

Institutional feedback report

Name of Institution	University of Kwa-Zulu Natal (UKZN)
Date of institutional visit	21 April 2016
Names of peer reviewers	Ms Rachel Prinsloo (Unisa) Prof Jeff Jawitz (UCT)
Name of CHE person involved in the visit	Prof Diane Grayson
Date draft report submitted to institution	23 May 2017
Date of final report	18 August 2017

GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO QEP PEER REVIEWER REPORTS

Four focus areas were selected for Phase 1 of the Quality Enhancement Project (QEP) with which all institutions were asked to engage, namely: (1) enhancing academics as teachers, (2) enhancing student support and development, (3) enhancing the learning environment, and (4) enhancing course and programme enrolment management. In September 2014 each university produced a baseline submission that addressed the following questions for each focus area:

- Which aspects of your institution's Strategic Plan relate to this focus area? (Please be specific by quoting from the Strategic Plan).
- What activities do you currently have in place related to this focus area that are successful? What evidence do you use to conclude that they are successful? (Do not provide detailed evidence, just a description of the type of evidence you collect and a short summary of the results.)
- What activities related to this focus area have you initiated during the past three or four years that have not been as successful as you had hoped? In what ways were they unsuccessful? What do you think might be the reasons for the lack of success?
- What activities have you recently implemented or are you planning to implement in the next 12 to 18 months related to this focus area? Why have you chosen these particular activities? What is the need or problem they are intended to address?
- What are the challenges or problems related to this focus area that still need to be addressed in your institution?

The submission also included an introductory section on the contextual features of the institution that are salient to student success, a description of how the submission was prepared, and a concluding section on other activities the institution was undertaking to promote student success and challenges being faced.

Universities were asked to submit final reports by 11 December 2015 that indicated improvements that had been made or were being planned since the baseline reports were submitted. The stated aim of the report is shown below.

The aim of the institutional report is to demonstrate efforts to bring about enhancements in each of the four Quality Enhancement Project (QEP) focus areas since the beginning of Phase 1 of the QEP in February 2014, reflect on the journey towards enhancement and assess the extent to which the efforts have resulted in improvements.

Because of widespread student protests in the last few months of 2015, some reports were submitted early in 2016. In the final report, for each focus area universities responded to the following questions:

- Summarise what the university considers to be the key issues in [this focus area] in one or two paragraphs.
- During Phase 1 of the QEP, what changes at institutional level (a) have been made, (b) are in progress, or (c) are in the planning stages that relate to enhancing academics as teachers?

- Provide one or more (but not more than 5) exemplars to illustrate specific aspects of the changes that are successful. Provide evidence for claims of success. Where an activity is in the planning stages, indicate what evidence will be collected.
- Provide one or more (but not more than 5) exemplars of changes that have not been successful and suggest reasons.
- If possible, identify one or more promising practices related to this focus area. Describe the practice and provide evidence for success. Suggest what the key features might be.
- Identify the main challenges the university still faces in relation to this focus area.

The document also included an introduction that described how the report was prepared and a concluding section on reflections on Phase 1 of the QEP.

During 2016 and early 2017 individual institutional visits were carried out by two peer reviewers and the Director: Institutional Audits. The CHE communicated with the DVC Teaching and Learning or Academic to find a suitable date for the visit, and then a formal letter was sent to the Vice-Chancellor, which included the names of the peer reviewers and a request to indicate whether he or she felt there was a serious conflict of interest. In addition to logistical matters, the letter described the purpose and format of the visit as follows:

The purpose of the institutional visit is to provide a structured opportunity for institutional leaders to engage with peer reviewers external to the institution about the journey they are taking towards improvement in the QEP focus areas, the milestones achieved, the challenges encountered along the way and the plans for further improvement. It is also an opportunity for institutions to receive feedback on their engagement with the focus areas and suggestions for what else they might consider doing, or doing differently, based on what is being learned in and with the sector. Please note that we are interested in what is being done at your university that relates to the four Phase 1 focus areas, not just designated QEP activities.

The broad frame for the visit is appreciative inquiry (AI), originally developed by Cooperrider and Srivastva (1987)¹. AI is a strengths-based approach to change management that uses the “positive core” of an organisation as the starting point for growth and improvement. In contrast to problem-solving – trying to fix what is – it employs a generative method to envision what does not yet exist. While it is impossible for peer reviewers to engage in a full-blown AI process, the institutional visit is intended to focus on the positives as a springboard for thinking about what to enhance and how.

During the visit we would like to meet with the following groups of people over the course of the day:

1. Senior management (60 minutes)
2. Key role players involved with Focus Area 1 (80 minutes)
3. Key role players involved with Focus Area 2 (80 minutes)
4. Key role players involved with Focus Area 3 (80 minutes)

¹ Cooperrider, D.L. & Srivastva, S. (1987). Appreciative inquiry in organizational life. In Woodman, R. W. & Pasmore, W.A. (Eds), *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, Vol. 1, Stamford, CT: JAI Press, 129-169.

5. Key role players involved with Focus Area 4 (80 minutes)
6. Senior management (30 minutes for feedback)

The team will have read the university's QEP baseline report and final report. At the meetings, the team may ask for further information beyond what was in the two documents. The university may also wish to bring additional information to the meetings.

The selection of participants is up to you. However, we hope that you will be able to be part of the first meeting, and if possible, the last. For the meetings with senior management, we would like to speak with people who have the authority and responsibility to implement and drive initiatives at institutional level that relate to the four focus areas of Phase 1 of the QEP². For the meetings on the focus areas, we hope that students will be included.

Several weeks before the institutional visit, the two peer reviewers were sent the institutions' two reports, two articles on Appreciative Inquiry and the peer reviewer manual, which contains, among other things, a list of possible questions and detailed guidelines for the peer reviewer report. Immediately prior to each institutional visit, the peer reviewers and the Director: Institutional Audits spent most of a day preparing for the visit by going through the institution's two submissions in detail. During this preparatory meeting, several specific questions for the senior management were formulated and areas in which the panel wanted more information were identified for each focus area. The meetings that took place during the institutional visit were audio-recorded, and the audio files were sent to the peer reviewers after the visit for reference.

Each peer reviewer report is based on three data sources: the institution's baseline submission, the institution's final report and the content of the meetings during the institutional visit. As stated in the letters to the VCs, institutions could provide additional information during the visit. Some institutions did provide further documentation to elaborate on specific issues during the visit or, by agreement, emailed additional documentation immediately after the visit; in these cases such documentation was also taken into account in writing the report. It was necessary to limit the scope of the work in this way to ensure that the work could be completed within a specified time frame and also to be fair to all institutions.

Following receipt of the peer reviewers' reports, the CHE undertook a process of editing and harmonisation of the reports (to ensure a reasonable level of consistency among them) before sending them to institutions. In the initial letter to each VC it was indicated that the reports would be sent to the institutions for corrections, but that institutions were not expected to add new information at this stage. After the corrections were received from institutions, the final report was produced; new information was not included. It is hoped that the report will be a useful resource for an institution in its own journey to improvement. In addition, the reports will be among the documents that the CHE will use to produce a document synthesising what has been learnt during Phase 1 of the QEP across the sector. The final reports will serve at the Institutional Audits Committee and the Higher Education Quality Committee for information.

² (1) Enhancing academics as teachers, (2) Enhancing student support and development, (3) Enhancing the learning environment, (4) Enhancing course and programme enrolment management.

