of the appropriate academic standards.
19. The extent to which criteria for assessing performance and describing grades are in place, clear and understood by students and examiners.
20. The effectiveness of the arrangements for internal and external moderation of examination tasks, students answers and the grades awarded.
21. The level of confidence, fairness, transparency and integrity of the assessment procedures as expressed by students and the reviewers' judgements.

Achievement

22. The record of student progression through the programme(s) including pass rates at each stage.
23. The record of final achievement by students including the grade profile of graduation for the last three years discussing any trends or patterns.
24. The overall academic standard of students' performance as demonstrated by the assessment procedures and the sample of work seen by the reviewers, and verified against external references, e.g. the use of external evaluators.
25. Feedback from past graduates and employers about the relevance of their degree in terms of employability and continuing learning in line with the mission statement.

26. The record of graduate employment including discussion on the value of the programme(s) in supporting the mission statement.
27. EITHER Overall the Academic Standards are appropriate. OR (name the components) are appropriate. However, (name the components) require further improvement to satisfy the criteria.

Quality of Learning Opportunities Teaching and Learning

28. Strategies for teaching and learning and the methods used, to the extent that they support the attainment of the range of ILOs.
29. The quality of the teaching and learning, including students' opinions. Discussion of any special characteristics drawing on any peer observation by the faculty and/or by visiting reviewers.
30. The consistency and effectiveness of the quality of teaching across the programme, including punctuality and attendance of staff and students with special reference to the performance by other faculties providing courses and any resort to private lessons.
31. The appropriateness of what is taught and learned in terms of knowledge and skills and the extent to which the faculty members and students draw upon recent research and publications to inform the learning in line with the mission statement.
32. The extent to which students are engaged in the teaching and encouraged to develop skills in self-learning through for example wider reading, projects and practical activities.
33. The quality of the teaching materials including texts and handouts and the extent to which e-learning supports the ILOs.
34. The extent to which the quality of teaching and learning is influenced by staff development programmes.

Student support

35. The overall strategy, design and administration of suitable support for students.
36. Arrangements for admissions and orientation.
37. The quality of information provided for students by handbooks, intranet or equivalent means.
38. The effectiveness of academic guidance including a discussion of the key features.
39. The range and effectiveness of the arrangements for providing social and financial support.
40. The identification in the programme(s) of outstanding students and those requiring additional support, including those with special needs. The quality of any provision for language skills development.

Learning Resources

41. The adequacy of faculty members and other academic staff including their number and their collective expertise in relation to student numbers and the programme ILOs.
42. The adequacy of the clerical, technical and other staff and their deployment.
43. The suitability of teaching accommodation with respect to student numbers, organisation of classes and the range of teaching and learning activities.

44. Library facilities in terms of opening hours, study space, book and journal collection, electronic resources including internet access and staffing.
45. Information technology in support of the programme(s)' ILOs, including e-learning facilities, the adequacy of PCs, printers and general and subject specific software. Discussion of the actual uses made by students including appropriate skills development.
46. Laboratories and other special facilities including their scheduling for groups and the procedures for safety and supervision.
47. EITHER Overall the Quality of Learning Opportunities in the educational programmes is appropriate. OR (name the components) are appropriate. However, (name the components) require further improvement to satisfy the criteria.

Research and Other Scholarly Activities

48. The presence and quality of any overall strategic plan for the range of activities in the institution and the extent to which it meets the mission statement.
49. The actual range of research activities, its relevance to the plan and the extent to which it meets the mission statement.
50. The adequacy and accessibility of the database of research activity and output, with examples of transfer to other educational activities.
51. The scale of output and the impact of earlier research plans.
52. Distinguishing features such as themes, strategic alliances with sponsors, collaborative activities.
53. EITHER Overall, the research and other scholarly activity satisfy the criterion OR the research and other scholarly activity require further improvement to satisfy the criterion and make a full contribution to the mission of the institution.

Community Involvement

54. The presence and quality of any overall strategic plan for the range of activities in the institution and the extent to which it meets the mission statement.
55. The actual range of activities, its relevance to the plan and the extent to which it meets the mission statement.
56. The quality of the engagements with the range of organisations such as NGOs and partners, including the arrangements for systematically identifying needs and seeking views on the relevance and value of the activities.
57. EITHER Overall, community involvement satisfies the criterion OR the community involvement requires further improvement to satisfy the criterion and make a full contribution to the mission of the institution.

