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Abstract

Ensuring and enhancing the quality of education is one of the key responsibilities of higher education institutions. Despite its significance, the present situation concerning quality of higher education in Pakistan is of particular concern given that many Pakistan universities are not only struggling to meet global standards in education but are also striving to achieve their goals at the national level. The quality of teaching is central to achieving goals and improving their global standing. However, it is difficult for Pakistan universities to promote and support high quality teaching in the absence of a clear and coherent policy framework to guide the improvement of teaching as found in other high-performance global universities. This study focused on developing a framework of quality assurance (and enhancement) processes for teaching for Pakistan universities aligned with international academic standards and practices. Using Universitas 21 (U21) institutions as a benchmark, the intended Framework of quality assurance (QA) processes for Pakistan universities has been drawn from the experiences of these research-intensive universities. However, it also takes into account the academic culture of Pakistan universities.

The study used a mixed method research approach comprising three phases. The first phase employed template analysis to identify eight broad categories of QA processes for teaching from 229 policy and practice documents from U21 institutions concerning QA of teaching. The second phase used the Delphi technique to elicit views on the desirability and the likely acceptability of these identified categories of QA processes in Pakistan universities. The third phase used interviews to examine the acceptability in more detail.

Four main sets of conclusions emerge from this study. These conclusions contribute to scholarship in four significant ways. The first is the identification and classification of QA processes for teaching in U21 institutions into eight broad categories. These research-led universities view quality teaching in terms of enhancing students’ learning outcomes. Secondly, the analysis of the nature of each process in the broader context of quality assurance or quality enhancement revealed that various aspects of each process vary along a continuum, from accountability at the judgemental end of the scale, to the purely developmental and enhancement-led end. On balance, however, U21 institutions base their QA processes for teaching towards enhancement-led end of the continuum. The third is the development of an Integrated Framework of Quality Assurance and Enhancement
of Teaching (IFQAET) for Pakistan universities comprising quality assurance, quality enhancement, and recognition and rewards components. The fourth set of conclusions is methodological. The four commonly-used consensus criteria for the Delphi analysis not only corroborate each other but also compensate for each other’s weaknesses.
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</tr>
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Chapter 1
Introduction

1.1 Background

Ensuring and enhancing the quality of education is one of the key responsibilities of higher education institutions. Despite its significance, the quality of higher education in Pakistan is of particular concern given that not a single university, out of 64 public and 56 private sector universities, is ranked in the top 500 of the world (Hayward, 2009) or in the top 100 universities of Asia (Azam, 2007). A substantial number of Pakistan universities are struggling to meet international standards in higher education (Higher Education Commission [HEC], 2005; National University of Science and Technology, 2007). Because of the poor quality of education, the majority of students emerge from Pakistan universities with no significant social or technical skills (Boston Group, 2001).

Notwithstanding concerns about quality, the provision of higher education in Pakistan is growing at quite a remarkable rate. Reid (2009) asserts that this is the issue of quality against quantity, further arguing that the higher education system in Pakistan may grow rapidly at the expense of retaining quality. An expansion in higher education is evident with almost half the universities in Pakistan having been established during the last decade. Furthermore, the average rate of growth in enrolments in higher education institutions in Pakistan over the past eight years is about 5 percent per annum (Reid, 2009). This growth in enrolments has also generated questions about how to maintain quality in universities when quantity is increasing.

The quality of higher education is also of significance for Pakistan in the context of a developing country as it is the quality of higher education that promotes a knowledge-based economy. The Medium Term Development Framework (MTDF) of the HEC (2005) states that the goal of a knowledge-based economy in Pakistan could not be achieved without enhancing the quality of its higher education and its relevance to the needs of the country despite increasing access to it. Bazargan (2007) argues that it is essential for developing countries to make quality a major ingredient of their higher education systems for developing a capacity to link knowledge to their economic growth. On the basis of this evidence, it is argued that the significance of quality in the higher
education sector of Pakistan is an essential consideration for the social and economic development of the country.

Despite the significance of quality higher education for economic development of the country, Batool and Qureshi (2007) report that the current system of quality assurance in the higher education sector of Pakistan is not sufficiently strong. They assert that the gap between the present status and the desired level of quality is critical and there is a strong need for a directed approach to enhance the quality of higher education in Pakistan. The issue of quality has also been identified as a major issue confronting the higher education sector of Pakistan in the MTDF (HEC, 2005). To enhance the quality of higher education and its output in response to the aforementioned issues, an acceptable and sustainable system of quality assurance is required for the higher education sector of Pakistan. This system should be developed in line with international academic standards and practices.

1.1.1 Efforts and Accomplishments of the HEC

In recognition of the situation concerning ‘quality’, the Higher Education Commission (HEC) spearheaded a movement for assuring and enhancing the quality of higher education in Pakistan. In order to assist universities to improve the quality of their teaching and research, the HEC established the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) in 2003 at a national level as a policy-making and monitoring body. Quality Enhancement Cells (QECs) have also been established at 30 universities in Pakistan, with a mandate to introduce quality assurance (QA) practices in their respective universities. The HEC plans to extend the family of QECs to all universities in a phased manner with the aim of improving their academic standards.

The Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) of the HEC acts as an advisory body for both HEC and QAA concerning quality-related matters and for developing an effective and workable system of quality assurance and quality enhancement in the country. The QAC comprises eight vice-chancellors from both public and private sector universities of Pakistan supplemented by two experts from the HEC. The QAC is responsible for framing requisite policies, processes, procedures and guidelines for assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching and research. These policies, processes and procedures are intended to be introduced in universities through QECs. However, it appears that the current ‘quality agenda’ of the HEC is limited to three components of quality assurance.
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The first of the three components of quality assurance (QA) is focused on setting up quality assurance standards and criteria through a consultative process at a national level to ensure engagement and ownership of all stakeholders. The second involves the development of an internal quality assurance (IQA) system at an institutional level and thus institutions would be responsible for setting up their own IQA system under the guidance of the HEC. The third component is focused on developing an external system of quality assurance (EQA). Respective accreditation bodies will be responsible for EQA through academic audit, accreditation or performance reviews.

In response to the goals defined for the first component of the HEC QA agenda, a manual has been designed which offers a set of guidelines primarily to facilitate the functioning of the QAA and of QECs. The manual also provides guidelines for the roles of the QAA and QECs in the “guidance, facilitation, and conduct of quality assurance activities by the higher education institutions” (Batool & Qureshi, 2007, p. 4). As far as the second component is concerned, the self-assessment of each academic programme has been scheduled in 30 Pakistan universities. The QECs, in consultation with the department and faculty concerned, are responsible for planning, coordination, and for conducting self-assessment activities in each university.

With respect to the third component, the HEC has established accreditation councils in various disciplines with the intention to develop a globally acceptable set of criteria and standards for the accreditation of academic programmes in all public and private sector universities (Government of Pakistan, 2006). The resources related to QA, available at the websites of the HEC and 30 QECs, indicate that significant contributions of the HEC in response to QA agenda include: Good Practices for Quality Assurance for Accreditation Councils in Pakistan (Batool & Qureshi, 2006); Self Assessment Manual (Raouf, 2006); Quality Assurance Manual for Higher Education in Pakistan (Batool & Qureshi, 2007); development of guidelines for PhD programmes; and the development of a framework for the ranking of universities in Pakistan. These documents provide details about the establishment and functioning of the QAA, QAC, QECs and accreditation bodies.

1.1.2 Challenges

As a result of the determined efforts of the HEC for assuring and enhancing the quality of higher education, considerable progress has been made in the higher education sector of Pakistan but much still remains to be accomplished. No systematic framework has been
developed yet, either at a national or an institutional level, for assuring and enhancing the quality of education in general and of teaching and learning in particular. Furthermore, higher education academics are not undertaking research into quality assurance, which suggests it has a low priority for them. For instance, Ameen (2007) reports that hardly any literature has been produced on the issue of quality assurance at a local level in Pakistan. In the absence of consistent policies, processes, guidelines and procedures for quality assurance in the context of Pakistan, universities are still struggling in this area.

A small number of universities under the guidance of the QAC and QECs have attempted to implement a range of QA practices borrowed from international organizations without conducting research on these practices from the perspective of Pakistan. For instance, the document *Good Practices for Quality Assurance for Accreditation Councils in Pakistan* (Batool & Qureshi, 2006) has been derived from the *Guidelines of Good Practice 2005* – a document published by the INQAAHE Secretariat and presented in the INQAAHE Workshop held at The Hague, the Netherlands, in 2005. Similarly, the *Quality Assurance Manual for Higher Education in Pakistan* (Batool & Qureshi, 2007) has been developed by consulting the *Quality Assurance and Accreditation Handbook for Higher Education in Egypt* – published by the NQAAC in 2004. The implementation of these borrowed and adopted policies and practices takes place in an ad hoc manner without the benefit of a systematic analysis of the way in which these policies and practices translate into the Pakistan context.

While the HEC has developed a number of guidelines and criteria in consultation with universities for assuring and enhancing the quality of their research\(^1\), less attention has been given to the quality of teaching in Pakistan. Neither the HEC nor universities have developed any guidelines, policies or processes for assuring and enhancing the quality of their teaching. Furthermore, no research work has been conducted in Pakistan with a particular focus on improving the quality of teaching in universities. However, a growing international trend suggests that a focus on teaching in QA processes is essential to improving the quality of education in general and of teaching in particular.

\(^1\) For example, criteria for PhD Programmes; sponsoring of doctoral students to overseas universities; sponsoring of faculty members for research projects; and the inclusion of research in promotion processes.
1.1.3 The International Context

The global trend towards a stronger emphasis on teaching in higher education suggests that there is a strong interest in enhancing the quality of teaching and in making it more valued. Knight (2006) notes that steps have been taken globally to enhance the quality of teaching. He further observes that it is common in Canadian universities to expect a teaching portfolio from academics seeking tenure or promotion. This shift in emphasis towards teaching in a quality regime is also evident from the establishment of the Teaching Quality Enhancement Committee and the creation of Centres of Excellence for Teaching and Learning and The Higher Education Academy in the United Kingdom (McKimm, 2009). The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching is an example in the context of the United States.

This shift in emphasis towards teaching in a quality regime is not without demands. For instance, Seldin (2004) reports that faculty members are being held accountable and, therefore, are being asked to provide solid evidence of the quality of their classroom teaching. QA processes, such as student evaluations of teaching, peer review of teaching, teaching portfolios, professional development, and scholarship of teaching serve as tools for the evaluation of teaching quality in many international universities. But in many instances these QA processes have two functions. While on the one hand they are likely to enhance the quality of higher education due to their focus on teaching, on the other hand they are incorporated into decisions concerning awards, tenure and promotions.

