**6. PROGRAMME COORDINATION AND PROGRAMME REVIEW**

**6.1**

**Accreditation criterion no. 10**

|  |
| --- |
| **Instructions:**   * Interrogate each statement, consider all relevant data available and rate whether the Programme Coordination and Programme Review:   + meet minimum standards   + need improvement   + do not meet the majority of the minimum standards. * Justify the ratings in a concise, analytical and reflective summary. * Where the Programme Coordination and Programme Review need improvement, indicate what actionable improvements will be taken by the institution within specified timeframes to ensure that programme meets minimum requirements. * Compile supporting evidence to substantiate the institution’s response and list it systematically in the space provided. The actual supporting evidence should be uploaded on the HEQC Online system at the time of submission and should correspond to the list of evidence below. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **STATEMENT** | **Meets minimum standards** | **Needs improvement** | **Does not meet the minimum standards** | **Comment** |
| A qualified and suitably experienced programme coordinator is appointed |  |  |  |  |
| The programme coordinator ensures the academic coherence and integrity of the programme |  |  |  |  |
| The programme coordinator manages the quality management system of the programme that feeds into the annual quality monitoring and cyclical programme reviews of the Institution. |  |  |  |  |
| The programme coordinator ensures relevant data is collected for the purposes of annual quality monitoring |  |  |  |  |
| The programme coordinator manages the review of the programme on a cyclical basis |  |  |  |  |
| The programme coordinator ensures that changes that need to made to the programme and its delivery as indicated through annual quality monitoring and cyclical programme review are effected |  |  |  |  |
| The programme coordinator ensures the integrity of the certification process |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **OVERALL RATING**  **(Consider the individual ratings above and provide an overall rating)** | **Meets minimum standards** | **Needs improvement** | **Does not meet the minimum standards** | **Comment** |
| Programme coordination and programme review |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **JUSTIFY THE RATINGS (in a concise, analytical and reflective summary)** |
|  |
| **ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENTS (within specified timeframes to ensure that programme meets minimum requirements)** |
|  |
| **SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (to substantiate response where necessary)** |
|  |

**6.2**

|  |
| --- |
| **Instructions:**   * Respond to each statement in the space provided * Attach supporting evidence to substantiate the institution’s response where necessary |

|  |
| --- |
| **STATEMENT** |
| The institution may be planning to or is already operating an internal quality management system (IQMS) for the combined purpose of monitoring, evaluating and quality assuring the institution and its programmes. Describe the planned or operational quality management system to conduct internal quality reviews of the institution and its programmes. |
|  |
| **SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (to substantiate response where necessary)** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **STATEMENT** |
| Reflect upon the adequacy of the internal quality management system, quality assurance activities and practices for evaluating the quality of programmes, and the management and coordination thereof. |
|  |
| **SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (to substantiate response where necessary)** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **STATEMENT** |
| Provide a robust critique of the system, activities/practices and management thereof and a clear set of action plans in this regard for a three year period in relation to quality assurance of institutional and programme quality, quality management and the internal quality management system. |
|  |
| **SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (to substantiate response where necessary)** |
|  |