The Effectiveness of Quality Management and Enhancement

58. The mission statement in terms of being: clear, linked to the university mission statement, comprehensive, realistic, the product of consultation with the range of key stakeholders, circulated and known to faculty, employees, students and other key stakeholders and underpinned by mechanisms for regular review and revision. (Note the report does not evaluate the fitness of purpose of the chosen mission).
59. The effectiveness of governance and management (draw on evidence generated by the template on Governance; this may need more than one paragraph but should avoid description).
60. The extent to which the institution has implemented the internal quality assurance system outlined in the Handbook.

61. The completeness and rigour of the implementation in respect of course and programme reports and action plans, including the use made of data and information and the impact of earlier plans.
62. The adequacy and relevance of the institution's overall action plan.
63. The quality of the annual self-evaluation report.
64. The engagements with, and the quality of information collected from, all key stakeholder groups (including students) by the faculty and how feedback is given on actions taken.
65. The ability of the institution and the effectiveness of its procedures to ensure the integrity and academic standards of the programme(s) and awards.
66. EITHER Overall Quality Management and Enhancement are adequate and the engagement by the institution in developing its quality assurance systems is progressing well. OR The Quality Management and Enhancement are in need of further improvement to satisfy the criteria.

Conclusions

67. The developmental engagement at the Faculty of xxx at zzz University included a site visit by reviewers in mmm 200n. The reviewers, on the basis of the self-evaluation report and supporting documentation and the additional information derived from the site visit, conclude that the Faculty is (OR is not yet) ready to receive an accreditation visit.
68. The strengths include: (list with bullet points)
69. Matters that should be addressed before an accreditation visit are: (OR in the case of not ready) Matters that need to be rectified before an accreditation visit include: (list with bullet points)

ANNEX S

Visit Secretaries

Background

Following a review of the first phases on developmental engagement site-visits in 2005-06 QAAP was decided to request universities to provide visit secretaries to support the visiting review teams during the site visit. The visit secretaries will be employed from February 2007 onwards.

This note supplements the Quality Assurance and Accreditation Handbook and provides information for the visit secretary, the reviewers and the institution on the duties of the visit secretary. It also provides guidance on how to use the role well and advice on questions of confidentiality.

The purpose of the visit secretary is to improve the production of records of activities and draft reports during the site visit. This in turn improves the flow of information shared within the review team and the record of the growing evidence base on which the reviewers make their judgements.

The duties of the visit secretary

The visit secretary attends the site visit from days 1 to 3 inclusive. They will have access to a PC provided by the Faculty and a printer. The review chair may also offer use of their laptop and should provide a flash memory for back up copies. They will require a suitable desk and chair within the base room provided for the visiting review team.

The main duties are as follows:

Type documents for the review chair and peer reviewers

Print documents

Photocopy either extracts of original papers provided by the institution and printed notes from the reviewers as directed

Circulate copies to members of the review team as directed by the review chair

Create or open an existing DE visit sub-directory

Save documents in a visit directory

Maintain a list of papers and electronic files for the developmental engagement

Make back up copies of files for the review chair, to be forwarded to QAAP at the end of the site-visit

Assist with receiving, sending and passing on messages on behalf of reviewers within the developmental engagement tasks

At the discretion of the review chair, attend scheduled review team meetings to take notes

Give other assistance to the reviewers such as helping with arranging seating for meetings.

It is good practice to use trays or baskets for each reviewer or each of the five sections of the report to ensure that the documents are effectively circulated and read each day. In the first place, they will copy and paste and merge initial commentaries brought by the reviewers. As notes of meetings and other activities are generated they will type or copy these and make a record of the documents.

At the close of the site visit they will assist the review chair to ensure that there is a full record of documents for the developmental engagement, that there is a back up of electronic files and that any files for the site visit created by the visiting review team on the institution's PC are fully deleted.

They will not normally attend or make a record of meetings arranged between reviewers and the members of the institution.

They will not undertake other unrelated secretarial work for the review team or the institution.

