MANAGING THE EVALUATION AND REVIEW OF FACULTIES AT AN AUSTRALIAN UNIVERSITY

Russell F. Waugh
Edith Cowan University
Western Australia


Key words: Evaluation, review, faculty, university

Running head: FACULTY REVIEWS

September 1998

Address correspondence to Dr Russell Waugh at
Edith Cowan University, Pearson Street, Churchlands,
Western Australia, 6018.

Abstract

This study investigates the procedures used in the evaluation and review of two Faculties at an Australian university in 1998. The three aims are to describe the evaluation and review programme in terms of formative, summative and meta-evaluation, to describe some of the issues that arose during the formal evaluation and review process, and to propose improvements to the evaluation and review process. The results show that the University used a continual formative review by Consultative Committees and internal review, with a five-year summative evaluation by a Review Panel, incorporating a modified meta-evaluation process. The Review Panels focused on the ‘broader picture’ rather than a narrow subject-by-subject approach and evaluated research, teaching, administration, course accreditation, community service and international activities. The Review Panels relied on Consultative Committee reports, documentation provided by each of the Schools of the Faculty, and interviews with academic and administrative staff, and with undergraduate and postgraduate students. The meta-evaluation procedures involved a mini-debriefing session with the Review Panel and senior Faculty staff, a minimal review of the review process by the Review Panel, and a formal opportunity for the Faculty to respond to the evaluation report, before it was submitted to University Council for its consideration.
MANAGING THE EVALUATION AND REVIEW OF FACULTIES

AT AN AUSTRALIAN UNIVERSITY

Introduction

Quality management is an important issue for universities in Australia. Both the international and domestic student markets are competitive and there is strong pressure on universities to provide high standards in courses, teaching and facilities to attract students and maintain them. It is believed that regular evaluation of the processes and outcomes of universities is necessary to maintain the high standards. In 1994, over half of Australian universities had regular review processes and many others were developing them (Cole, Shortland-Jones & Meney, 1994). It is likely that more Australian universities now have official regular evaluations and reviews.

Many universities submit their courses to professional bodies for accreditation, as for example, in engineering, law and psychology. This process has become part of the regular Faculty review process in some universities and ensures that the courses are relevant and serving the local business communities. This helps to provide a link between the universities and the communities which they serve. Students support this because many of them want to know if they will get a job at the end of their course and linking with businesses and the community is one way to improve employment prospects.

In recent years, the Australian Government, through the Department of Employment, Education and Youth Affairs (commonly called DEETYA), implemented the so-called Quality Assurance Rounds 1,2 and 3 and provided monies to universities, partly on the basis of demonstrated quality (see Committee for Quality Assurance in Higher Education, 1995a, 1995b, 1994). This has helped universities to focus on continuous improvement in teaching, courses, research and community service. During the 1990s, many universities in Australia have implemented review programmes and there are a number of current papers addressing different aspects of improvement or quality assurance (see for example, Brown, 1995; Clapham; 1995; Hughes, 1995, 1994; James, 1995; Mackay, 1994; Maling, 1995; Marshman, 1995; Massaro, 1995; Neumann, 1994; Piper, 1993; Sachs, 1994; Waugh, 1997).

This focus on quality and improvement has been world-wide in institutions of higher education during the 1990s. The OECD Journal, Higher Education Management, devoted two volumes on quality assurance in OECD countries (12 papers in volume 9, number 1, March 1997 and 10 papers in volume 7, number 1, 1995). The latter included three papers on various aspects of quality in Australian universities (Linke, 1995; Massaro, 1995; Meade, 1995). The American Journal, New Directions for Institutional Research, devoted a volume to program(me) review in American Universities and Community Colleges (7 papers in Number 86, Summer 1995). There are other journal papers which focus on aspects of evaluation, such as teacher evaluations (Schmelkin, Spencer & Gellman, 1997), Faculty instruction (Hativa, 1995) and perceptions of effectiveness (Knight, Moore & Coplethwaite, 1997).