1. INTRODUCTION

The University of KwaZulu-Natal (UKZN) was established in 2004 following the merger of the former Universities of Durban-Westville and Natal. The UKZN is one of South Africa's largest residential/ contact universities, and comprises five campuses in Durban, Pinetown and Pietermaritzburg. In 2013, the enrolment profile of 44 327 students was made up of 74% undergraduates, 58% female and 67% African.

The UKZN operates a College model, with four Colleges, each comprising between four and six Schools, and each led by a Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Head of College. Each School, in turn, is led by a Dean and Head of School; academic leadership in each discipline is provided by an Academic Leader. The current structure was an outcome of an external Institutional Review in September 2010. Flowing from the recommendations, there was a reorganisation of Colleges, resulting in revised academic and management structures being implemented in 2011. The reengineering led to 19 new Schools (from the previous 52 Schools and 8 Faculties) distributed across four Colleges. The new academic leadership structure has dedicated roles and responsibilities at College and School levels, giving equal weight to the core University functions of teaching and learning and research, which became effective from 2012. Each College has a Dean of Teaching and Learning, a Dean of Research, a Director: Professional Services and Managers for Student Support and Academic Services. In addition, there are School-level Teaching and Learning Committees and academic monitoring and support.

The centrality of student access with success is a defining strategic goal in giving expression to UKZN'S vision 'to become the Premier University of African Scholarship'. At an institutional level, the Teaching and Learning Portfolio, headed by the DVC: Teaching and Learning, consists of five pillars: University Teaching and Learning Office (UTLO), Quality Promotions and Assurance (QPA), Higher Education Training and Development (HETD), the Language Planning and Development Office (ULPDO) and UKZN Extended Learning (Pty) Ltd (UEL). There is also a University Teaching and Learning Strategy Group (TLSG), which includes teaching and learning representatives from each School and College, and helps ensure that innovations reach School level. The TLSG replaced the former Senate Teaching and Learning Committee and provides a space for testing ideas and for pro-active and responsive discussions.

Policy development is done in a consultative way, allowing for discussions and input from various levels in the University prior to finalisation and then implementation. As a result, there is a high level of coherence in policies, while allowing for contextual variations at college level.

In order to prepare the first (2014) QEP report, the TLSG was expanded to include people with institutional responsibility for the various aspects of the QEP focus areas, and monthly meetings were held. Inputs into the report were received from each College and relevant professional staff, and several drafts were produced before final submission to and approval

by Senate. A similar process was followed in preparing the final QEP report, with input from formal academic and professional staff structures, executive management and the SRC.

The UKZN is to be congratulated on producing very balanced and considered accounts in their submissions to the QEP process. The reported shifts and achievements are well counter-balanced with the identification of areas requiring deeper analysis and attention. The two reports have a coherent and compelling voice throughout, indicating the consistent efforts that went into facilitating the multiple dialogues. There is also ample evidence of the progress and responses to new challenges emerging from the quality enhancement journey from September 2014, to the more substantive account in the December 2015 submission. During the institutional visit, senior management indicated that the QEP was useful to the University in helping it to identify good practices at various levels in the institution and promote sharing of these, as well as encouraging the presentation of evidence for claimed success.

The institutional commitment to embed the initiatives aimed at bringing about improvements in the QEP focus areas was demonstrated by the significant and inclusive participation of executive management and staff responsible for implementation during the institutional visit conversations. In the opening meeting, the Vice-Chancellor referred to serious attempts across the University to enhance teaching and learning, and a serious commitment to continuous improvement.

It is acknowledged that the preparation of this report cannot do justice to fully appreciating and distilling the rich information provided in the comprehensive compendium of policies, charters, the robust and QEP-aligned reviews and externally evaluated reports provided by the institution as evidence during the institutional visit and referred to in the reports.

There is compelling evidence, however, that the key strategies and monitoring systems are systematically placed under rigorous scrutiny and that the ensuing recommendations for improvement are acted upon in a meaningful manner in the respective spheres of operation. The accounts are incisive, soundly conceptualised and thematically integrated, affording rich enhancements to the core businesses, and incrementally resolving the identified challenges of the UKZN. This bodes very well for the future.

2. FOCUS AREA 1: ENHANCING ACADEMICS AS TEACHERS
(Including professional development, rewards and recognition, workload, conditions of service and performance appraisal)

THE INSTITUTION'S STRENGTHS

The core strengths of the UKZN's translation of their Strategic Goal 4, "Excellence in teaching and learning", to advance the institution as the premier University of African Scholarship, have been supported by a number of structural, policy and programmatic changes to elevate teaching as a key and central pillar to be on par with the more established research enterprise, while not being treated as in opposition to research. For example, prior to the QEP the institution established the position of DVC Teaching and Learning (2008) as

well as appointing people responsible for teaching and learning at the levels of colleges, schools and disciplines. This cascading organisational structure within the institution has provided the framework for a working through of the institutional policy and strategies on teaching and learning. The DVC Teaching and Learning manages the five units listed in the introduction above; these provide vehicles for implementation and monitoring of developments.

The University has encoded its commitment to teaching and the development of academics in a number of policies and associated procedures. These include: Integrated Talent Management, Performance Management, Learning, Training and Development, Academic Promotion, Teaching Workloads, Student Feedback on Teaching Quality and Distinguished Teachers' Award.

An important initiative in preparing new lecturers for university teaching is the University Education Induction Programme (UIEP), an 80-hour induction programme that is compulsory for new academic staff and those at lecturer level or below. It comprises four modules: Assessing learning, Designing and evaluating curricula, Supervising research and Teaching and learning. Academics with a rank of senior lecturer or above may be exempted on the basis of a teaching portfolio that is evaluated at 'strength' or above.

Academics are evaluated through the performance management system, in which teaching is one of the key performance areas. Staff develop annual Personal Development Plans, in consultation with their line managers. The Human Resources Division analyses the plans and procures the training needed.

A Teaching Workload Framework was approved by Senate in 2011 and has been in operation at the University since 2012. The system is designed to promote equity and transparency in work allocations using quantifiable measures. Aspects of teaching that are considered are: contact, preparation, assessment and supervision.

The Academic Promotions Policy identifies four areas for assessment: teaching, scholarship and research, community service and development, and university service. There are sub-minima that must be achieved in each category for promotion to various levels, but beyond this applicants may place more emphasis on some areas than on others. This has allowed a number of academics to be promoted on the basis of excellence in teaching, 48 (36%) between 2009 and 2013, as opposed to 36 (27%) on the basis of excellence in research. A further 50 (37%) applicants achieved excellence in both teaching and research.

There are university Distinguished Teaching Awards, which recognise excellent teaching across the University. Staff and students may make nominations. Applicants submit a teaching portfolio, which is evaluated by an institutional committee comprising College DVCs, Deans, the Quality Assurance and Promotion Director and SRC representatives. In addition, Schools and Colleges offer a number of awards for teaching excellence, based on their own criteria.

The University runs an annual Teaching and Learning Higher Education Conference, which includes not only presentations from UKZN staff and other participants from South African institutions, but also highly esteemed international speakers.

The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SOTL) is promoted in a number of ways by the UTLO. Approximately R1.5 million is made available annually for grants for teaching-related research, enhancement and innovation. From 2009 to 2013 approximately 118 projects were funded, involving 345 academics. In addition, the T&L portfolio launched a PhD in Higher Education in 2011 using a cohort supervision model. This has helped to increase the number of academics with PhDs in the University, and, together with the projects run on grant funding and other activities of the T&L portfolio, led to an estimated 178 accredited publications between 2009 and 2013.