In contrast, the provisions for the evaluation of teaching quality in Pakistan universities are limited in the absence of QA policies and processes for teaching. Consequently, the influence of teaching is minimal in decisions about tenure and promotion of academics. On the basis of these issues, there is a pressing need to develop a framework of ‘quality assurance processes for teaching’ for Pakistan universities at the policy level. This will not only improve the quality of teaching but also provide a strong base for valuing and rewarding teaching in universities.

1.2 Overview of the Study

Many Pakistan universities are struggling to meet global standards in higher education. These concerns about ‘quality’ are not only inhibiting the economic development of the country. They are also presenting a major obstacle to the achievement of the HEC’s goals
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and, consequently, the goals of Pakistan universities, that is, to enhance the global standing of universities by improving their performance in teaching, learning and research; to develop a capacity to respond to domestic and global challenges of the future; and to educate students for global purposes by enhancing their capability (Batool & Qureshi, 2007; HEC, 2005). Quality of teaching is the key to achieving the HEC’s goals. However, despite remarkable efforts by the HEC in responding to issues of quality in higher education, currently no significant framework exists in Pakistan that might uplift universities by improving and enhancing their quality. This study provides a basis for Pakistan universities in this context.

1.2.1 Statement of the Problem

The essence of the problem is that the quality of teaching in Pakistan universities needs to be improved. Despite initiatives by the HEC and QECs, it is difficult for these agencies to promote and support high quality teaching in the absence of a clear policy framework for improving the quality of teaching and learning. This thesis aims to address the problem of the lack of a clear and coherent policy framework for guiding the improvement of teaching in Pakistan universities.

To be precise, this study aims to develop a framework of ‘QA processes for teaching’ for Pakistan universities, aligned to international academic standards and practices. This framework would not only provide a strong basis for Pakistan universities to develop systematic procedures for improving the quality of their teaching but would also provide a directed approach for them to achieve the goal of becoming world-class institutions. For the sustainability of the intended framework of QA processes for teaching, it needs to be built from a research base that is internationally informed but also grounded in the culture of higher education of Pakistan. As a result, the intended framework has drawn on the experiences of research-led universities as well as taking into account the academic environment of Pakistan universities. The next section highlights the research approach adopted to conduct this research.

1.2.2 The Research Approach

This study employed a mixed methods research approach. The research was conducted in three phases. In phase I, an analysis of 229 policy and practice documents regarding QA of teaching from sample Universitas 21 (U21) institutions was undertaken using template
analysis to identify international practices and processes in QA of teaching in higher education. The U21 institutions were chosen as the basis for this work because they represent a leading international network of research-led universities that reflects the HEC’s approach for a higher quality university system in Pakistan.

The value of a framework of QA processes for teaching in higher education for Pakistan developed on the basis of U21 institutions raises the issue of sustainability, given that U21 institutions exist largely in developed countries. As Rana and Reid (2009) suggest, attention needs to be paid to the prevailing conditions of the universities in developing countries. Phase II and phase III of the study are, therefore, particularly concerned with taking into account of the circumstances in Pakistan in order to develop a viable ‘framework of quality assurance processes for teaching’ for Pakistan universities. The three phases of the study are visually presented in Figure 1.1.

Figure 1.1: Visual presentation of three phases of the study

Phase II of the study was concerned with seeking opinions from higher education staff in Pakistan about the desirability and the likely acceptability of QA processes for teaching in Pakistan universities using the Delphi technique. These QA processes were derived from the U21 institutions’ polices and practice documents using template analysis. This phase revealed a consistently high desirability of QA processes in Pakistan universities but there were significant variations in the likely acceptability of processes. This led to the third phase of the study which used interviews to examine the perceptions of higher education staff in Pakistan about the reasons for variations in the likely acceptability of QA processes in Pakistan universities. On the basis of these three phases of research, a framework of QA processes for teaching for Pakistan universities was developed.
1.2.3 The Nature of the Framework

In developing a framework of QA processes for teaching for Pakistan universities, a significant consideration is the underlying approach to quality. Broadly speaking, there are two approaches to quality in higher education: quality assurance (QA) and quality enhancement (QE). The choice of approach to quality is guided by the purpose, which negotiates the contrasting ends of accountability and improvement. The literature suggests that the focus of QA is on accountability, whereas the focus of QE is on improvement. Within universities there is considerable debate about the optimum balance between these two externally imposed (QA) and internally driven (QE) approaches and no consensus has been achieved. It is, however, hypothesized that coherence between both approaches to quality is essential to ensure that these approaches support rather than contradict each other.

The choice of either of the two approaches to quality depends upon the economic, social, political and cultural contexts of a university, which in turn affect decisions about: mission and objectives; provision of adequate facilities; formulation of policies; qualifications of academic staff; appointment and promotion processes; and academic freedom (Lim, 2001). The approach to quality in higher education is also influenced by such factors as: quality of incoming students; academic leadership; resources; curricula; infrastructure; socio-political environment of universities; planning; governance; and assessment procedures.

These factors have a strong impact on the quality of higher education and can either boost quality or decrease it further. Knight (2006) argues that enhancing the quality of teaching implies the creation of a working environment that favours certain kinds of professional formation, for example an environment that encourages the scholarship of teaching and learning. These factors have a number of implications in the context of Pakistan and suggest that any framework of quality assurance processes developed at either of the two extremes of accountability or improvement is unlikely to work in Pakistan universities. Global experiences of approaches to quality also suggest that it should comprise both accountability and improvement aspects.