In managing the reviews of Faculties, there are three aspects of evaluation used: formative evaluation, summative evaluation and meta-evaluation. Formative evaluation refers to an ongoing or continuous evaluation process. In the case of Australian University Y (to preserve anonymity), it refers to the continuous evaluation of Faculties by means of regular meetings of Consultative Committees, student-unit (subject) evaluation of teaching each semester and annual graduate evaluation of courses and programmes. Summative evaluation refers to a 'final' evaluation at the end of a course or programme. In the case of University Y, it refers to
a formal five-yearly review of courses, programmes, research, teaching, community services and administration of each Faculty by a Review Panel composed of members external to University Y and appointed by University Y Council. Meta-evaluation refers to an evaluation of the evaluation and includes an evaluation of its own approach. For University Y, it involved submitting the Report of the Review Panel to the Faculty for response and sending both the report and the response to University Council for consideration. The Review Panel was asked to evaluate the review process.

Aims

The present study has three aims. The first is to describe how Australian University Y implemented its evaluation and review programme in terms of formative, summative and meta-evaluation, for two Faculties in 1998. The second is to describe some of the issues that arose during the formal evaluation and review process and the third is to propose improvements after evaluating the evaluation and review process.

Official Review Policy of University Y

This section is closely paraphrased from the official policy of University Y, without references, to ensure anonymity. Faculty reviews are integral components of University Y's overall evaluation programme. They involve a review of each Faculty's planning and review processes; structure and management; courses; research and development; and community service activities (called the official evaluand). Information on these activities is expected to be collected regularly by Faculties from a range of sources, including students (such as student-unit evaluations), academic staff, graduates (such as the Graduate Destination Survey and Course Experience Questionnaire), employers and specialist consultants, and is used to assist Faculties and Consultative Committees with the maintenance of appropriate academic and professional standards. This continuous review (called formative evaluation) culminates every five years with a summative review (called summative evaluation) by an independent Review Panel appointed by University Y Council, on advice from Faculty Boards, Faculty Consultative Committees and Course Consultative Committees.

Review Panel members are mostly external to University Y and are representative of the following six categories: general educationalist; academic specialists in relevant fields; practitioner or employer in relevant fields; member of a professional body; external studies specialist; and a recent graduate or student from University Y. There is no set number of Review Panel members (in this study, Review Panel A had nine members and Review Panel B had seven members). The Chairperson must be external to University Y and the Executive Officer is a University Y staff member from the Office of Planning and Review.

The role of a Review Panel is to report to University Y on whether the Faculty is performing at a level expected of a quality international university in relation to five aspects: planning and review; structure and management; courses; research and development; and community service. The Panel is not expected to carry out a detailed analysis of specific courses at the level of the unit (subject) outline, delivery and assessment. Specialist Consultative Committees are expected to do this and provide regular reports to Faculty Boards who will collate these reports for consideration by the Review Panel. Whenever it is possible, University Y is expected to coordinate its review of courses with those of professional bodies. Where a course has been recently accredited by a professional authority, further detailed examination is usually not required, though course matters relating to resources, the mission of the Faculty and profile of the Faculty would still be reviewed.

Review Panels would normally assemble for a preliminary meeting with senior staff of University Y and the Faculty to be briefed on the review process, to agree on the exact
procedures to be adopted and to confirm procedures for preparing the final report. Subsequent meetings would extend over three or four days and culminate in the drafting of a report to University Y Council. The report should be based on seven aspects of information: documentation prepared by the Faculty; previous review reports; evaluative data collected by the Faculty; discussions with Consultative Committees; discussions with academic and general Faculty staff; discussions with students and graduates; and viewing the facilities. In preparing its report, the Review Panel is asked to provide comments and suggestions for guidance and make specific recommendations on particular matters for improvement. For each course, the Panel should recommend endorsement unconditionally or subject to conditions. Alternatively, the Review Panel may recommend that a course not be endorsed.

