



## QUALITY MANAGEMENT UPDATE

March 2010.

### 1.0 PROGRESS ON THE INSTIUTIONAL AUDIT (IA)

There are now 225 days to your audit.

Planning for the audit is well on track and once comments from the Institutional Planning Committee and Senate have been incorporated the project plan will be communicated widely. Currently, the focus has shifted from the development of the scorecard and IA project plan to producing the next IA self-evaluation report.

#### Suggestions to Clear Diaries

Executive Management input into the self-evaluation report (SER) will be required intermittently from the 28<sup>th</sup> February to the 4<sup>th</sup> June, 2010. Dedicated effort is suggested from the 18<sup>th</sup> to the 23<sup>th</sup> June. HEQC will arrive on campus on the 17<sup>th</sup> October, 2010 and interviews will commence on the 18<sup>th</sup> to the 22<sup>nd</sup> October, 2010.

### 2.0 PROJECT MANAGEMENT PLAN

#### Development of the plan

The plan was based on the HEQC manual for site visits, as well as an evaluation of audits conducted at other institutions. As most institutions have now been audited, there is a wealth of knowledge to draw from. Within CPUT, a consultative approach to the project management plan was used with Executive Managers and their respective line functions. namely, the:

DVC: Academic

DVC: Research, Innovation and Technology, and Partnerships

Executive Advisor to the Vice-Chancellor

DVC: Operations

Dean of Students

Registrar

These are all people in the steering committee.

The DVC: Academic was to approach the Vice-Chancellor and Council on their input into relevant issues. A presentation will be made to the next Council meeting.



A meeting was arranged with the above functionaries and their managers, at which the overall process was explained to each division. Managers were made aware of their possible interactions with the audit, as well as their responsibilities. Input into the project plan was sought from each head in terms of responsibilities, possible integration with other units and possible risks.

The need for senior management to be interviewed during the HEQC visit was explained and, while an exact schedule is not yet available, managers were given an indication of when they might be interviewed and what the possible composition of their interview group could be.

**PLEASE NOTE:** Details will only be finalized closer to August, but managers can spend the period until August engaging on discussion around the findings, their QIPs and the audit criteria, to ensure that all parties have a good understanding of matters.

The role of faculties, Deans and Heads of Departments were outlined. Most heads should expect to be interviewed and all departments need to contribute towards evidence compilation.

**PLEASE NOTE:** This should not be confused with the programme reviews, or strategic unit reviews that departments have been subjected to. The information from the programme reviews is integrated into the Institutional Audit finding, but the HEQC audit panel will not want to audit individual departments, only the institutional level, senior functionaries, or someone with a specialist area of expertise.

Each Executive Manager and Head of Unit was asked to commit themselves to the deadlines and responsibilities assigned by the project plan.

### **Audit Marketing and Communications**

In addition, extensive activity has taken place with Marketing and Communications. A marketing campaign has been suggested by MCD and is attached. There has been discussion on the technical requirements of producing the self-evaluation report as well as determining the “look and feel” for CPUT. This is currently with the designer.

### **Events Coordination**

Marketing and Communication are assuming the responsibility for the marketing aspects as well as the events coordination that is required during the week of the site visit.

### **Communication on the Audit Matters**

Please can staff remember to copy queries to both Dan and Luclaire as this facilitates communication amongst all.

### **Additional comments**



Based on the climate at CPUT at the time of the visit, the need for additional security arrangements should be considered closer to the time. Lines of communication with students about the audit need to be strengthened.

As can be seen from the project plan indicators (i.e. the robots on the side) many of the activities have already commenced.

### **3.0 VENUES AND THE HEQC VISIT**

The HEQC visited CPUT on Tuesday 24<sup>th</sup> February 2010 to provide some assistance on detail as well as inspect the intended venues, which were the Blue room and the Major Sports Hall. The HEQC advised that the Vice Chancellor's suite would be ideal for the visit set up, provided the Vice-Chancellor gave permission. The suite of rooms would enable a HEQC discussion and interview venue, a room for evidence and a room for interviewees. The Blue room would also be required. A report on the visit is attached.

The Major Sports Hall has been booked for an extended period. Venues on other campuses are still to be sourced

### **4.0 CPUT'S AUDIT PANEL**

Due to the size of CPUT will have a ten member panel in addition to the HEQC members. We should therefore anticipate a team of sixteen people. The Vice-Chancellor will be contacted to approve the panel. Once the panel is made known, staff are requested not to contact panel members directly, but to channel all requests for information to Dan and Luclaire who will liaise with the HEQC.

### **5.0 LIST OF INTERVIEWEES**

Representative groups for interviewing have been tentatively compiled and populated with potential names. We anticipate between 400-500 interviewees from all core business areas and constituencies. Once populated, it will be sent to Executive Management for approval. Care needs to be taken to ensure that different people are representative of different constituencies. Obviously there will be people who could represent various categories and we should assign them to their strengths accordingly.

### **6.0 BUDGET ALLOCATION**

Please note finance resolution to allocate IA budget items to the QMD budget

### **7.0 COLLECTION OF EVIDENCE FROM FACULTIES**

#### **Progress**

Good progress has been made on the collection of evidence requested from Faculties. The evidence provided has been captured on spreadsheets. These have been provided to Deans so that judgment



can be exercised by Deans' on whether additional information should be provided. Faculties are reminded about the evidence required for WIL activities and Postgraduate Studies.

### **Electronic filing**

Evidence has been provided electronically and this is now organized into a simple file plan for the audit. After discussion with HEQC, primary and secondary evidence will be provided electronically as far as possible, with secondary evidence only available on site. Not all primary evidence will be sent, only core primary evidence. In the absence of an institutional document management system, this will be burnt to CD/DVD's corresponding to the index system. Discussions still need to take place on a web interfacing.

## **8.0 UPDATING OF THE QMD/IA WEBSITE**

The website is under new construction and will be regularly updated with information sourced by MCD from the project plan and reports provided by QMD. The IA DVD produced for the launch has been linked through to U-tube. Staff may connect to this via the website.

## **9.0 SCORECARD AND QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

Further input has been made to update some of the scorecard elements. There has been enquiry from Operational heads on using the information and the existing scorecard information is now being used in performance management sessions with some unit heads. It is suggested that heads use this information in conjunction with the Quality Improvement Plan that has been developed for strategic units (QIP: Strategic Units) and programme reviews.

## **10.0 STUDENT SATISFACTION SURVEYS**

These have been completed and the qualitative data analysed. Reports have circulated at the Dean's forum and will be placed on the website.

## **11.0 STUDENT EVALUATION OF STAFF**

These were completed on those surveys submitted to QMD by the 11<sup>th</sup> November 2009. Up to this time the surveys have been analysed and returned to the relevant academic staff members, together with any qualitative comments submitted by students. These reports should be available for discussion during the performance appraisal of academic staff and staff are asked to make them available to their HODs. Surveys submitted after 11<sup>th</sup> November 2009 will be analysed after March 2010. Based on the process followed there is a need to revisit the confidentiality clause in the policy. This request will be forwarded to the Teaching & Learning committee.

Dan and Luclaire

2010 -03-04