THE APPROACH TAKEN TO IMPROVEMENT

The UKZN has opted for a strategic and research-based incremental approach to improvement, which has impacted upon policy and improving practices and is supported by structural innovation. The need for a possible intervention is researched, followed by piloting, evaluating and then rolling out of the intervention.

The university has introduced an Integrated Talent Management (ITM) policy, launched in 2014 after piloting, for all staff. It is administered by Human Resources, which trains line managers, and encompasses performance management, career-pathing and professional development.

In an effort to continue to blur the boundaries between teaching and research at the University and following considerable discussion, supervision has been identified as a form of teaching. As with other teaching activities, it therefore requires skills and demonstration of quality practices.

IMPROVEMENTS UNDERTAKEN AND PROGRESS MADE

The UKZN has made considerable progress in this focus area, and is mindfully plotting the way forward to attain optimal impacts.

Professional development

The University's Integrated Talent Management (ITM) system was launched in 2014. The TLSG and Human Resources Division work together on matters related to teaching and learning. The purpose of the system is to assist the University in monitoring and developing human resource capacity and promoting career development of its staff. Targeted initiatives are developed to address identified current and future needs. An example is the Accelerated Academic Development Programme, which is intended to attract and develop young academics by appointing them as Developmental Lecturers and providing support to

accelerate their careers. Since this programme began in 2013, 117 Developmental Lecturers have been appointed.

Increasingly the university is looking to provide administrative assistance to Academic Leaders so that their functions can be academically more strategic and less administrative. They are currently supported by school level administrators.

Completion of the UEIP is supposed be done during a new academic's two year probation period (except where competence based on prior experience can be demonstrated). Senior academics also attend some of the modules. The programme is overseen by the School of Education and the content is developed by the Higher Education Development and Training Office under the DVC. It is managed by UKZN Extended Learning. Presenters include teaching award winners. Between July 2012 and October 2015, the numbers of staff who attended each of the four modules were 428, 425, 452 and 409, but only 67 have completed the entire programme. All academics at lecturer level or below were meant to complete the UEIP by December 2015, but the deadline has had to be extended by a year, accompanied by a range of measures to encourage completion.

During the institutional visit students said that it helps students perform better when they are taught by people who know how to teach. They commented that it is very important to have teachers who have aspirations and dreams, and want to develop their students. Academics use their personal traits to make their students perform better. For students coming from highly disadvantaged backgrounds the passion can be seen, and it matters to students.

There are also numerous seminars, colloquia and workshops, although it appears that these are mostly offered centrally and attendance is not as high as the UTLO would wish.

The use of student evaluations is increasing, although not mandatory. In the past they were paper-based, but recently they have been embedded into the University's learning management system. An app has also been created for student evaluations. There are standard questions designed by the Quality Promotion and Assurance (QPA) unit, and lecturers can add others. QPA is responsible for compiling reports of evaluations. Student evaluations are included in lecturers' teaching portfolios and sent to line managers, who are expected to take action where needed. Analyses of the evaluations can be done at institutional level to identify areas for attention.

Rewards and recognition

Academics are able to choose relative weights of teaching, research, community engagement and university service when applying for promotion, although a certain level of performance in each one is required.

Recently a policy was implemented that requires all applicants for promotion to submit a teaching portfolio. The use and development of teaching portfolios is increasing in the University, which are used not only for applications for promotion but also for performance

appraisal and applications for teaching awards. The Academic Promotions Policy includes guidelines on how to prepare a teaching portfolio. Training for creating and assessing teaching portfolios will be rolled out in 2016. Statistics collected on promotions applications and results show that the flexibility provided by the promotions policy in allowing applicants to excel in either teaching or research (while demonstrating at least “strength” in both) is having a significant positive effect on the promotion of women academics, as in the past few years more women applicants achieved excellence in teaching than men, while more men achieved excellence in research than women. Interestingly, more women achieved excellence in both teaching and research than men.

Performance management and teaching workloads

In addition to a teaching portfolio, academics need to compile a short teaching file for their annual performance appraisal.

In 2014 online data were collected for the first time on teaching workloads, using the four categories of teaching-related activity specified in the Teaching Workload Framework (TWF). During 2014 the system was piloted in four schools and extended to all schools in 2015. Operationally, the system works at school level where administrators are trained to capture data, which they input with the help of the Academic Leaders (ALs). Two cycles of workload are processed: the plan at the beginning of the year and confirmation work carried out at the end of year. The data is also used for HEMIS reporting. There is an approval work flow process starting with the academic who approves the workload, then the AL who can approve or reject, then the Dean and Head of School. Accountability checks are built in at every level. Live data on student registrations are fed into the system. The TWF quantifies the core work by assigning single values to modules. This has been contentious as schools often see themselves as unique. However, while the system quantifies the workload it does not do the allocation. There are no prescribed workload norms. This must still be done by academics and their line managers. There is a resource allocation model with different weightings for different programmes and functions, such as clinical supervision, that colleges can use to make internal decisions.

All workloads are made available on the system in the form of online reports, available to all, facilitating comparisons and a consistent approach. This transparency has contributed to the data becoming more accurate and intelligent. Since the system was implemented, long standing inequities have been discovered that can now be addressed. For example, identifying and ending the practice in one college of assigning a lot of the teaching to contract lecturers led to a savings of R15 million. On the other hand, institution-wide analysis of teaching workloads revealed that many of the lecturers with high teaching loads also have high research outputs.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER IMPROVEMENTS

The UKZN has an impressive and carefully conceptualised and implemented array of initiatives designed to enhance academics as teachers. Several suggestions for further enhancement are given below.

While the institution-level work in SOTL and teaching development is certainly valuable, the panel recommends that the university promote communities of practice to enhance teaching and learning that is discipline-specific. It could also consider introducing discipline-specific components to the UEIP and post-graduate higher education certificates and diplomas, which may increase the attractiveness of these programmes.

During the interviews, students indicated that they would like to be able to see the evaluation reports to identify where the problems are and what interventions are being put in place, including by student structures. It is recommended that the university develop formal feedback mechanisms for students to be informed of how their concerns about particular modules are being addressed. In addition, the University might consider stipulating a minimum frequency for the administration of student evaluations (per lecturer and/or module). In the case of gateway modules, more frequent evaluations may be needed.

The Teaching Workload Framework is a commendable initiative to promote equity in workload allocations and effective uses of resources. However, one issue that the model does not address is career stage development. In particular, it is recommended that the model be used to ensure that young academics do not get assigned heavy teaching loads while they are still establishing their careers. One way that NMMU does this is to allocate a larger number of hours for preparation to young academics. Another way, used by UP, is to create norms for academics at different career stages.

3. FOCUS AREA 2: ENHANCING STUDENT SUPPORT AND DEVELOPMENT

(Including career and curriculum advising, life and academic skills development, counselling, student performance monitoring and referral)

THE INSTITUTION'S STRENGTHS

As part of the devolved model at UKZN, each college has its own structures, academic development officers (ADOs) and counsellors, but different implementation strategies for supporting student development. This allows the support to be tailored to the particular needs of each College's students. College-based support includes academic support activities, such as academic literacy development, a writing centre, supplemental tutorials, peer-mentoring and bilingual English-isiZulu tutorials, and non-academic support, such as life skills workshops, career counselling and development and counselling by registered psychologists.