On the basis of the abovementioned factors in the context of Pakistan, a mixed approach to QA processes appears to be more acceptable and sustainable for Pakistan universities than either of the two extremes of accountability and improvement. There will be a need
for legislation along with some input from grass-root level for enhancing the quality of teaching in Pakistan universities. It is thus hypothesized that the intended framework of QA processes for teaching for Pakistan needs to take account of both improvement and accountability approaches to quality for enhancing its acceptability and sustainability. There are strong reasons for the inclusion of both approaches in the intended framework of QA processes for Pakistan.

For instance, a focus on the developmental aspects of quality assurance is likely to be necessary because higher education in Pakistan suffered from decades of neglect until the reform agenda was introduced in 2002 with the establishment of the HEC. Approximately half the universities in Pakistan have been established during the last decade and thus universities are in a developmental phase. Likewise, the quality assurance system is also in a developmental phase in Pakistan universities because of the HEC’s recent introduction of the reform agenda, with the establishment of the QAA and QECs in 2004-05. It is estimated that a mere 23 percent of current academics in public sector universities hold PhD degrees (Hayward, 2009). However, a culture has now developed of PhDs as a gateway to quality. The HEC has sent a substantial number of faculty members and students to major international universities for doctoral studies. The intention is that both students and academics will return to teaching and research positions in universities after completing their degrees. The developmental needs of universities are also evident as they face specific issues, such as a lack of understanding and familiarity with the concept of QA and a lack of expertise in QA.

On the other hand, the accountability aspects of quality assurance are also likely to be important. For example, Hayward (2009) asserts that the HEC “saw its change process as being top down by necessity, arguing that was the only viable alternative after decades of institutional failures” (p. 19). The focus of the HEC on accountability aspects is also evident as its Quality Assurance Manual states that the “QECs will be responsible for promoting public confidence that the quality and standards for the award of degrees, management and overall quality of knowledge being imparted by the institutions are enhanced and safeguarded” (Batool & Qureshi, 2006, p. 13).

The hypothesis about the nature of the framework is further strengthened by the fact that the focus of the HEC is also on the linkage of internal quality processes, which tend to be more developmental, with external processes, which tend towards accountability, so that both approaches complement and are integrated with each other. The HEC believes that
internal QA practices are essential for the external QA practices, while external QA practices motivate internal QA for future developments and improvements (Batool & Qureshi, 2006). In short, both approaches are essential in practice (see Chapter 2). However, the coherence between both approaches to quality is necessary to ensure that they support rather than challenge each other.

1.3 The Research Outcomes

The main objective of the study is to develop a framework of QA processes for teaching for Pakistan universities based on the experiences of research-intensive universities. To achieve its main objective, this study has the following key objectives:

- To identify and classify quality assurance processes for teaching in Universitas 21 (U21) institutions.
- To investigate and understand the nature of QA processes for teaching in U21 institutions.
- To assess the desirability and the likely acceptability of various aspects of QA processes for teaching in Pakistan universities.
- To examine the perceptions of higher education academics in Pakistan in relation to the reasons for variations in the likely acceptability of QA processes in Pakistan.
- To use the findings of the empirical work in the first four objectives to propose a framework for quality assurance processes for teaching in Pakistan universities.

1.4 Significance of the Study

Despite many studies in the area of quality assurance in higher education, few previous studies have been conducted to investigate the nature of quality assurance processes in higher education collectively by using a global network such as U21 institutions. While this inquiry is essentially aimed at the nature of QA processes for teaching and learning through the examination of policy documents from leading research-led universities, it also informs deeper aspects of ‘quality teaching’ and ‘quality learning’. The identification and classification of QA processes for teaching with reference to the key characteristics of ‘quality teaching’ in research-led universities also has many consequences for the
broader domain of policy and process development to enhance the quality of teaching and learning.

The goal of Pakistan universities is to enhance their capability and global standing. The aim of higher education in Pakistan is to enhance the social and economic development of the country. These aims and goals of higher education in Pakistan depend to a large extent on an efficient and high quality university system. This study thus provides an evidence-informed basis for achieving these aims and goals by focusing on one key component of a quality system – the quality of teaching – and offers a research-informed policy framework for improving the quality of teaching and learning in Pakistan universities.

Improving the quality of teaching will not only enhance the experiences of students but also generate more successful graduates and doctoral students who will contribute to the development of the country. A framework of QA processes for teaching will guide the work of the QECs by providing a theoretical, contextually-informed basis for Pakistan universities to develop policies and processes aimed at improving the quality of teaching and learning. The policy framework developed here will further inform the development of other QA/QE policies in Pakistan universities such as those related to research or to the provision of supervision to students.

The main beneficiaries of this study will be the Higher Education Commission, the Quality Assurance Agency, Quality Enhancement Cells (QECs) and Pakistan universities. This study provides a base for these bodies to develop, revise and update their policies and processes for assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching in comparison with standards of research-led universities. This study also offers guidelines for the implementation of QA processes for teaching into practice in Pakistan universities.