Guidance on protocols

The visit secretary is appointed by the universities assigned to the site-visit under the management of the review chair. They may be nominated by the institution, either from the University's central administration (such as from the Quality Assurance Centre or another faculty) or from the Faculty that is undertaking the developmental engagement.

The developmental engagement should be conducted with an open and transparent manner between the visiting review team and the institution. However, the visit secretary will need to respect the confidential nature of the discussions within the review team. They will therefore not convey, during or after the site-visit, any information to the facilitator or other members of the institution concerning the process, the discussions within the review team, and its interim and final judgements.

The review chair is expected to welcome and brief the visit secretary on arrival, and provide whatever orientation is required. This will normally include a brief summary of the method and schedule of the site-visit, personal introductions to the visiting reviewers and if necessary the faculty members immediately involved in the site-visit, and an explanation of the main duties as set out above. The review chair is also responsible for deciding on priorities for work in progress and approving the quality of the work produced.

The main channel of communication between the review team and the institution is the review chair with the facilitator. Responsibility for compiling and checking the evidence base and ensuring that essential review papers are preserved after the site-visit rests with the review chair. The visit secretary will not remove any documents from the base room or take copies of the files other than for the review chair and QAAP.

Specification

The visit secretary should offer at least the following:

Arabic and English language fluency in oral communication, reading and writing

Familiar with an English keyboard and the main PC function keys

Microsoft word

Typing skills for composing and copy typing with accuracy and self-checking accuracy (using spell-check)

Making amendments and revisions to word documents under direction

On screen editing including at least cut, copy, paste and merge documents

Transferring files from and to the PC/laptop

Taking back up copies

Operating a printer and photocopier

Collating papers and filing

Annex T
Framework for the Development of Guidelines
for Preparing and Implementing Action Planning
towards Accreditation by the Agency

Framework for the Development of Guidelines for Preparing and Implementing Action Planning towards Accreditation by the Agency

Item	Heading	Comments (edit or add to if you wish)	ü If you agree or add X or make comment
1.	What is the Purpose?	The Guidelines on Action Planning are intended to assist institutions as they build their agenda for continuing improvement, enhance their quality assurance systems and processes and secure performance of the published criteria in the Evaluation Framework.	
2.	Who is it for?	Primarily designed for institutions (faculties) it is also expected that the Quality Assurance centres in universities and the Presidents' offices will wish to consult the guidelines to ensure that the faculties are adequately supported in their enhancement programs.	
3.	What is the scope?	The action planning should embrace all educational activities in the institution, including undergraduate and postgraduate programs, research and other scholarly activity and community involvement. Centrally operated facilities in universities that provide additional support for the faculties, such as libraries, student support and welfare services, education development units and computing services, should also be addressed to the extent that they assist the faculties to meet the criteria.	
4.	Operating principles	The action planning should reflect the principles set out in <i>the Quality Assurance and Accreditation Handbook</i> on page 4 paragraph 8. They include a focus on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the interests of the customer (students and other stakeholders); • tools to address the means as well as the product or outcomes; • continuing improvement; • adopting decisions on the basis of fact (or evidence-based approaches); and • next steps. 	
	(Please add comments and suggestions to the following headings)		

5.	Plans should address (content):		
----	--	--	--

6.	The planning process should include and take due account of:		
7.	The action planning requires managing in respect of:		

	<p>7.1 Implementation</p> <p>7.1.1 How?</p> <p>7.1.2 When?</p> <p>7.1.3 Who is responsible?</p> <p>7.1.4 Where does the information on progress come from?</p> <p>7.1.5 Where is the monitoring and reporting of the effectiveness of the action planning located within the internal quality assurance system?</p> <p>Other?</p> <p>7.2 Continuing review of the relevance of the action plan</p> <p>7.2.1 SWOT analysis</p> <p>7.2.2 What if scenarios</p> <p>7.2.3 Accommodating necessary changes</p> <p>7.2.4 Risk assessment</p> <p>7.2.5 Troubleshooting</p> <p>7.2.6 Measures and decisions on achievements</p>		
8.	<p>How and when will you evaluate the impact of the action plans?</p>		

Annex T1

Template to assist in the review of action plans:

use one for each action plan analyzed

Template to assist in the review of action plans: use one for each action plan analyzed