The university has a home-grown, innovative, institution-wide and overarching student support system called the Academic Monitoring and Support (AMS) system and each College has an AMS office. The AMS system is premised on the principle that if students do not succeed it is not because the University was unaware that they were at risk or was

unable to offer support. Part of this system is a centralised tracking system for student performance and progression, informally called the “robot system”. Student performance is colour-coded as green, orange or red according to students’ academic standing. A shift from green to orange or orange to red (at risk of exclusion) sets up alerts, and flags students for referral for support. Students identified as being at risk are required to consult College-based student counsellors at least twice a year. The AMS system also allows students to monitor their own progress, which they are encouraged to do. One of the impacts of the approach is a reduction in the number of exclusion appeals considered at institution level from several hundred in 2009 to fewer than 100 in 2014.

A variety of student health and wellness services are offered. Each campus has a health clinic and an HIV/AIDS programme, which includes peer educators. Meal vouchers are issued to students who do not have food. An indigenous healthcare provider is available to students, who works with the psychologists and is consulted by several hundred students each year.

THE APPROACH TAKEN TO IMPROVEMENT

A similar strategic, structural and research-based development approach is being followed in this focus area as in focus area 1. The extensive and systemic thinking about how to improve in this focus area has led to the development and adoption of a strategy document for creating a Student Services Council, which is in the process of being implemented. The Student Services Council includes representatives from campus management services, RMS, and school managers. Previously, managers would provide different reports, but now they work together, see trends, and identify problem areas.

A Student Support Strategy Group at institutional level is being established based on the Teaching and Learning Strategy Group (TLSG) model. This should help ensure closer alignment rather than these two areas working as if they are in parallel universes.

IMPROVEMENTS UNDERTAKEN AND PROGRESS MADE

The devolved model has enabled the colleges to respond to the specific needs and discipline-related demands of their own students in a holistic manner. Initiatives offered by some colleges include peer mentors, Supplemental Instruction, tutoring and bilingual isiZulu-English tutorials. While first year students are the focus of much of the support, some colleges are providing support for students all the way through their degree programmes.

The stigma attached to presenting for at-risk counselling appears to have been countered; the institution is seeing that not only at-risk but also good students go to Academic Development Officers (ADOs). This has impacted positively on the behaviour of the at-risk students, and more of them are attending support sessions.

The AMS system is reviewed each November by Senate and at an annual colloquium to look critically at current practices in colleges and share good practices. The aim is to provide holistic student support through a coherent institutional approach, involving both academic and support staff. Revision of the academic monitoring and support criteria was initiated as

a result of the need, identified by the SRC, for colleges to provide evidence that students were being supported, prior to implementing the provisions of the recently approved Academic Monitoring and Exclusions Policy.

However, during the interviews both staff and students acknowledged that, while there are numerous college-based activities, there is no coherent approach to student support across the institution. Students felt that interventions should be more standardised, so that students can expect the same quality of care and provisioning across all colleges. In addition, some areas for support need to be addressed at institutional level, such as the need for support for students in residence. One of the challenges of the present devolved model is that Colleges operate on more than one campus, so it is not easy to determine whether the services offered at different campuses are equitable. This is an area that the university is working on, particularly given its deliberate efforts to recruit more students from quintile 1 and 2 schools, who tend to have less support at home than more economically advantaged students.

A more coherent institutional approach will likely be supported by the appointment in September 2014 of a Senior Student Development Specialist, as the purpose of this position is to work with College Managers for Student Support Services to oversee an institutional student development strategy.

Provision of support for disabled students, of whom there are close to 600 at UKZN, has improved, resulting in improved graduation rates. Student assistants help provide support.

Composite reports are produced on student support and development initiatives, based on college reports. A composite report on student counselling, psychotherapy and assessments has shown that these services are widely used, with 11,532 individual consultations recorded from January to December in 2014. Interestingly, statistics by year of study show that only a little less than one third of the consultations were with first year students; the rest were with senior students, including a small proportion of post-graduate students. This points to the need to ensure that support initiatives are not limited to first year students. An analysis of the five most common problems that students present by College was undertaken in January and June 2015 which showed that the problems are not the same. However, the June analysis showed that two of the five are common, namely issues related to career choice and mental health issues, such as anxiety and depression.

In Humanities interventions to address the material conditions of students are in place to facilitate academic success. The lessons from the Science Foundation for quintile 1 and 2 students indicate that students appreciate and benefit from counselling. Each college has its own counselling unit and a new online booking system helps with making appointments.

Student Health and HIV/AIDs support services are also widely used, with 36,589 consultations held from January to December 2014.

One of the support gaps identified during the interviews was orientation for new students, which is left to individual colleges to implement or not. The development of an extended

orientation prototype within Student Support, different from an academic orientation programme, is being evaluated. The programme is compulsory for first year students and each discipline has a full day, with meetings of the support team (mentors, counsellors). The programme continues into the year as part of the first year experience project, with ongoing tracking and intervention. It is important that this programme does not evolve into a parallel intervention, and efforts must be made to ensure integration into a holistic student development strategy.

Tracking the effects of interventions is problematic, with the staff turnover rates and transient workforce because of short-term contracts for many support staff, requiring reinvestments into training and upskilling, which then puts an additional drain on institutional resources. Given the recruitment and admission of more disadvantaged students, pressure for increased support and interventions is expected and needs to be planned for proactively.

There is an intention to introduce a co-curricular record to recognise students' engagement in co-curricular activities.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER IMPROVEMENT

While the University has in place a number of well-considered student support and development activities, sustainability is a concern. The institution is aware of that fact that key initiatives are reliant on soft funding (TDG), including the AMS system and the ADOs. There is job insecurity – many staff are on short-term contracts – and high annual turnover of staff, with little career-pathing for such employees. To further complicate matters, traditionally and historically student services have been on the periphery and need integration into the mainstream. In the interviews it was indicated that support staff feel that there is little support from academic and management staff to address student support, which is something needed by the majority of students.

As the AMS system captures final marks and not continuous assessment, it only picks up examination performance at the end of a semester. Some schools have monitoring systems to identify students at risk during the term, but a comprehensive early-warning system at institutional level is needed, linked to record-keeping of consultations and support opportunities taken up by students. Commercial software is available that makes this straightforward.

While students identified by the AMS system as not progressing at a satisfactory rate are required to see a college-based support person, not all students do; as a result they often end up facing exclusion. Attempts should be made to address this matter, rather than having the issue only coming up during appeals.

According to one of the international leaders in student success, George Kuh, first year orientation has been shown to be a high impact practice in improving student success. At present, orientation is undertaken by individual colleges. A review of the diverse orientation initiatives across the Colleges would, no doubt, provide useful information that should

inform a common approach. A compulsory university-wide orientation programme with college-specific components is highly recommended, supported by a First Year Experience programme that extends over the entire first year. Examples of such orientation programmes can be found at UCT, UP and Stellenbosch. The National Resource Centre for the First Year Experience at UJ has extensive information about First Year Experience programmes.

The proposal for a co-curricular comprehensive transcript that reflects all student activities during their university careers needs to be expedited, since such a policy has existed since 2008. This helps students feel recognised for participating in co-curricular activities, especially where they have offered support such as mentoring, as well as increasing their employability. An example of how this can be done is provided by NMMU.

The focus on student wellness and caring for the students is receiving consistent attention, and should be complemented by ensuring that “academic development counselling” and training programmes on academic and digital literacy skills development also forms part of the repertoire of professional graduate skills. The extent to which the curriculum explicitly includes soft skills development and growth moments is another dimension for the possible mainstreaming of student academic support services.

