

**THE NATIONAL REVIEW OF DOCTORAL QUALIFICATIONS**

**2020-2021**

**Desktop Evaluation Report Template**

**Name of Institution: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Doctoral qualification(s) offered \***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  | | --- | | Full title | | |  | | --- | | Abbreviation | | **Total number of credits #** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Site(s) of delivery:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Panel members**: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Date of report**: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\*Doctoral qualification types and variants are described in the Manual for National Review of Doctoral Qualifications, Chapter 1, Introduction. If the institution offers variants, list each variant separately.

# If the qualification includes credits allocated to coursework or/and WIL, list the credit allocation accordingly.

*Note*

*For each of the areas below, the evaluator comment should be preceded by a brief summary of the main points from the SER on which the comments are based, including reference to the section(s) or/and the page(s) of the SER in which they are to be found.*

**Self-Evaluation Report**

***Preparation of the Self-Evaluation Report***

Please describe the process involved in the preparation of the self-evaluation report, including details of any meetings and workshops that accompanied the drafting, the range of participatory involvement (formal entities, *ad hoc* groups, etc.), and the process of formal institutional approval.

***Evaluator Comment***

***1.The Preamble and Rationale of the Qualification Standard for Doctoral Degrees***

*With reference to the Preamble and Rationale in the Qualification Standard for Doctoral Degrees, briefly*

*(a) describe the history and scope of your institution’s offering of doctoral qualifications*

*(b) explain how your doctoral qualifications address the values and ethos expressed in the Preamble of the Doctoral Qualification Standard, and*

*(c) describe and evaluate the alignment between the doctoral qualifications offered by your institution and your institution’s context, mission, goals and strategic plan.*

***Guide:*** *The institutional response may include – but need not be limited to – a discussion of matters such as the increasing demand for doctoral graduates against the background of the knowledge economy and the importance it places on a steady supply of high-level new knowledge for innovation and sustained growth; increasing diversity and transformation of the doctoral student cohort; increasing pressure on supervisory capacity; innovation in pedagogic and supervisory models and approaches; rationale for and incentives to offer doctoral programmes (including funding incentives); research outputs (e.g., publications, patents) emanating from doctoral research; and the impact and benefits of doctoral training and research on the broader society.*

|  |
| --- |
| ***Evaluator Comment*** |

|  |
| --- |
| **2.The Purpose of the Doctoral Qualification (refer to the standard)**  *Describe and evaluate how your doctoral qualifications address the purpose of the Doctoral Qualification as stated in the Qualification Standard for Doctoral Degrees* |

***Guide:*** *The institutional response to this question should take into account the various fields of study and disciplines, and the different variants (general and professional), if applicable, of the Doctoral Degrees that you are offering.*

*The response to this question will be mostly a narrative and qualitative in nature, reporting the institution’s interpretation of the data provided in Appendix A.*

|  |
| --- |
| ***Evaluator Comment*** |

|  |
| --- |
| **3.NQF Level and Credits (refer to the standard)**  *If any of the existing doctoral qualifications allocate or recognise credits other than the undifferentiated allocation for the doctoral thesis (e.g., credits for a specific aspect or section of the research process, for coursework or for work-integrated learning), indicate in the table how the credit allocation meets the requirements relating to NQF Level and credits as stated in the Qualification Standard for Doctoral Degrees.* |

***Guide:*** *list only those doctoral qualifications in the provided table which do not have the typical credit allocation of 360 credits for the thesis.*

*Note: The Doctoral Qualification Standard on the recognition of prior learning (RPL) at the doctoral level. RPL procedures resulting in decisions granting access to enrolment for a doctoral qualification are to be distinguished from RPL procedures resulting in the granting of advanced standing within the study and research programme leading to a doctoral qualification. As specified in footnote 11 of the Doctoral Qualification Standard, RPL resulting in advanced standing is only permitted in the case of the coursework components of Professional Doctoral Degrees. Institutions offering Professional Doctorates are requested to report, describe and evaluate their RPL policies and procedures also here (in response to Question 3 of this Template for the Self Evaluation Report).*

*\*In cases where credits are awarded separately to different components of research (for example, sub-sections such as the literature study, or the research proposal) the credit allocation must be recorded.*

|  |
| --- |
| ***Evaluator Comment*** |

|  |
| --- |
| **4. Graduate Attributes (refer to the standard)**  *Describe and evaluate how your institution prepares candidates to attain the graduate attributes (knowledge and skills) set out in the Qualification Standard for Doctoral Degrees.* |

***Guide:*** *This is a high-level question requiring a high-level response supported by adequate evidence. More detail, such as on how the attributes are assessed, can be provided in response to further questions in this template.*