The framework of QA processes for teaching also provides the basis for assessing the quality of teaching in Pakistan universities. As a result, Pakistan universities will be in a better position to develop their own policies aimed at rewarding teaching excellence through tenure and promotion processes. It will also benefit those teachers who are currently disadvantaged in tenure and promotion processes due to the absence of appropriate procedures for the assessment of quality teaching. Teaching is an important component of the learning process and improving the quality of teaching is more likely to improve quality learning outcomes for students. It is also argued that improving the quality of teaching is more likely to raise the overall quality of Pakistan universities.
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This study also adds value to international literature on ‘quality assurance’ and ‘quality enhancement’ in the context of developing countries. Traditionally, this literature has focused on developed countries, with little reference to universities in the developing world. This study integrates findings from universities in developed countries with those in the developing world, namely Pakistan. Academics of research-led universities can benefit from this study as it provides greater clarity about the nature and purposes of QA processes drawn from an extended network of institutions. Because the framework of QA processes for teaching has its basis in the experiences of research-led universities, it is argued that it would provide a directed approach for the universities in developing countries to develop their QA processes in a research-informed manner.

In summary, the significance of this study is as follows:

- This study aims to provide a policy framework that guides Pakistan universities to achieve their goals in terms of teaching quality.
- It assists the HEC, QAA, QECs and the universities in Pakistan to develop more robust policies and processes concerning quality assurance of teaching.
- It suggests guidelines for the evaluation of teaching in Pakistan universities.
- It informs higher education academics interested in improving the quality of their teaching.
- It also adds value to the international literature on quality assurance and quality enhancement in the context of developing countries.

1.5 Structure of the Thesis

This thesis begins by examining the relevant literature in order to understand the origin and the nature of approaches to quality in higher education. Discussion develops in three parts. The first part traces the origin of quality assurance in higher education and provides the rationale to support the notion of quality. The second part examines the approaches to quality in higher education with a particular emphasis on the nature of the approaches. The concepts of quality assurance and quality enhancement are discussed. The final part focuses on the models of quality in higher education.

Chapter 3 focuses on five key international practices aimed at assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching in universities. It also examines the nature of these practices and whether they are characterized by quality assurance or quality enhancement.
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Chapter 4 discusses the methodological choices involved in carrying out inquiry. It also highlights the rationale for using mixed methods, along with a rationale for the particular methods used for each phase of the study.

Chapter 5 presents a critical analysis of policy and practice documents related to QA of teaching in U21 institutions. The focus of the analysis is on the identification and classification of QA processes for teaching in U21 institutions. This chapter also presents a detailed discussion about the nature of these processes in U21 institutions with reference to their focus on quality assurance or on quality enhancement.

Chapter 6 examines the responses of higher education academics in Pakistan to the desirability and likely acceptability of various aspects of QA processes for teaching in Pakistan universities, using the Delphi technique. The Delphi Round I questionnaire was derived from the findings of U21 institutions (see Chapter 5).

Chapter 7 deals with higher education academics’ perceptions of the gap between the desirability and likely acceptability of various aspects of QA processes for teaching in Pakistan universities. This chapter identifies the factors that are likely to influence the acceptability of QA processes in Pakistan universities.

Chapter 8 synthesizes the findings of chapters 5, 6 and 7 in order to propose a framework of QA processes for teaching for Pakistan universities. Chapter 9, the final chapter of the thesis, draws conclusions. It also deals with practical implications of the study, presents recommendations, and provides directions for the future research.
Chapter 2
The Concept of Quality in Higher Education

2.1 Overview

This study is centred on understanding the nature of quality assurance processes for teaching in higher education. It is essential, therefore, to understand the concept of ‘quality’ in its wider perspective and to locate quality assurance processes within the broader discussion of quality in higher education, with a particular emphasis on quality of teaching. This chapter examines the relevant literature in order to understand the concept of quality and the nature of approaches to quality in higher education. The concepts explored in this chapter guide the subsequent discussion in Chapter 3, which focuses particularly on the key international practices aimed at assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching in universities.

Discussion in this chapter develops in four parts. The first part focuses on defining the concept of quality in higher education. The second part traces the origin of quality assurance in higher education and provides the rationale to support the notion of quality. The third part explores approaches to quality in higher education with a particular focus on understanding the concepts of ‘quality assurance’ and ‘quality enhancement’. The final part examines models of quality in higher education. Discussion in this chapter views quality in holistic terms with the inclusion of teaching.

2.2 The Concept of Quality in Higher Education

Assuring and enhancing the quality of higher education has been a prime concern of governments and universities in recent years. The literature indicates that academics are taking the issue of quality increasingly seriously and a substantial amount of research has been carried out in this area. However, despite its importance and the progress that has been made through research and debate, quality remains an elusive concept (Cheng & Tam, 1997; Kidney, Cummings & Boehm, 2007) both in theoretical literature and in higher education policy documents (Sachs, 1995). The meaning of the word ‘quality’ has become confused as it is being used in an increasing range of contexts and with a multiplicity of purposes.
In higher education documents and literature, the concept of quality is “notoriously ambiguous” (Pounder, 1999, p. 156), “vague” and “controversial” (Cheng & Tam, 1997, p. 123). The literature illustrates that quality is a complex and multifaceted concept with several different and overlapping interpretations (Coates, 2005; Warn & Tranter, 2001). As a result, defining quality in higher education is a challenging task and due to lack of agreed definition there is no universal consensus on how best to manage quality in higher education (Becket & Brookes, 2006; D’Andrea, 2007). One way to understand the term ‘quality’ in higher education is to consider various notions of quality because it has more than one dimension.