4. FOCUS AREA 3: ENHANCING THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

(Including teaching and learning spaces, ICT infrastructure and access, technology-enabled tools and resources, library facilities)

THE INSTITUTION’S STRENGTHS

Wi-Fi is available on all UKZN campuses (although not ubiquitous). Significant data allocations are provided for students. A common lecture venue upgrading project has been undertaken to improve the facilities in lecture rooms. Computers are provided in computer laboratories, with a computer to student ratio of 1:8. Moodle has been adopted as the University’s learning management system.

APPROACH TAKEN TO IMPROVEMENT

A great deal of effort has gone into upgrading ICTS infrastructure. The efforts to develop a campus master plan covering all aspects of the infrastructural and space needs of the institution by 2017 are noted. The plan will include lecture theatre needs as well as increased residence space. Areas that need attention include increased social learning spaces, access to libraries, LANs and learning spaces that are available 24/7 and improved social amenities, such as cafeterias, which are not currently available on all campuses.

IMPROVEMENTS UNDERTAKEN AND PROGRESS MADE

Substantial progress has been made in upgrading and extending the ICT infrastructure and its use in teaching. This is being achieved by expanding Wi-Fi access, installing power points for charging and upgrading lecture venues.

The use of Moodle is increasing, supported by a better server and the acquisition of an upgraded version of the software. From 2016 it is compulsory for all first year modules to have a presence on Moodle. Academics are being trained in the technical aspects of how to use Moodle, with the result that many lecturers use it mostly as a document repository. There is a plan for the Academic Computing Centre (ACC) to do a two-day training in future, with one day devoted to technical aspects and one to pedagogical aspects of using Moodle. The ACC, however, has very few staff and does not have the capacity to provide support for instructional design.

Students are expected to purchase a laptop. In the past, students were charged fees for notes, which have now been abolished. The University calculated that the cost of notes over three years equals the cost of a laptop. However, computer laboratories are available for students who cannot afford laptops.

One of the innovative uses of blended learning in the University is the production of videos in isiZulu, including on how to use Moodle, which are made available online.

In Health Sciences students are able to connect to the LMS while they are doing their hospital-based clinical training, as well as participate in video conferences. Lectures in all first year courses and most second year courses in the College are video-captured.

The expansion of efforts to moving towards greater use of e-learning has been delayed because of the lack of an institutional e-learning policy. The institution had adopted a “pragmatic” approach to technology adoption. However UKZN management did not want to support a “piecemeal” approach and emphasised the need to have an e-learning strategy in place before dedicating more resources.

A campus master plan is in the process of being developed, which will be supported by the recent appointment of an Executive Director for institutional planning. There is a university-wide forum on built pedagogy, which looks at how to encourage social learning through the provision of physical spaces. At present, there are not enough social spaces and social learning spaces. However, efforts to repurpose spaces to expand the areas for social interaction and collaborative learning are underway, such as through the provision of benches and Wi-Fi in the Shepstone building. Drinking fountains have been installed as well as outdoor furniture for increased seating for social learning opportunities on the Howard College campus. Spaces in residences and in LANs are being created to enable students to study in groups. Some LANs are open 24/7. Libraries are open 24 hours a day from Monday to Friday and until 17h00 over weekends.

In the Library there is a project underway to provide learning spaces, some for quiet, individual study and some for group learning. There are undergraduate commons in the libraries on some campuses; there are efforts to duplicate these on other campuses. While mention is made in the

University's QEP report as to the benefits of having streamlined library services across campuses, during the interviews it was clear that in the main there is still unevenness in the way the infrastructural developments have occurred across the campuses and faculties.

Timetabling and allocation of shared venues are done centrally and electronically, while laboratory scheduling is done by schools and disciplines. There is an intention to try to also centrally manage venues located in Schools, although some Schools do not want to give up "their" spaces.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER IMPROVEMENT

The panel notes that the level of activity, supported by policy, which was seen in the first two focus areas was not evident in this focus area. A contributing factor may be that the institution did not have a planning office for several years.

It is suggested that the initiative to develop a Campus Master Plan be directly informed by the pedagogical and curriculum transformation needs of the UKZN. Given the mild climate in KZN, further development of outdoor informal learning spaces is encouraged, which could include solar charging stations as are used, for example, at CUT. Some universities, such as UCT, are looking at how the "nooks and crannies" – such as wide passages or large foyers – can be utilised as learning spaces by providing Wi-Fi and seating.

Two suggestions made by student representatives are supported. Firstly, there is a need to address differences between conditions in leased residences and those managed by the university. Problems raised included the amount of noise and the standard of the Wi-Fi facilities in leased accommodation. It was acknowledged that the university needed to enforce the standards required at the leased residences. Students offered to assist in providing details of those residences that are not up to standard.

Students also raised the issue of the learning environment needing to be made more user friendly for disabled students, with an easier positioning of facilities and an increased number of ramps. A special computer lab was created for disabled students, but attention needs to be given to finding a venue with easier access.

The issue of integrating ICT affordances into curriculum and course design and delivery in class goes way beyond the training solution suggested in the report of how to address the lack of ICT "fluency" amongst academic staff. A more fundamental approach is necessary to address the academic staff development needs to support this integration process. This would aim to address the "slow uptake" by academics to making use of Moodle's full potential.

Furthermore, the planned roll out of the Student Technology Programme (laptops), has implications beyond the need to provide computer literacy and Moodle training for students. The increased space and power point demands within the lecture theatres are substantial and it is suggested that attention be given to the support needed to assist academics in rethinking their teaching in ways that take full advantage of the new technology to facilitate student learning.

5. FOCUS AREA 4: ENHANCING COURSE AND PROGRAMME ENROLMENT MANAGEMENT

(Including admissions, selection, placement, readmission refusal, pass rates in gateway courses³, throughput rates, management information systems)

THE INSTITUTION'S STRENGTHS

UKZN provided evidence of an extensive process of analysing and reviewing its admissions and enrolments process.

Like the other HEIs in KZN, UKZN makes use of the regional Central Applications Office (CAO). Enrolments are managed at School and College level, and at institutional level through the Executive Deans Forum. Undergraduate selection and admission are done at college level. In 2013 the overall undergraduate enrolments were within 1% of the University's enrolment target.

A report was produced on "First year undergraduate student profile and performance (2007-2012)", which covers the period before and after the introduction of the National Senior Certificate and provides an evidence basis for determining admissions criteria.

An analysis of applicants showed that a number of them met all admissions requirements except for a pass in Mathematics at the right level. To increase access, the University decided to offer the Foundation Mathematics course, which is part of the BSc Foundation Programme, as a two-week short course through the UEL. Students who did not score high enough marks in Mathematics in Grade 12 or who took Mathematical Literacy instead of Mathematics may take the course. For students who pass it, the module takes the place of Grade 12 Mathematics as an admissions criterion.

The Academic Monitoring and Support (AMS) system, described in focus area 2, is used to track students' progress throughout their degree. The use of this system, together with the Academic Monitoring and Exclusion Policy, has significantly reduced contentions around student exclusions. Cohort analyses and analyses of student retention, dropout, progression and graduation are tracked by Colleges and institutionally every year.

Each College has a minimum pass rate below which a module is investigated. Colleges have also identified modules that impede progression for significant numbers of students, and put measures in place to improve the situation, such as offering the module in both semesters. Modules that attract low student evaluations are also identified for interventions.

The University's Institutional Intelligence Unit (IIU) maintains and provides accurate and accessible information to the University community. Data from multiple sources within the

³ "Gateway courses" are those courses that have a large impact on students' ability to progress. Typically they are prerequisites for other courses, and often they have large enrolments. At many universities, examples of gateway courses are first year Mathematics and Economics. In some cases, if students fail a gateway course they automatically have to extend their studies by one or two semesters.