Content	Comments
1. Does the plan give sources of information?	
2. Does the plan address all educational activities?	
3. Does the plan refer to the criteria in the evaluation framework?	
4. Which of the following are present? 4.1 Measures or targets 4.2 Who is responsible for delivering (does it differentiate between the faculty, and the need to involve others such as the university, ministry, supreme council, or others?) 4.3 Stages/phases of progress 4.4 Time for completion 4.5 Estimates of costs and sources of funds 4.6 Date and endorsement by faculty council and university council	
Process	
5. What time horizon is used?	
6. Was the time allocated to finishing the activity realistic?	
7. What sources of information are in use?	
8. Is there evidence of SWOT analysis?	
9. Is there evidence of SMART? § specific § measurable § agreed § realistic § time related	
10. Is the focus on the students and other stakeholders?	

11. How extensive is the consultation with stakeholders?	
12. Does the action plan reflect coordination between different items?	
13. Does it reflect coordination between persons in earlier action plan?	
14. Does it reflect follow up changes?	
15. Does the planning allow for future changes?	
16. Is there evidence of risk management?	
17. Are there suitable arrangements for systematic monitoring of progress and regular review?	
18. Does the plan set out arrangements for implementation?	

ANNEX U

Template: Developmental Engagements follow-up process

Background

1. The Minister for Higher Education and Scientific Research has requested information of the readiness of institutions for applying for accreditation.
2. As part of the reform program for higher education, and in order to optimise the efforts made by institutions in the transitional period 2005- 2008, the QAAP wishes to adopt and implement a follow-up process to review the progress in institutions that have completed funded projects and a developmental engagement in the period 2005-2007.
3. Up to January 2007, 24 institutions have completed developmental engagements. During the academic year 2006-07, up to 24 additional institutions will receive a site-visit. Summary information from the developmental engagements and reports provides an assessment of the range and the degree of difficulty of improvement plans that the institutions should be implementing to be ready to apply for accreditation. This proposal sets out a new follow-up method, together with the required evidence base, the criteria and a set of questions.
4. Follow-up is a standard for quality assurance and accreditation processes in higher education and is specified as good practice by INQAAHE and ENQA.

Purpose

5. Follow-up to Developmental Engagements supplements the reports of the Monitoring and Evaluation team and the Review report from the site-visit. It has one prime and one subsidiary purpose:
 1. Identifying institutions that may be ready to apply for accreditation within the next two years, and those that are at risk of failing to build on their developmental engagements and associated projects funded by QAAP.
 2. Providing further information and support for the continuing improvement of academic standards and quality of higher education.

Method

6. The follow-up process is designed to deliver evidence based reports to the Ministry for Higher Education and Scientific Research on the readiness of institutions to apply for accreditation during and after the transitional period of establishing internal quality assurance systems and processes and completing related funded QAAP/HEEP projects.
7. There will be three phases to the follow-up:

Phase 1: Desk analysis of evidence leading to a written report giving an estimate of three categories, planned timing May-July 2007.

Group 1: institutions that appear to be close to applying for accreditation.

Group 2: institutions that are making progress but will not be among the first to be ready to apply for accreditation.

Group 3: institutions that appear to be at risk of not building upon the developmental engagements and related funded projects.

Institutions will be informed of the details, procedures and timing of this process and required to send all of the documentary evidence, listed in paragraph 8, below, to QAAP for the desk analysis. As a result of this analysis, a judgement will be made as to whether or not an institution is ready to proceed to Phase 2. If not, they will be given guidance as to what further actions would be required.

Phase 2: A follow-up site visit, normally needing up to one day, to institutions, leading to a brief written report on state of readiness to apply for accreditation, conducted by the Head of the University's Quality Assurance Centre, a member of the National Committee and an external consultant. If necessary, the site-visits can be targeted at the top and the bottom quartile using risk assessment techniques. The planned timing of site-visits will be April - May 2007.

Phase 3: A consolidated overview report to the Ministry on the state of readiness of institutions to apply for accreditation will be prepared after the completion of the first series of follow-up visits. The planned timing for the delivery of this report is June 2007.