2.2.1 Notions of Quality

A number of researchers have interpreted the term ‘quality’ in various ways (Ashcroft & Foreman-Peck, 1995; Biggs, 2003; Green, 1994; Harvey & Green, 1993; Harvey & Knight, 1996; Lim, 2001; Watty, 2006). These interpretations are primarily based on Harvey and Green’s (1993) five interrelated notions of quality, namely: excellence or quality as exceptional; perfection or consistency; fitness for purpose; value for money; and quality as transformation. In addition to these five notions of quality, the concepts of quality as enhancement and quality as threshold have also been discussed in the literature (McKimm, 2003). To understand the concept of quality in higher education, a brief explanation of the various dimensions of quality follows:

*Excellence or quality as exceptional:* This notion of quality is generally linked with a reputation for exceptionally high academic standards in higher education. It implies the notion of reputation (Ashcroft & Foreman-Peck, 1995) and refers to the traditional, but often implicit, academic view which aims to demonstrate high academic standards (Lim, 2001; McKimm, 2003). However, the issue with this notion of quality, as raised by D’Andrea and Gosling (2005), is who should define academic standards in higher education if they are taken as a measure of excellence.

*Quality as perfection or consistency:* This view of quality refers to the perfection of processes in measuring specified products. Perfection, in this context, implies “zero errors” (Mizikaci, 2006, p. 38), “faultlessness” and that “standards are checked to achieve consistency” (Ashcroft & Foreman-Peck, 1995, p. 14). This view of quality is related to a process rather than inputs and outputs (Holmes & Brown, 2000). However, it appears that this notion of quality is most relevant to industry where it is possible to establish “detailed
product specifications” (McKimm, 2009, p. 187) and where “standardized measurements of uniform products can show conformity to them” (Mizikaci, 2006, p. 38).

Quality as fitness for purpose: This view of quality refers to the extent to which the service fulfils customers’ needs, requirements, or desires (Lomas, 2007; McKimm, 2003; McKimm, 2009; Mizikaci, 2006). In higher education, the service refers to the universities, and customers or stakeholders (students, teachers, administrators, employers and the government as a representative of the public). Quality, in this sense, is a value judgement and can be interpreted differently by different stakeholders. This view of quality requires higher education institutions to formulate their own goals, objectives and mission against which they are evaluated.

The basic question for quality assurance within this dimension is, therefore, whether teaching programmes are producing the required results aligned to student learning. This may require the design of teaching and learning activities in terms of student learning outcomes and also ensuring that quality mechanisms are aligned with teaching and learning activities. This view of quality appears to be problematic for several reasons. D’Andrea and Gosling (2005) contended that this view of quality defines standards as the goals formulated by the institutions. Consequently, institutions are judged against their own goals. Similarly, Ramsden (2003) argues that this is a “misleading view of quality in teaching and learning” as it “sidesteps” the basic idea of quality as excellence (p. 218). Biggs (2003) raises concerns over the purpose of getting students to learn effectively against publicly recognizable standards.

Quality as value for money: This view of quality is essentially related to the notion of accountability. The proponents of this notion of quality believe that higher education institutions, like other public services, are expected to be accountable to governments and funding bodies. As accountability is the central theme in this view (Lomas, 2007a; Mizikaci, 2006), a ‘quality’ institution is, therefore, the one that “satisfies the demands of public accountability” (Biggs, 2001, p. 221). Biggs (2003) argues that “this view of quality has nothing to say about the quality of teaching and learning” and defines a ‘quality’ institution as the one that “produces more graduates for less public money, has a high ratio of PhDs on its staff, and a strategic plan that signals high levels of self-funded activities” (p. 267).
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Quality as transformation: This notion of quality focuses on changing student behaviour (McKimm, 2009) to that which leads to significant improvement (Lomas, 2007a) as a result of their studies in universities. This view of quality expects universities to stress goals which focus on “creating experiences and environments for students” to enable them to “add value in terms of their competencies, including learning competencies”, rather than goals which focus on “narrowly defined package of content and skills” (Boyle, n.d). In this model, the aim is to create conditions where students can experience a qualitative change (Ashcroft & Foreman-Peck, 1995).

The transformative view of quality needs to be taken more seriously in universities as it demands such teaching and learning activities that enhance learning outcomes for students. This view of quality, therefore, does more justice to education as a process in which learners are the centre of the action (Van Kemenade, Pupius & Hardjono, 2008). As Biggs (2003) argues, this view of quality refers to the transformation of “students’ perceptions of their world and the way they go about applying their knowledge to real world problems” (p. 267). In this sense, a quality institution is one that “empowers students with specific skills, knowledge and attitudes which enable them to live and work in the knowledge society” (Mizikaci, 2006, p. 38).

Quality as enhancement: This view of quality centres on continuous improvement of quality in higher education. It generally assumes that “achieving quality is central to the academic ethos” (Mizikaci, 2006, p. 38) and refers to the improvement of quality through “dissemination of good practice or use of a continuous improvement cycle” (McKimm, 2009, p. 187). This notion of quality is particularly concerned with improving the quality of teaching and learning within the institution. It places an emphasis, therefore, on a “range of teaching and learning activities across the institution” (D’Andrea, 2007, p. 211) to “continually review and improve current practice” (Biggs, 2001, p. 223). It mostly uses qualitative approaches and a formative feedback process to bring about improvement (D’Andrea, 2007).