University, as well as outside, is integrated to generate reports to guide decision-making. A dashboard of institutional data is available that provides a wide range of data on, among other things, enrolments, pass rates and cohort analyses.

THE APPROACH TAKEN TO IMPROVEMENT

Extensive systems of monitoring are in place at School, College and institutional levels. The Academic Monitoring and Support (AMS) system is an important element. Studies are done on attrition and retention, colloquia are held to interpret trends, and evidence-based areas for attention are filtered from the data and translated into action. Annual reports tracking the planned effects are shared and discussed.

Evidence was presented showing that the key UKZN strategies and monitoring systems are systematically placed under scrutiny and that the ensuing recommendations for improvement are acted upon in a meaningful manner in the respective spheres of operation.

IMPROVEMENTS UNDERTAKEN AND PROGRESS MADE

The decision to work towards making all registrations online has assisted with the near real-time monitoring of enrolment targets. It has also enabled students to register where and when it is convenient for them, within certain guidelines. In 2015, three-quarters of new students registered online. Walk in registrations have nearly been phased out. Students who need assistance with making choices about what to register for are required to come to campus for academic advice. Returning students who have been identified by the AMS as being at risk also have to get curriculum advice. There is a challenge as regards the number of returning students as the University does not know whether or not a student will return until registration.

A particular challenge has been to provide applicants from rural areas with sufficient information about the programmes they might wish to apply for. The CAO allows for six choices; in the interviews it was mentioned that this is too many choices, especially as several of them might be within UKZN. The initiative to produce a game on Facebook to help applicants navigate their programme choices on the online application form is commended.

The policy of allowing students to attend class (from 8 Feb in 2016) before registering and settling fees (by the 29 Feb) is an interesting innovation. It would be of interest to other institutions to hear how colleagues manage to balance supporting students with complex registration processes, and stabilising the course register at the start of the period of teaching. Of concern would be that students who are struggling to register would not be in a position to pay attention to the learning process and hence might be disadvantaged from the start.

Efforts to increase the proportion of admissions from Quintile 1 and 2 schools are worth noting and will be of interest to other institutions. A decision was made a few years ago, when an analysis of new students by quintile was done, to increase intakes from quintiles 1 and 2, knowing that this would have an impact in terms of the support needed.

The AMS system focused primarily on students needing support, but not on students who are excelling. The Electronic Robot System is now being programmed to also monitor students who are on track to obtain their degrees *cum laude*. In addition to the AMS system, which contains end of semester results, there is another system, Student Central, on which students can view their continuous assessment marks. However, there is no uniformity in the entering of marks by departments.

A new system, Student Progression Mapping, is under development that will help students monitor their own progress and advise them on curriculum choices based on their performance.

An Institutional Intelligence (II) web portal has been created that enables staff to access information and get reports on students at various points in the student lifecycle without having to consult an II staff member. This has roughly halved the number of requests made of II staff. Control measures for the University's MIS, ITS, are being developed for student and staff information that will improve the quality of institutional data. However, since the previous director left in 2010, institutional research at UKZN has lacked high level leadership. A new position of Executive Director: Planning, Strategy and Governance has been created, which should help address this need.

Data analytics capabilities are being developed in the University. Institutional workshops were run by an international expert in 2014 and 2015 to equip both academic and support staff with skills in data mining and analysis. Four institutional research projects were initiated in 2015.

An innovation is the provision of small scholarships to new entrants who maintain a 70% weighted average, providing tangible motivation to do well.

Of interest, too, are the efforts to provide alternative pathways into the university for students who performed poorly in NSC Mathematics or only passed Mathematics Literacy. In addition to the foundation maths module referred to in the strengths section above, a new Mathematics Upgrade Course was designed for students who passed Mathematical Literacy in the Grade 12 examinations but need to have passed Mathematics for entry into their chosen programme of study. This new course lasts for one semester and was offered for the first time in 2014. UEL is planning to offer the course online to increase access and lower costs.

Monitoring of course pass rates is undertaken to identify gateway courses that might serve as obstacles for progression or completion of the curriculum in minimum time. It was noted that different thresholds existed for different colleges, ranging from 65% for Agriculture, Engineering and Science to 85% for Health Sciences. If the pass rate in a course is below the College threshold, Schools are required to investigate the reasons from both student and staff perspectives and design remedies. Reports are tabled at College Academic Affairs Boards.

In 2015 Senate approved a document on Principles and Procedures for the Examinations of Exit-Level Coursework Modules, which has substantially increased the percentage of external examiners' reports submitted for analysis and subsequent actions.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER IMPROVEMENTS

A key recommendation from the panel is to address the system challenges of the CAO and automation of selection and admission processes. While the efficiency of being part of the regional Central Applications Office in KwaZulu Natal was acknowledged, students in the interview voiced concerns about the difficulties that students experienced with the CAO application system. School students often did not have enough career information to be making informed decisions in prioritising their application choices. This needs attention.

There is also a need to more closely analyse the impacts on resource allocation and shifts in practices as a result of efforts to increase the proportion of admissions from Quintile 1 and 2 schools.

It is suggested that greater consistency in the uploading of continuous assessment marks by department to the Student Mark System be encouraged so that they may be used for the early warning system.

It is also suggested that the CAES review the low pass rate for interventions in gateway courses.

6. SUMMARY

The panel wishes to congratulate colleagues at UKZN on the professional way in which they have engaged with the QEP process, both at the reporting stages and during the institutional visit. The panel was impressed by the constructive engagement of all those who attended the sessions during the visit, including the student representatives.

The UKZN has an impressive and carefully conceptualised and implemented array of initiatives, supported by coherent policies and structures, designed to promote good teaching and learning and raise the perceived value of teaching in the University. One of the ways it promotes teaching and learning is by making efforts to remove the artificial boundaries and the difference in perceived status between teaching and research. The office of the DVC: Teaching and Learning has played a significant role in spearheading and coordinating these initiatives and policy developments, using an evidence-based approach combined with institution-wide consultations. A number of initiatives were already in place before the QEP, but improvements continue to be made.

There is evidence of substantial progress being made in several areas related to the QEP, particularly in focus area 1, where the emphasis has been on establishing an institutional framework to support and promote teaching and learning. The UKZN has slowly and

systematically built its Teaching and Learning framework to an extent that is exemplary in the higher education sector. The implementation of this framework might be improved by elaborating on the micro levels aspects of the institution. How are academics, academic leaders and support staff supported to meet the requirements of systems? Sustained guidance, mentoring and staff development appear to be needed.

The institution has an enormous amount to share with the rest of the higher education sector, such as the Integrated Talent Management programme, compulsory University Education Induction Programme (UEIP) for new lecturers, which includes a module on research supervision, and the differentiated promotions policy that enables academic staff to choose to weight some components of their activity, teaching, for example, more heavily than others. The Teaching Workload Framework (TWF) is another development that other institutions might benefit from. It can play a valuable role in guiding resource allocation and decision-making in the university. However, the panel recommends that the TWF is used to ensure that young academics are not overloaded with teaching, especially not large, first-year classes.

There are substantial efforts to promote scholarship in teaching and learning through, among other things, post-graduate study, support for publication writing and funding for teaching-related projects. The panel suggests that the University also considers promoting more discipline-based SOTL and communities of practice. The UEIP could also contain a discipline-based component. An interesting example of how this can be done is provided by Stellenbosch University.

During the institutional visit students indicated that they would like to see the results of evaluations so that they can participate in identifying areas of concern and help monitor how they are being addressed. The panel suggests that the University consider regularising the administration of course evaluations and explore ways of providing feedback to students.

