

**FACULTY REVIEWS:
STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT AND
QUALITY ASSURANCE**

H Geyser, I Pretorius, UQP

18 September, 2014



Overview

1. Rationale
2. Purpose
3. Context
4. Theoretical Framework
5. Methodology
6. Findings: Process
7. Findings: Reports
8. Findings: Perceptions
9. Conclusion

1. Rationale

- Faculty reviews introduced in 2012
- Benchmarking exercises, monitoring positioning to provide leadership in Africa and internationally, monitoring progress towards Global Excellence and Stature
- Transformation/change is the purpose of the UJ Strategic Plan.
- Transformation and continuous improvement are two definitions of quality in SA.



2. Purpose

To reflect on the nature and scope of faculty reviews with special reference to quality aspects of these reviews.

3. Context

Process of faculty reviews shows overlap with the process of quality reviews:

- Self-reflection report
- Evidence based
- Site visit by external peers
- Interviews

Some complicating differences:

- Faculty report forward looking, limited in scope
- Panel of eminent international scholars
- MEC approval and involvement.



4.Theoretical Framework

- Faculty as a complex unit of analysis
 - Intersection between disciplines and institution
- Strategic planning
 - Aims to bring about change to institution through members' ability and willingness to participate
- Quality review criteria focus on:
 - Inputs or resources
 - Processes or interactions to transfer inputs to outputs
 - Outputs or the results of processes.



5. Methodology

Qualitative analysis of reports to determine coverage of key elements of quality review criteria, as well as specific criteria for UJ faculty reviews:

- Inputs, processes, outputs
- Faculty strategic plan
- Future perspective
- Reflection

Faculty Reports and Peer Review Reports were analysed.



5. Methodology (continued)

- Individual interviews with deans and vice-deans to provide additional information on their perceptions of:
 - faculty review as a quality review
 - improvements as a result of the reviews
 - student involvement in the process
 - benefits from the review process and
 - possible improvements of the review process.

6. Findings: Process

- Leadership stability
- Faculty wide consultation on Faculty Report
- Panel briefing/understanding of the process crucial:
 - Briefing by dean before site visit
 - Briefing by DVC
 - Meeting with VC
 - Experienced chair
- The independence of the panel should be guarded at all cost.



7. Findings: Reports

- Focus of faculty reports and peer review reports
 - Both sets of reports discussed “input”: resources are clearly deemed important to reach Global Excellence and Stature
 - When faculty report did not provide information, panels gleaned it from interviewees
- International panel makes recommendation without institutional or national insight. Recommendations should be interpreted and adapted to take financial realities and national imperatives into consideration.
- Research:
 - Publication in credible international journals
 - Incentives: monetary as well as time credits.



8. Findings: Perceptions

- Preliminary findings: two peer review reports still awaited
- Faculty review as a quality review:
 - “you cannot benchmark without looking at quality”
 - faculty reviews lead to improvements
- Benefits of the faculty reviews:
 - Panel was knowledgeable and already opened doors for international collaboration.
 - Responsiveness to market changes enhanced by networking.



9. Conclusion

Faculty reviews seem to meet the requirements of a quality review, although the focus of these reviews are more strategic.

THANK YOU