The report is to be formally submitted to University Y when it will be subject to the following meta-evaluation procedures. The Office of Planning and Review will formally submit the report to the Faculty and request a formal response to each recommendation. The Faculty responses are combined with the Review Panel report and the final document is then formally submitted to University Y Council for consideration. When Council has made its decision, the report and the Council's decision are considered by Programmes Committee (a formal committee of University Y) and by the Faculty for implementation. Programmes Committee is also expected to review the evaluation and review process, taking into account any suggestions from the Review Panel.

Methodology

The author acted as a participant observer during the formal review and accreditation process of two Faculties (A and B, to preserve anonymity) at University Y during 1998. He attended all meetings of the Review Panels, had access to the documents and kept notes of proceedings and processes used.

Results

What actually happened Prior to the Review Panel meetings

In both Faculties A and B, a Faculty staff member was appointed to coordinate the preparation of documents for the Review Panels. The documents were a Faculty overview, reports from each School, unit (subject) outlines and staff curriculum vitae. There were tight deadlines for the preparation of these documents and the coordinators had to contend with many staff problems in getting the documents prepared on time. There were three aspects that added to the problems in preparing for these reviews. First, University Y had a new Vice-Chancellor appointed about 12 months before the reviews. There was university-wide uncertainty about many new policies and changes at University Y, including new appointments and redundancies. Second, a new strategic plan was about to be approved by University Y Council, on recommendation from the Vice-Chancellor, and there was uncertainty about its effects. The strategic plan was formally released just before the Review of Faculty B. In particular, there was to be a re-organisation of Faculties and questions were raised as to 'why are we reviewing the old Faculties?'. The Dean of Faculty B, with the support of many academic staff, sought to have the review postponed, without success. The Dean argued that, as Faculty B was only half way into a new four-year degree programme and all the Faculties were being restructured, the review of Faculty B should be postponed for at least one more year and probably two. The Vice-Chancellor arguments in support of the review were that a five-year review was policy for all Faculties (no matter what), research and community service evaluations were still relevant (no matter what), and programmes and administration were continually being evaluated. Third, University Y restructured the Vice-Chancellor team and two Professors in Faculty A were temporally moved to the Vice-Chancellor for about six months prior to the review (and were still there during the review).
Academic staff in Faculty A were promoted to fill the acting Faculty positions and, while they did a creditable job at short notice, it did create added pressures on Faculty A.

The Chairpersons of Review Panels A and B telephoned each member as an introduction and to provide a brief discussion of the procedures, during the month prior to the formal meetings. Contrary to the official policy of University Y, no initial meetings were held to formulate and agree on a timetable and agenda. The meeting timetable was prepared by the Executive Officer, prior to the Review Panel meetings. This was apparently necessary to plan and organize University Y staff and others for attendance at the formal meetings. (Senior University Y personnel gave directions to the Review Panel on the first morning of the formal meetings).

The work for the Review Panels began two weeks before the scheduled meetings when members received a number of documents by courier. One was an overview of the Faculty prepared by Faculty senior staff and it contained information and performance indicators (as relevant) relating to the mission and strategic plan of the Faculty, the structure of the administration, staff profile, research and development, community service, initiatives and future directions of the Faculty. The second document was prepared by staff of School 1, with substantial input from the School's Consultative Committee. It contained information about courses in the School, including awards, course structures, resources available to teach the courses, student performance, and course planning and review. Other documents were prepared by staff of the other Schools, similar to that prepared by School 1. The 1998 University Handbook was prepared by the University Y Publications Department. It contained, for each of the Faculties of the University, details of undergraduate and postgraduate programmes with units (subjects) of study and a list of the names and qualifications of Faculties by School. Another document contained a list of recommendations from the previous five yearly report. The last document was the official directions on Faculty evaluation and review, prepared by staff from the Office of Planning and Review. A substantial amount of reading and thought was required to comprehend all the material in these documents in two weeks.