An impressive innovation at UKZN is the Academic Monitoring and Support (AMS) system. A central feature of the system is the Electronic Robot System, a home-grown system for tracking student progress over the course of their degrees and colour-coding their academic status. When a student's status changes from green to orange, an alert is sent out to the College, triggering interventions. Each College has structures in place for student support and development. Both academic and non-academic support are offered, which differ in form from one College to another, according to the needs of each College's students. The allocation of counsellors to each College is noteworthy.

In addition to tracking student progress during the course of their degrees, there is also a need to monitor student performance during a semester in order to intervene before failure is a certainty. There are some efforts to do this in pockets in the University, but the panel recommends that the University put in place an early-warning system based on continuous assessment marks. Commercial software is available that can do this.

During the institutional visit, students raised concerns that the level of support varies from one College to another. Further variations in the level of support exist at different campuses. The panel's perception was that there is considerably less coherence in the student support and development focus area (focus area 2) than in focus area 1. Furthermore, it appears that the highly devolved College model runs the risk that some areas in which attention is needed may fall between two stools, such as support for students in residence. The panel recommends that an institutional review of student support and development initiatives be undertaken to identify good practices and areas needing attention. The new Student Services Council and proposed Student Support Strategy Group should help develop greater coherence in this area of activity.

As with many other activities at UKZN, first-year orientation is devolved to Colleges. The panel's impression is that implementation is uneven. Given that research has shown the positive impact of orientation on student success, the panel urges the University to implement a compulsory, institution-wide orientation programme, with College-specific components, followed by a comprehensive First-Year Experience programme. As part of this, there is value in allocating first year students to a peer mentor in their discipline for at least the first semester, if not the first year. Examples of good orientation programmes can be found at UCT, UP and Stellenbosch, and the National Resource Centre for the First Year Experience at UJ has extensive information about First Year Experience programmes.

Concerns about the sustainability of student support initiatives due to soft funding surfaced repeatedly, especially with the reported knock on effects in terms of new appointments and annual turn-over of staff. Several key initiatives, such as the Academic Monitoring and Support System, and many student support staff are funded by the Teaching Development Grant. In the case of student support staff, a number of positions are offered on a one-year contract basis, resulting in a high staff turnover and a constant need for retraining. The panel recommends that consideration is given, in the short-term, to longer (3-5 year) contracts and in the longer term to at least some permanent positions in each College, based, perhaps, on return on investment calculations.

Various initiatives are in progress to enhance the learning environment (focus area 3), including improved ICT infrastructure, upgrading equipment in teaching venues and an increased number of social learning spaces. A Campus Master plan is being developed, which will include increased social learning spaces, as this has been identified as a shortcoming. There has been a lack of leadership at institutional level for several years in institutional planning, but the recent appointment of an Executive Director for Institutional Planning should revitalise activities in this area.

There is an increase in the use of the learning management system, Moodle, but the uptake among academics is slow and it seems to be used mostly as a document repository. Increased and more innovative use of Moodle seem to be hampered by a lack of an institutional e-learning strategy and the very small staff complement of Academic Computing Services, which is responsible for staff training in e-learning. The panel recommends that the UTLO

incorporate increased professional development opportunities in e-learning into its suite of offerings.

In focus area 4, course and programme enrolment management, substantial evidence is gathered on a regular basis in order to inform decision-making. Enrolment planning is done with great care to ensure that enrolments are within a few percent of enrolment targets. Deliberate efforts are being made to admit more students from quintile 1 and 2 schools. Admissions criteria are reviewed periodically on the basis of student performance data. A noteworthy initiative to increase access is the provision of two mathematics upgrade courses, a short one of two weeks' duration before the academic year begins, and a longer one of 6 months' duration, which is available to students who took Mathematical Literacy in high school but need a pass in Mathematics to gain admission to their chosen programme. These courses are designed for prospective students that meet all admissions requirements except for mathematics.

The Institutional Intelligence Unit, which synthesises institutional data from various sources, has recently introduced the facility for academics to generate their own reports according to their requirements. Data analytics capabilities in the University are being strengthened through workshops with an international expert that the University has brought in several times over the past two years.

Identifying courses that are barriers to progression is the responsibility of Colleges. While Colleges flag courses with pass rates below a certain threshold for interventions, this threshold is lower in some Colleges than others. The panel suggests that there should be greater consistency in what the University considers to be acceptable course pass rates.

Overall, the panel commends the University on its efforts to engage in collaborative policy development, based on evidence and followed by monitoring, to ensure coherence in promoting teaching and learning and student success. This approach is particularly successful where there is strong top leadership, notably teaching and learning, and the University has recognised the need to provide such leadership in all focus areas.

Finally, the panel commends the UKZN colleagues on their commitment to the quality enhancement journey and the progress that has been made, and wishes it well in its continued journey.

APPENDIX: Programme



COUNCIL ON HIGHER EDUCATION HIGHER EDUCATION QUALITY COMMITTEE

UNIVERSITY OF KWAZULU-NATAL Quality Enhancement Project Visit Schedule

Date: Thursday, 21 April 2016

Venue: Council Chamber, MW Makgoba Administration Building, Westville Campus

Host: Quality Promotions and Assurance

08:00 – 08:30	WELCOME	Prof Renuka Vithal , Deputy Vice-Chancellor: Teaching and Learning
SESSION 1 08:30 – 09:30	Meeting with the Senior Management (Strategic/Academic Group)	<p>Executive Management Committee</p> <p>Dr A. van Jaarsveld, Vice-Chancellor & Principal</p> <p>Prof D. Jaganyi, DVC and Head of College of Agriculture, Engineering & Science</p> <p>Prof C. Potgieter, DVC and Head of College of Humanities</p> <p>Prof J. Mubangizi, DVC and Head of College of Law & Management Studies</p> <p>Prof J. Blackledge, DVC: Research</p> <p>Prof R. Vithal, Deputy Vice-Chancellor: Teaching and Learning</p> <p>Dr S. Chalufu, Executive Director: Student Services</p> <p>Dr D. Malaza, Executive Director: Institutional Planning and Governance</p> <p>Mr S. Mokoena, Registrar</p> <p>Mr B. Mahlangu, Chief Finance Officer</p> <p>Mr L. Seshoka, Executive Director: Corporate Relations</p> <p>UKZN QEP Task Team</p> <p>Dr T. Moodley, acting Director for Quality Promotions and Assurance</p> <p>Dr R. Dhunpath, Director: Teaching and Learning</p>
09:30 – 09:45	Panel Review	
SESSION 2 09:45 – 11:05	Focus Area 1: Enhancing Academics as Teachers <i>(Including professional development, reward and recognition, workload, conditions of service and performance appraisal)</i>	<p>Prof N. Hlongwa, College Dean Teaching and Learning for the College of Humanities</p> <p>Prof D. Teferra, Academic Leader for Higher Education Training and Development</p> <p>Mr S. Tankard, CEO, UKZN Extended Learning</p> <p>Mrs N. Moodley, Information & Communication Services Division (ICS)</p>

