1. **STUDENT RETENTION AND THROUGHPUT RATES, EMPLOYABILITY AND USER SURVEYS**

**10.1**

**ACCREDITATION CRITERIA 17, 18 AND 19**

|  |
| --- |
| **Instructions:**   * Interrogate each statement, consider all relevant data available and rate whether the programme:   + meets minimum standards   + needs improvement   + does not meet the minimum standards. * Justify the ratings in a concise, analytical and reflective summary. * Where the programme needs 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. Supporting evidence for this section should include:   + Table 07, 8, 9, 10, 11 of the Annual Report submitted to the DHET for the last three years- **The Institution must ensure that these are submitted as part of the application and not merely referred to in the submission**     - Retention and throughput analysis records for at least three years     - Evidence that this analysis informs strategy to improve retention and throughput rates     - Evidence that where the race and gender profile of the qualifying class differs significantly from the entering class strategies are developed to ensure improvement     - Evidence of acknowledgement of the programme     - Evidence that as appropriate, improvement plans based on feedback     - Surveys and tracer studies conducted by the Institution     - Impact studies aimed at measuring and/ or monitoring the impact of the programme on the workplace, institutions/ programmes into which gradates articulate carried out by the Institution |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **STATEMENT** | **Meets minimum standards** | **Needs improvement** | **Does not meet minimum standards** | **Comment** |
| The programme coordinator has access to and monitors information on retention and throughput rates for the programme, also in terms of national benchmarks |  |  |  |  |
| The race and gender profile of the qualifying class increasingly resembles that of the  entering class |  |  |  |  |
| There is evidence that the programme attempted to have an impact on the employability of students, where these are the desired outcomes of the programme |  |  |  |  |
| Conscious efforts are made to get the programme acknowledged in the workplace/ community and by other institutions. An improvement plan is put into operation, where necessary |  |  |  |  |
| User surveys are undertaken at regular intervals for feedback from academics involved in the programme, graduates, peers, external moderators, professional bodies and employers, where applicable, to ascertain whether the programme is attaining its intended outcomes |  |  |  |  |
| There are regular reviews of the effectiveness of benchmarking in the programme against equivalent national and international reference points, with a view to goalsetting and continuous self-improvement in the programme |  |  |  |  |
| Student throughput and retention rates are regularly reviewed, also with regard to national requirements |  |  |  |  |
| Impact studies are regularly undertaken to measure and evaluate the impact of the programme on the employability of students and in alleviating shortages of expertise in relevant fields, where these are the desired outcomes of the programme. Impact studies could also ascertain the degree of acknowledgement of the programme in the community, by other institutions, and in the workplace, where  applicable |  |  |  |  |
| Results of user surveys, reviews and impact studies are used in a regular evaluation of  all programme aspects and to develop improvement plans |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **OVERALL RATING**  **(Consider the individual ratings above and provide an overall rating)** | **Meets minimum standards** | **Needs improvement** | **Does not meet the minimum standards** | **Comment** |
| Student retention and throughput rates |  |  |  |  |
| Employability of students |  |  |  |  |
| User surveys, reviews and impact studies |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **(FOR EACH CRITERION) 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)** |
|  |

**10.2**

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

|  |
| --- |
| **STATEMENT** |
| Provide the definitions used by the institution for throughput rates (since the last engagement with the CHE), dropout rates, student success and student success rates. |
|  |
| **SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (to substantiate response where necessary)** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **STATEMENT** |
| Analyse and critique the throughput and dropout rates and provide possible reasons for low throughput and high dropout rates.  Analyse and critique the student success rates for the programmes and provide possible reasons for low success rates.  Analyse and critique the use of impact studies to measure and evaluate the impact of the programme and its graduates on the employability of students and in alleviating shortages of expertise in relevant fields, degree of acknowledgement of the programme in the community, by other institutions, and in the workplace where applicable  Provide a critical analysis of the use of user surveys, feedback from stakeholders, impact studies and show how this is used to regular evaluation of all programme aspects and to develop improvement plans. |
|  |
| **SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (to substantiate response where necessary)** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **STATEMENT** |
| Provide a summary of any planned changes in relation to the identified needs. Explain the mechanisms and procedures to bring about these changes (e.g. financial resourcing and policy adjustments) including arrangements for the approval thereof. |
|  |
| **SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (to substantiate response where necessary)** |
|  |