The main work for the Faculty occurred during the six months before the scheduled meetings. The Dean appointed a Faculty staff member to coordinate staff attendance at the Review Panel meetings, to coordinate the Faculty-prepared documentation and to liaise with the Executive Officer on a regular basis. The Faculty-prepared documentation was required about three weeks prior to formal Review Panel meetings. About eight weeks prior to the formal meetings, the Executive Officer of the Review Panel prepared a draft timetable of meetings for the Panel over three days. This was discussed with the chair of the Panel and some minor amendments were made. The timetable was then discussed with the Dean of the Faculty and some further amendments were made. It was then sent to the chair again when it was agreed that it could be distributed to Review Panel members. The timetable included discussions with senior staff of University Y at the beginning of the first day in regard to the purpose and extent of the review. From then on, discussion times were scheduled with the Dean and Associate Dean, Heads of Schools, staff of each School, Directors of the Research Centres, Commercial and administrative staff, a group of undergraduate students, a group of postgraduates, and the Librarian and Faculty Librarian. At the end of each day, time was set aside for discussion and formulation of recommendations. On the last day, a mini-debriefing session between the Review Panel and Faculty Executive staff was programmed. All this was needed well in advance so that staff would be available to meet with the Review Panel at the appointed times.
Formative Evaluation by Consultative Committees

In Faculty A, each School had a Consultative Committee composed of business and professional people. These committees met regularly, about twice a year, to provide advice to the Faculty. These had worked reasonably well, except for the Committee in one School in Faculty A. These committees examined the School programmes, resources and Unit (subject) outlines and they provided reports for the Review Panel. The Panel could then focus more on the ‘broader picture’ of programmes and not be bogged down on individual items.

In contrast, Faculty B School Consultative Committees had not been meeting on a regular basis. Faculty B believed that it had a strong case to postpone its review and had been arguing its case in Programmes Committee for many months in the previous year. Believing that it would win its argument, Faculty B Schools were slow to organise Consultative Committee meetings and slow to begin preparation of the documents needed for the Review Panel. Consequently, there was more tension and pressure for Faculty B staff in preparing the documents than there was for Faculty A staff.

During the Review Panel meetings

For both Faculties A and B, a timetable of discussions was prepared for three full days. These involved discussions with all Heads of Schools, all Professors, all chairs of main Faculty committees, staff from each School, general administrative staff, and both undergraduate and postgraduate students. At the beginning of the first day, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor and the Head of Planning and Review gave directions to the Review Panels. The Review Panels were asked to focus on the ‘broad picture’ involving programmes, research, teaching and learning, community service, internationalisation and administration, and to provide recommendations on all these aspects including the accreditation of all courses offered by the Faculties. The following is an example of the timetable for the third day of Faculty B: discussion with Head of School 2 (8.15-9.00am), discussion with Head of School 3 (9.00-9.45am), discussion with Chair of Professional Practice and Advanced Studies (9.45-10.30am), discussion with staff of School 3 (10.45-12noon), lunch with Heads of Schools and Professors (12noon-1.00pm), discussion with staff of School 2 (1.00-2.00pm), Review Panel formulation of recommendations (2.00-5.00pm), Review Panel debriefs the Faculty Executive on the perceived strengths and areas of improvement and on the trends of the recommendations (5.00-6.00pm).

After the Review Panel meetings

The Executive Officer wrote the first draft of the reports for Faculties A and B in about seven working days and submitted it to the Review Panel members by email (or by post if no email address was available). Most comments were received by email and amendments were made to the master copy as they were received. The Chairperson, on advice from Panel members, wrote an executive summary for Faculty A report and this was added to the master copy. When the comments of Panel members had been added, the report was re-submitted to the Panel as the next draft. Four drafts were submitted to Review Panel members before the Chairperson wrote a letter to the Executive Officer authorizing the report to be submitted formally to University Y. The reports were submitted to the University formally, from four to six weeks after the Review Panel meetings.