		<p>Ms B. Ramabodu, Director: Human Resources Development</p> <p>Dr R. Dhunpath, Director: Teaching and Learning</p> <p>Prof D. North, Dean & Head of School of Statistics Discipline, School of Mathematics, Statistics and Computer Science</p> <p>Ms R. Subbaya, Researcher: University Teaching and Learning Office</p> <p>Dr T. Moodley, acting Director for Quality Promotions and Assurance</p> <p>Prof R. Vithal, Deputy Vice-Chancellor: Teaching and Learning</p> <p><u>Student Representative Council</u></p> <p>Mr B. Majola, Local SRC for Howard College, President</p> <p>Mr S. Jili, Central SRC, Finance & Project Officer</p> <p>Miss N. Bhengu, Central SRC, Community Development Officer</p>
11:05 – 11:20	Panel Review	
<p>SESSION 3 11:20 – 12:40</p>	<p>Focus Area 2: Enhancing Student Support and Development <i>(Including career and curriculum advising, life and academic skills development, counselling, student performance monitoring and referral)</i></p>	<p>Dr S. Chalufu, Executive Director: Student Services</p> <p>Prof K. Pillay, College Dean Teaching and Learning for the College of Law and Management Studies</p> <p>Dr S. Pillay, Manager: Student Services College of Health Sciences</p> <p>Ms A. Stephens, Manager: Student Services College of Humanities</p> <p>Dr A. Bengesai, Teaching and Learning Unit, College of Law and Management Studies</p> <p>Dr N. Chetty, School of Chemistry & Physics</p> <p>Mr M. Bashe, Manager: Student Health and Sport</p> <p>Mr A. Ramballie, Disability Office</p> <p>Mr K. Gobardan, Director of Professional Services in the College of Humanities</p> <p>Dr R. Dhunpath, Director: Teaching and Learning</p> <p>Dr T. Moodley, acting Director for Quality Promotions and Assurance</p> <p><u>Student Representative Council</u></p> <p>Mr S Memela, Central SRC, Secretary General</p> <p>Mr S Nguse, Local SRC for Pietermaritzburg, President</p> <p>Miss N Mcoyi, Local SRC for Edgewood, Finance & Projects Officer</p>
12:40 – 13:25	Panel Review & Lunch	
<p>SESSION 4 13:25 – 14:45</p>	<p>Focus Area 3: Enhancing the Learning Environment <i>(Including teaching and learning spaces, ICT infrastructure and access, technology-enabled tools and resources, library facilities)</i></p>	<p>Dr S. Singh, Acting College Dean Teaching and Learning for the College of Health Sciences</p> <p>Prof D. Jaganyi, DVC and Head of College of Agriculture, Engineering & Science</p> <p>Mr H. Reynolds, Information & Communication Services</p> <p>Mr A. Pillay, Institutional Intelligence</p> <p>Mrs N. Moodley, Information & Communication Services</p> <p>Mrs J. Myeza, Director: Library Services</p>

		<p>Prof F. Botha, Director of Professional Services in the College of Health Sciences Prof S. Essack, Director: Antimicrobial Research Unit, College of Health Sciences Mr M. Mfusi, Director: Campus Management Services Dr R. Dhunpath, Director: Teaching and Learning Dr T. Moodley, acting Director for Quality Promotions and Assurance</p> <p><u>Student Representative Council</u> Mr T. Radebe, Local SRC for Howard College, Secretary General Mr M. Magudulela, Local SRC for Medical School, President Miss S. Myende, Local SRC for Howard College, Deputy President</p>
14:45 – 15:00	Panel Review	
SESSION 5 15:00 – 16:20	<p>Focus Area 4: Enhancing Course and Programme Enrolment <i>(Including admissions, selection, placement, readmission refusal, pass rates in gateway courses, throughput rates, management information systems)</i></p>	<p>Prof B. Pillay, College Dean Teaching and Learning for the College of Agriculture, Engineering & Science Prof K. Kirkman, Director of Professional Services in the College of Agriculture, Engineering & Science Mr A. Pillay, Institutional Intelligence Mr H. Reynolds, Information & Communication Services Mrs N. Moodley, Information & Communication Services Mr B. Poo, Director: Student Academic Administration Dr D. Malaza, Executive Director: Institutional Planning and Governance Dr R. Dhunpath, Director: Teaching and Learning Mrs R. Ramdeyal, Manager: College Academic Services, College of Health Sciences Ms K. Sallie, Manager: College Academic Services, College of Humanities Mr R. Govender, Academic Administrative Officer, College Academic Services, College of Law & Management Studies Dr T. Moodley, acting Director for Quality Promotions and Assurance</p> <p><u>Student Representative Council</u> Mr T. Mahomedy, Local SRC for Westville, Deputy President Mr P. Mofokeng, Central SRC, International & Marketing Officer Miss B. Ngobese, Local SRC for Westville, Community Development Officer</p>
16:20 – 16:35	Panel Review	
SESSION 6 16:35 – 17:05	Closing discussion with Senior Management	<p><u>Executive Management Committee</u> Dr A. van Jaarsveld, Vice-Chancellor & Principal Prof D. Jaganyi, DVC and Head of College of Agriculture, Engineering & Science</p>

		<p>Prof C. Potgieter, DVC and Head of College of Humanities</p> <p>Prof J. Mubangizi, DVC and Head of College of Law & Management Studies</p> <p>Prof J. Blackledge, DVC: Research</p> <p>Prof R. Vithal, Deputy Vice-Chancellor: Teaching and Learning</p> <p>Dr S. Chalufu, Executive Director: Student Services</p> <p>Dr D. Malaza, Executive Director: Institutional Planning and Governance</p> <p>Mr S. Mokoena, Registrar</p> <p>Mr B. Mahlangu, Chief Finance Officer</p> <p>Mr L. Seshoka, Executive Director: Corporate Relations</p> <p><u>College of Agriculture, Engineering & Science</u></p> <p>Prof B. Pillay, Dean Teaching and Learning</p> <p>Prof R. Robinson, Dean & Head of School of Chemistry and Physics</p> <p><u>College of Health Sciences</u></p> <p>Dr S. Singh, Dean Teaching and Learning</p> <p>Dr M. Mabandla, acting Dean & Head of School of Laboratory Medicine and Medical Science</p> <p>Prof M. Soliman, Dean & Head of School of Health Sciences</p> <p><u>College of Humanities</u></p> <p>Prof N. Hlongwa, Dean Teaching and Learning</p> <p><u>College of Law & Management Studies</u></p> <p>Prof K. Pillay, Dean Teaching and Learning</p> <p>Prof A. Singh, Dean & Head of School of Accounting, Economics and Finance</p> <p>Prof M. Reddi, Dean & Head of School of Law</p> <p><u>Student Representative Council</u></p> <p>Mr S. Khanyile, Central SRC, Transformation & Academic Officer</p> <p>Mr S. Memela, Central SRC, Secretary General</p> <p><u>UKZN QEP Task Team Members</u></p> <p>Prof B. Pillay, College Dean Teaching and Learning for the College of Agriculture, Engineering & Science</p> <p>Dr S. Singh, Acting College Dean Teaching and Learning for the College of Health Sciences</p> <p>Prof N. Hlongwa, College Dean Teaching and Learning for the College of Humanities</p> <p>Prof K. Pillay, College Dean Teaching and Learning for the College of Law and Management Studies</p> <p>Dr R. Dhunpath, Director: Teaching and Learning</p> <p>Dr L. Khumalo, Director: Language Planning & Development Office</p> <p>Prof D. Teferra, Academic Leader for Higher Education Training and Development</p> <p>Dr S. Chalufu, Executive Director: Student Services</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Mr H. Reynolds, Information & Communication Services</p> <p>Prof S. Essack, Director: Antimicrobial Research Unit, College of Health Sciences</p> <p>Ms R. Subbaya, Researcher: University Teaching and Learning Office</p> <p>Dr T. Moodley, acting Director for Quality Promotions and Assurance</p>
--	--	---