Quality as threshold: This view of quality refers to the setting of minimum standards on the part of institutions, that they are expected to exceed. McKimm (2009) believes that these minimum standards are generally taken as the “broad definitions of desired knowledge, skills and attitudes of graduates” (p. 187). Mizikaci (2006) argues that this view of quality focuses on setting of “certain norms and criteria” that institutions need to reach (p. 38). One controversial issue in this view of quality is: who should define
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standards, norms, and the criteria? It is likely that externally-driven standards and norms will be focused on accountability whereas those defined by individual units and institutions are more likely to lead to improvement.

It is apparent from this discussion that there is no consensus on various interpretations of the term ‘quality’ and use of term is largely dependent upon context. For instance, McKimm (2009) argues that the idea of quality is not only underpinned by the “thinking behind the design, delivery, evaluation and review of educational provision” but also depends on the “aims and purposes of the educational provision” (p. 186). It is argued, therefore, that the concept of quality should not be detached from the purpose and context because the issue of quality in higher education is essentially political (Harvey & Williams, 2010; Sachs, 1995).

Various dimensions of quality reflect different perspectives on the issue of quality and are ultimately dependent on the motives and drivers behind them. For example, Owlia and Aspinwall (1996) argue that different stakeholders prioritize the importance of each of these dimensions differently depending on their interests and motivations. It is, therefore, more than likely that there may be a preference for some quality dimensions at the expense of others (Becket & Brookes, 2006). The preferences for any particular dimension of quality are ultimately decided by the context which is generally guided by the purpose. The next section is, therefore, focused on the origin of quality in higher education and the purposes behind quality assurance schemes.

2.3 Origin of Quality in Higher Education

It appears that the origin of quality in higher education is essentially linked with concerns about the quality of higher education among various stakeholders. These concerns have led to a “worldwide proliferation of quality assurance and enhancement schemes” (Kulski & Groombridge, 2004, p. 45) and thus a number of policies and processes have been introduced in universities to assure and enhance the quality of higher education in general and of teaching and learning in particular. This section is, therefore, focused on exploring the origin of quality schemes in higher education, principles that underlie these schemes and the purpose, motives and drivers behind them.

The origin of quality assurance lies in business and industry. This idea emerged as a principal business methodology in Western world during 1950s and in early 1960s
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(Friend-Pereira, Lutz & Heerens 2002; Lim, 2001). It has now become a universally acknowledged factor in successful business organizations, educational institutions and in other public services and a symbol through which these organizations, institutions, and service providers differentiate themselves from their competitors. Ramsden (2003) reports that transition of the concept of ‘quality assurance’ from industry into higher education occurred in 1990s.

The introduction of quality assurance and enhancement schemes in higher education is essentially political and the literature demonstrates that the rationale behind these schemes is, first and foremost, accountability for public money, i.e. the dimension of quality as value for money. For instance, Sachs (1995) believes that the concept of quality in higher education was introduced to satisfy the growing external demands for accountability of higher education institutions. These demands have come primarily from governments who argue that “closer scrutiny of the outcomes” achieved by publicly funded higher education institutions is justified because they attract a huge amount of public money (Gosling & D’Andrea, 2001, p. 81). The next section provides the rationale for the introduction of quality assurance schemes in higher education.

2.3.1 Key Drivers of Quality Assurance in Higher Education

The literature illustrates that several different factors have contributed to worldwide establishment of quality schemes in higher education. In fact, higher education has experienced a great change over the last 15 years and new trends have evolved internationally. These trends have deeply influenced the rapidly changing environment of higher education and increasing demands for accountability of higher education institutions have emerged as a consequence (McKimm, 2009; Smith, 2008). This has in turn led to the initiation of quality assurance and enhancement schemes in higher education (D’Andrea & Gosling, 2005). This section explores the key international trends in higher education that are in fact the drivers for the initiation of these quality schemes.

The main driver for the establishment of quality assurance schemes in higher education can be viewed in terms of increasing demands for accountability of higher education institutions. These demands are largely based on the premise that universities, like other public services, are accountable for the use of public money that they have received from governments (Becket & Brookes, 2006; Brown, Carpenter, Collins & Winkvist-Noble, 2007; Gosling & D’Andrea, 2001; Lim, 2001; McKimm, 2009; Strydom, Zulu & Murray,
These demands have emanated primarily from governments (Coates, 2005; D’Andrea & Gosling, 2005).

Similar demands for accountability have also come from students, who expect to receive “quality teaching and sufficient learning resources” to meet their learning needs (Gosling & D’Andrea, 2001, p. 8) in return for their tuition fees (Lomas, 2007a). In the same way, quality assurance schemes have emerged in higher education because of the demands for transparency and efficiency in the use of public funds. The aim of quality schemes, in this sense, is to ensure that universities are justifying the use of public money by assuring the public and governments that the quality of their provision is of a high standard.

Factors such as globalization, massification and internationalization of higher education have also led to the initiation of quality schemes in universities (Asderaki, 2009; Brown et al., 2007; D’Andrea, 2007; Harvey & Williams, 2010; Smith, 2008; Strydom et al., 2004; Teelken & Lomas, 2009). For example, globalization is apparent in the number of higher education institutions that are providing their services in other countries, along with an increased mobility of academic staff and students across countries (Coates, 2005; Umemiya, 2008). Mass higher education has also led to an expansion in the size of student populations.

This rapid growth in the number of higher education providers and learners, along with diversification in terms of the types of providers, learners and programmes, has also raised concerns about the quality of higher education provision. As a result, there are increased demands from students, employers, the public and governments for high quality provision by universities. These demands for quality are largely driven by the fears that expansion in the size of higher education providers and in the student population, along with the diversity of that population, is threatening quality (Becket & Brookes, 2006; D’Andrea & Gosling, 2005; Gosling & D’Andrea, 2001; Lomas, 2007a).