Evidence base

8. The institutions' state of readiness to apply for accreditation will be assessed by QAAP using the following sources of evidence.
- Successive Faculty Annual Self-Evaluation Reports together with annual programme reports and annual course reports (i.e. 2005-06 as well as 2004-05)
 - Action plans
 - Developmental Engagement Review Report (executive summary)
 - University strategic plan (if any).

Criteria

9. The criteria on which the QAAP will assess the extent to which the institution is ready to apply for accreditation are based on the quality assurance and accreditation method and criteria published in the *Quality Assurance and Accreditation Handbook for Higher Education in Egypt* (December 2004).
10. An institution will be assessed as being ready to apply for accreditation when the following criteria are satisfied:
1. Finished main Developmental Engagement site-visit.
 2. Second faculty annual self-evaluation report (2005-06) completed, supported by programme reports and course reports.
 3. Clear action plan, realistic and budgeted.
 4. The action plan is based on the DE review report.
 5. The action plan sets a timescale of not more than three years to be ready for accreditation.
 6. The action plan addresses all postgraduate programmes.
 7. Endorsement of action plan by faculty council and university council.

8. The budget in the action plan is covered between the University (consumables) and the MOHE (infrastructure only).
9. The commitment of the Quality Assurance Unit manager, and the leaders of the faculty to attend meetings as required in the NOAAC.

Note

The desk office documents review includes the last two annual faculty reports, program reports, course reports Faculty action plan, and Strategic University Plan: These must be submitted at least two weeks before the follow up visit

Set of questions

11. The attached set of questions is offered to guide QAAP reviewers to assess the extent to which the institution is ready to apply for accreditation. They are based on, and are intended to focus upon, the above criteria.

Final overall assessment by QAAP reviewers:

12. The reviewers will assess which of the following groups most accurately describes the institution.
 - Group 1: institutions that appear to be close to applying for accreditation.
 - Group 2: institutions that are making progress but will not be among the first to be ready to apply for accreditation.
 - Group 3: institutions that appear to be at risk of not building upon the developmental engagements and related funded projects.
13. A written report will be submitted to the Minister of Higher Education and Scientific Research.
14. The QAAP will evaluate the follow-up process and assess the impact of the developments during the transitional period.

Action plans

Action plans must include all relevant matters identified in the annual self-evaluation report(s), the Development Engagement review report and the following:

- Governance and its development
- Postgraduate programmes
- Academic Reference Standards informing curricula and curricula development
- Student Assessment system and methods which match the ILOs
- Teaching and Learning including large/small group teaching and addressing private lessons
- Infrastructure including library, laboratories, IT and computer laboratories
- Student support system
- Research and scholarly activities
- Development of Community Services
- Financial support and resources for action plan

Template for Developmental Engagement Follow up Visits

Name of University _____

Name of Faculty _____

Date of Developmental Engagement site visit _____

Date visited in follow up _____

Date of follow-up report _____

Names of reviewers _____ Position/title _____ Signed _____

Questions	Yes? (check)	Comment	Further action required?
1. Are Faculty Annual Self-Evaluation Reports, complete for each year since the Faculty began its internal systems, with annexes in place and in use?			
2. Are all programme and course specifications implemented (if not all, by when)?			
3. Are academic standards in programmes addressed using NARS or if not available, alternative external reference points?			
4. Is there a complete set of accurately completed course reports, each completed by the person responsible for the course?			
5. Is there a completed programme report for each educational programme that informs the faculty annual report			

(if not all, state which)?			
6. Are activities in research and community services underpinned by strategic plans and evaluative reports?			
7. Do action plans address key needs, has the institution adjusted them to changing circumstances and has the institution reported on progress and impact?			
8. Do the faculty and/or the university's quality assurance centre monitor the progress on the action plan?			
9. Do the most recent self-evaluation reports indicate the extent to which the criteria in the Evaluation Framework are met and are being addressed?			
10. Are there any particular issues such as major changes to the curricula (e.g. two different curricula, old and new running at the same time) or the construction of new buildings, that would affect the timing of accreditation?			
11. How long does the institution estimate it needs to be ready to apply for accreditation?			
12. Are there any major gaps that appear not to be addressed?			
Place in Group 1. 2. or 3 as described above) (Circle)	1 2 3		