Meta-Evaluation

The Faculty reports were formally submitted to Faculties A and B by the Office of Planning and Review and a formal reply was requested. The Deans held meetings with Faculty staff
and Faculty Board endorsed a formal reply to each recommendation. The Faculties endorsed some recommendations and rejected others with accompanying arguments. The reply was formally sent to the Office of Planning and Review where it was combined with the Review Panel report as one document. The report and response of the Faculty were discussed by Programmes Committee (a formal committee comprising Deans, Associate Deans or others representing each Faculty with responsibility for all awards offered by the University Y) and then sent to University Y Council for its consideration.

After Consideration by University Council Y

After University Y Council had considered the Review Panel report and Faculty response, it made recommendations. These were sent to University Y Programmes Committee and the respective Faculties for action.

Discussion

Issues of the review process

The review process for both Faculties was friendly and positive, and a spirit of cooperation existed between Review Panel members themselves and between Review Panel members and University Y staff, although the 'climate' during the meetings with Review Panels A and B were distinctly different. This was due to the different personalities of Review Panel members and Faculty staff and to the mode of operation of the Chairperson. There were, at least, nine issues arising out of the evaluation and review process.

First, there is the issue of understanding the aims, the strategies, the strengths and the weaknesses of the Faculty in a short amount of time. This required concentrated work on the part of each Review Panel member in the two weeks prior to the meeting and during the three days of the meeting. Review Panel members received about eight documents, including a Faculty overview and various School reports, and they had to read these within two weeks. Although, they did not have to read other reports such as unit (subject) content, University and Faculty statistics, and curriculum vitae, these were also available, and sometimes it was necessary to know certain aspects of these or, at least have someone refer to parts of them. The agenda was full for three days from about 8 am till 6 pm and involved discussions with the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, the Dean, Professors, Heads of Schools, School staff, undergraduate and postgraduate students and members of Consultative Committees. There was a feeling amongst Review Panel members that they had to rush to discuss all the relevant issues and prepare appropriate recommendations within the three days.

Second, there was a constant problem for Review Panel members of knowing what is true and what is not. During discussions with groups of staff, it seemed that some staff did not know University Y policies. Sometimes different staff had different ideas of University Y policies or lack of policies. This lead Review Panel members to confusion at times as to what the policies were and whether they had been promulgated to all staff.

Three, on some issues, it was clear that only part of the 'story', and not the 'whole story', was given to Review Panel members. In one example, a section within one School had been making submissions, unsuccessfully, for over a year for increased funding to implement a practical course component on campus as a complement to its successful theory-based course. This would have cost many hundreds of thousands of dollars. Its position had been discussed by Faculty Board and the Dean over the past year and a current submission was before the Vice-Chancellor. The Review Panel was given only partial information and only
one side of the argument by the staff involved. This left the Panel in a difficult position when it came to formulate a recommendation.

Four, there was a difficulty with the Review Panels agreeing on the recommendations. In Review Panel A, the chairperson asked each member to suggest issues of importance and these were placed on a whiteboard under headings such as University general, Faculty general, and Schools. The chairperson also asked each member to suggest five recommendations which were placed under a different set of headings. Not all members agreed with this approach and there was a feeling amongst some members that, this being all there was now time for, the nuances surrounding the recommendations would be lost when the Executive Officer came to write the report. In Review Panel B, the members discussed the general direction that the recommendations should take during the times allotted after discussions with staff. The Executive Officer wrote the recommendations which were fine-tuned through successive drafts.