*Note: A narrative response to this section should be organized according to the headings in this section of the Standard. If, however,* *the institution integrated the response to more than one heading in order to enhance the coherence and comprehensibility of the response, the institution should indicate which of the headings have been reported on in an integrated manner to ensure that each attribute is addressed.*

|  |
| --- |
| ***Evaluator Comment*** |

|  |
| --- |
| **5. Contexts and Conditions for Supervision and Assessment of a Doctoral Qualification**  The institutional response to each of the following sub-sections (5.1 – 5.6) should address all the aspects related to that item in the *Qualification Standard for Doctoral Degrees*.  **5.1 Institutional conditions**  *Describe and evaluate how the institution meets the conditions for offering Doctoral qualifications as stated in the Standard.*  **5.2 Progress and review**  *Describe and evaluate how the institution addresses the requirements related to the progress and review of the performance of Doctoral students as stated in the Standard.*  **5.3 Submission**  *Describe and evaluate how the institution addresses the requirements related to the submission of Doctoral work as stated in the Standard.*  **5.4 Final assessment**  *Describe and evaluate how the institution addresses the requirements related to the final assessment of Doctoral work as stated in the Standard.*  **5.5 Coursework**  *If applicable, what measures are in place to ensure that credit-bearing coursework is relevant to the field or discipline of research, and is assessed at NQF level 10?*    **5.6 Work-integrated learning**  *If applicable, what measures are in place to ensure that credit-bearing work-integrated learning is relevant to the field or discipline of research, and is assessed at NQF level 10?* |

***Guide:*** *The institutional response to this question should be organized according to the headings in this section of the Standard. If, however, the institution integrated the response to more than one heading in order to enhance the coherence and comprehensibility of the response, the institution should indicate which of the headings have been reported on in an integrated manner to ensure that each sub-heading is addressed.*

*Note: The institution may provide different ways of qualification (for example, thesis, series of publications, a programme including coursework and/or work-integrated learning)’ If so, it should ensure that all the ways are adequately addressed.*

|  |
| --- |
| ***Evaluator Comment*** |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Areas Identified as Above-Threshold Practice**   *Where there are areas or aspects of your doctoral qualifications that the institution identify as above-threshold practice, describe them briefly, or refer to the sections above in which they have already been identified.* |

*Note the following statement in the introduction to the Standard: “The focus of a standards statement is the relationship between the purpose of the qualification, the attributes of a graduate that manifest the purpose, and the contexts and conditions for the assessment of those attributes. It is a threshold statement, establishing minimum criteria for the award of the relevant qualification. On the grounds that a standard also plays a developmental role, the statement may include, as appropriate, elaboration of terms specific to the statement, guidelines for the achievement of the graduate attributes, and recommendations for above-threshold practice.”*

*This approach is emphasized in the CHE’s Framework for Qualification Standards in Higher Education (CHE, 2013).*

*“…qualification standards are not intended to be mere instruments for compliance. One of the aims of standards is to encourage and enable development where it is sought in the quality and equivalence of programmes leading to the qualification. Institutions would, as and where appropriate in terms of their own programme evaluation, have the incentive of standards to strive to move from threshold to advanced graduate output.”*

|  |
| --- |
| ***Evaluator Comment*** |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Areas Identified as Being in Need of Improvement**   ***Where there are areas or aspects of your doctoral qualifications that you identify as being in need of improvement, describe them briefly, or refer to in the sections above in which they have already been identified.*** |

***Guide:*** *Where you have identified areas or aspects of your doctoral qualifications in need of improvement, what plans does the institution have to address such areas or aspects, and within what timeframes are the plans intended to be designed and implemented, and the results evaluated?*

|  |
| --- |
| ***Evaluator Comment*** |

**8. Plans to Address Areas in Need of Improvement**

*Where you have identified areas or aspects of your doctoral qualifications in need of improvement, what plans does the institution have to address such areas or aspects, and within what timeframes are the plans intended to be designed and implemented, and the results evaluated?*

**Evaluator comment**

**Appendices**

*Evaluator comment should focus on the comprehensiveness, clarity and consistency of data provided. Comparison with any external norm is not required.*

**Appendix A**

**Evaluator comment**

**Appendix B**

**Evaluator comment**

**Appendix C**

**Evaluator comment**

**Appendix D**

**Evaluator comment**

**Appendix E**

**Evaluator comment**

**Summary comments**

**Are there any aspects recommended as being above-threshold practice that the institution has not identified?**

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluator comment** |

**Are there any aspects recommended as being in need of improvement that the institution has not identified?**

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluator comment** |

**If the institution has identified areas in need of improvement, has it proposed clear procedures and timeline for implementation of improvement plans?**

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluator comment** |

**Are there any details or data relevant to the qualification(s) that the institution has not submitted, and that should be made available during the review process?**

**If so, indicate whether the details or data should be made available through:**

1. **further documentation submitted prior to further steps in the review process;**
2. **further documentation made available at the time of interviews with the institution;**
3. **submission of complementary material (e.g., audio-visual recordings);**
4. ***in situ* inspection by the panel.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluator comment** |

**Are there any general comments that have not been addressed above?**

Evaluator comment

**Are there any suggestions for whom the review panel might meet at the review site visit? (e.g. any staff or categories of students/ institutional structures whom you think that it would be helpful for the review panel to meet during the site visit)**

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluator comment** |