Five, in the case of Faculty A, one member of the Review Panel was from a local university which was in competition with University Y. There was a little uncomfortableness in supplying budget data, policies, strategic information and sometimes sensitive information to a competitor, albeit a friendly competitor. This raises the question for a University Council and Faculty as to whether to include an academic staff member from any local universities on the Review Panel. There is also a general issue about budget and costs information being given to the Review Panels. While there is some sensitivity about giving out confidential budget data, it is necessary for the Review Panel to have these data if it is to evaluate the operation of the Faculty, properly.

Six, the Review Panel had been asked to focus on the 'broader picture', especially with regards to courses. That is, the Panel was to rely on reports of units (subjects) and courses from the Consultative Committees which were supposed to monitor these over the past years. This was meant to reinforce the strategy that the Review Panel was evaluating summatively and the Consultative Committees were evaluating formatively. At times, the Review Panel needed to know the structure of courses and what sort of units (subjects) were available. In Faculty B, the Consultative Committees had not always been meeting as regularly as they should have and Faculty B was in the midst of being re-structured along with its Consultative Committees. This caused some concern at times because the Review Panel didn't always have an understanding of the fine detail in regard to all unit (subject) content, courses and policies.

Seven, in professional evaluation circles, there is a view that whenever 'n' is evaluating 'n-1', 'n' must be evaluated simultaneously. In Faculty reviews, this means that the report of the Review Panel evaluating a Faculty must be evaluated about the same time as its production and the Review Panel must know that it is being evaluated too. This is necessary to pressure the Review Panel into making recommendations which are based on facts and can be justified, and the need for the University to genuinely improve its operation and not 'gloss over' problems because they are sensitive, or too hard to implement. Where there are strengths and good things being done, the University needs to know about them and the Faculty needs to continue them. Where there is deficiency, the University needs to know about it and make improved policies and the Faculty needs to improve its performance. The reports prepared by the Review Panels for Faculties A and B were not subject to a meta-evaluation process in this form and this is a deficiency in the evaluation process.

Eight, there is an issue about the directions being given to the Review Panels. The Panels could be instructed to look for strengths, as well as weaknesses, new directions and improvements, and comment strongly on the strengths as things which the University and the Faculty need to maintain. Commenting on strengths and aspects done well can be
important because they are aspects which the Faculty can continue and they give a strong psychological fillip to staff, providing increased motivation to achieve.

Nine, there is an issue of collaboration and fairness between the Review Panel and University. The University, on the one hand, wants a proper review which provides for continuous improvement that benefits the University, staff and students, over the short and medium terms. Sometimes the Review Panel may have to make 'tough' recommendations in relation to improvements. On the other hand, Faculty Deans and Faculty staff want to be treated fairly and they do not want to be criticised unfairly because a Panel member doesn't agree with a particular method, process or goal. There are often a number of different ways to achieve similar goals and one particular way is not necessarily better than another, just different. This concern about unfair criticism led Deans to be careful about the selection of Review Panel members prior to the reviews. There is a common view in professional evaluation circles that, if you want to control an evaluation, then you should apply the following principle. 'If you can't have the police investigate the police, then the next best thing is to have the friends of the police investigate the police'. Review Panel members were all appointed by University Y Council, but only on advice from the Faculty. This is not to say that Review Panels A and B didn't make the hard recommendations, when necessary; They were, however, keen to be fair and just, perhaps overly so in some instances, particularly in questioning staff and framing recommendations. Panel B did not ask as many penetrating questions of staff as did Panel A and Panel B said that its members would have liked less time discussing issues with staff, even though Faculty B was undergoing more re-structuring and redundancies than Faculty A.

Suggested improvements to the review process

There are seven suggested improvements that could be made to the evaluation and review process. First, the procedure of telling the Review Panel that the University will ask the Faculty to respond to the recommendations of the Review Panel, after the Panel has left the University, is not sufficiently strong. The Review Panel needs to have more pressure placed upon it to gather better information in pursuit of the truth and to devise recommendations which will praise sections of the University that warrant it and suggest improvements where that is warranted. To help the Review Panel achieve this, there needs to be a meta-evaluation process in place. One way to do this is to say to the Panel before the meetings that its report will be sent to an independent person who will evaluate the evaluation and produce a meta-evaluation report. The meta-evaluation report will be sent to the Review Panel who will respond by changing their recommendations where they agree with the meta-evaluator and provide a written response arguing why they disagree with the meta-evaluator on the other recommendations. Then the Review Panel's report, the meta-evaluator's report and the Review Panel's response will be formally submitted to the University. The Faculty can respond to these before all are submitted formally to University Council.

Second, the University could allow academic staff to make individual submissions to the Review Panel. At present, all written data and information submitted to the Review Panel comes through the Dean, Associate Dean and the Faculty Board. Some individual academic staff have alternate views about how 'things' should be run and the Panel could be given the chance to evaluate those views. The Review Panel could raise these views with the Dean and Associate Dean in a formal discussion session with the Panel.

Three, the Review Panel and the University could benefit from having placed before it some other research, teaching and course programme models, strategies, policies and initiatives which allow a comparison with those at University Y. These could involve in summary form, at least, two models which look different but achieve similar ends, a cheap alternative model and a more radical alternative model, with advantages and disadvantages for each (see
Scriven, 1991). For example, if University Y has a four-year degree programme for subject Z, with a practicum and 32 semester units, taught in small classes by tenured lecturers, then other models that achieve similar ends ought to be available for comparison. These could include a much cheaper model; maybe large lecture classes with sessional lecturers and tutorials, less emphasis on semester assignments; and a more radical model, maybe 24 semester units with guest lecturers, television lectures and three month practicums.

Four, each Review Panel could have a member who is a Faculty Administrative Officer at another university, conversant with budget operations. This officer could evaluate the budget, the way it is used, allocated and publicised in the Faculty. As universities decrease their reliance on government money and increase their reliance on external sources such as full fee-paying students and research consultancies and grants, the importance of budget evaluation in Faculties will increase.

Five, the Faculty could prepare a paper with a list of key questions (and brief arguments for and against) on which the Review Panel could provide advice. The Review Panel can add questions to the list. These questions could relate directly to the issues (including policy directions and implementation methods) that the Faculty thinks are important to its short and medium term future.

Six, since the Review Panel is now required to do more reading and thinking, the University would have to submit the documents to the Review Panel about one month before the formal meetings. The Chairperson and Executive Officer would then have to be available from that time to discuss issues with review Panel members and gather data and information relevant to the key questions.

Seven, the Review Panel members could be appointed by University Council acting on advice from the Dean, Consultative Committee and Faculty, with maybe two members external to the University suggested by the Vice-Chancellor. The point here is that all recommendations for members should not come from the Faculty or its affiliates alone. The large majority of Panel members should be external to the University and they could cover the general areas as set out in the official policy of University Y.

Conclusion

A revised Faculty evaluation and review procedure can now be put forward. This procedure could follow the official University Y evaluation policy and include the improvements suggested above. It would have the following key elements:

1. Formative review through the regular use of School Consultative Committees to evaluate course programmes and resources in Schools, Faculty evaluation of mission statements and strategic plans (on aspects such as teaching and learning, research, equity, marketing and internationalisation), budgets, staff profiles, student enrolments and completions (including international and domestic markets separately), student-unit (subject) evaluations, graduate surveys (Graduate Destination Survey/Course Experience Questionnaire), employer surveys, and performance indicators on research, teaching and community service;

2. Summative evaluation by an external Review Panel every five years covering all the aspects mentioned in the formative review and the suggested improvements;

3. A meta-evaluation involving submission of the Review Panel's report to an external meta-evaluator, re-consideration of the report in the light of the meta-evaluation report, Faculty response to the recommendations of the reports of the Review Panel and meta-evaluator; and
4. Submission of the reports of the Review Panel, the meta-evaluator and the Faculty response to University Council for its consideration.
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