The literature suggests that demands for quality assurance in higher education are also driven by decreasing resources for universities (McKimm, 2003). Funding bodies and governments are squeezing budgets for universities (Asderaki, 2009) despite the fact that participation rates are increasing. The decline in public funding has also resulted in deterioration of student-staff ratios (Gosling & D’Andrea, 2001), which in turn has raised concerns about the quality of provision in universities.
One factor that has contributed to demands for quality assurance in higher education is that of worldwide economic and technological advancement (D’Andrea, 2007; McKimm, 2003). Higher education is expected to respond to economic needs and highly social demands of society. Quality assurance of higher education provision is, therefore, of central importance to address these needs and demands of society.

All of these trends in higher education, although to a varying degree of importance in each case, have led to the need to reassure the public and governments that the quality of higher education is being maintained and enhanced. In response to these demands for quality, a substantial growth has been noted in quality management processes both internally, through quality offices within institutions, and externally through quality assurance agencies and accreditation agencies (Asderaki, 2009; Gosling & D’Andrea, 2001). Thus it can be concluded that the initial drivers for quality in higher education have their roots largely in external demands for accountability, with the idea of quality in higher education having derived from industry. The next section examines the background to quality schemes in higher education.

**2.3.2 Background to Quality in Higher Education**

It is evident from the literature outlined in the previous section that growing external demands for accountability have led to the establishment of quality schemes in higher education. It is important to note that external demands for accountability have been largely based on the premise that higher education is like an industry, and their institutions like a business. Consequently, quality systems for higher education were primarily derived from the world of business and industry (Bowden & Marton, 1998). The growth of quality out of business and industry has created a lively debate among academics about what constitutes ‘quality’ (Gosling & D’Andrea, 2001). An important question to emerge from this debate is “whether the use of corporate business models of quality assessment is appropriate to higher education” when the nature and context of each organization is different (D’Andrea, 2007, p. 210).

In response to this overarching question, scholars argue that the language and tools of industry-born quality models, such as the total quality management (TQM) model, are “imperfect” (Houston, 2008, p. 61) and a “poor fit” (Houston, 2007, p. 3) with the purpose of advancing quality in higher education (Hodgkinson & Kelly, 2007). It is generally believed that the major driver for applying business models of quality assessment such as
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TQM in higher education is governmental regulatory accountability (D’Andrea, 2007). These types of models are dependent on measurable objectives and, therefore, complicate things further (D’Andrea & Gosling, 2005).

Notwithstanding concerns about industry-born models, De Jager and Nieuwenhuis (2005) advocate the use of TQM in universities by relating it to outcomes-based education. They argue that a TQM approach places an emphasis on learners and the focus of an outcomes-based approach is also moving away from a teacher-centred approach to that of a learner-centred approach. However, not all academics agree that industry-focused quality measures are suited to higher education. For example, many academics in UK universities believe that higher education is not like a service industry where a product or a service is sold to students (Lomas, 2007), rather it is about developing the mind. Mizikaci (2006) also report significant limitations of industry-focused quality measures in higher education.

Bowden and Marton (1998) observe that the focus of quality schemes in industry is generally on the quality of processes by which products are produced. These products are well defined in advance and one has to optimize the conditions under which they are produced. Products in higher education may not be so easily defined in advance. They further argue that adaptation of relevant strategies would help educational institutions to create higher standards of quality. Sachs (1995) argues that universities have a particular view of quality that is largely dependent upon their own needs, goals and objectives. The lack of trust in business models of quality by academics indicates the failure of such models in higher education (D’Andrea & Gosling, 2005; Harvey & Williams, 2010). Both the failure of business models of quality and the unique nature of higher education institutions has led to the emergence of concepts like ‘quality improvement’ and ‘quality enhancement’.

As a result, a discernable trend or a shift from a focus on quality assurance towards a focus on quality enhancement has been noted internationally in recent years. For instance, McKimm (2009) observes that the emphasis of current quality agenda in England is on enhancement rather than inspection by reducing external scrutiny and bureaucracy and by increasing institutional autonomy and self-regulation. An enhancement-led approach is also the central theme of the institutional reviews in Scotland and Wales, with a focus on student learning experiences (McKimm, 2003). Gosling, D’Andrea and Blackwell (2005, p. 55) also observe a “substantial and potentially significant shift” in approaches to
quality in the higher education sector of the UK with a growing interest in quality enhancement (QE) during the last few years.

Filippakou and Tapper (2007) also report a shift in the quality debate from assurance to enhancement in the UK. This shift is reflected in the discourse generated by the Quality Assurance Agency and in the establishment of The Higher Education Academy. D’Andrea (2007) believes that the shift in the UK from a focus on business models of quality assessment towards a focus on QE models in higher education is due to the failure of quality assessment activities over the last decade. She further asserts that QE models are now gaining support in the higher education sector. Patton (2002) describes this shift more from accountability towards improvement.

The key driver behind the introduction of quality schemes in higher education is accountability. Quality assurance practices were originally introduced in higher education to satisfy external demands for accountability, the notion of quality as value for money. However, factors such as: the failure of business models of quality in higher education, the unique nature of higher education institutions, and the lack of business models in improving students’ learning experiences, have led to the emergence of concepts like quality improvement and quality enhancement. It is, therefore, concluded that key drivers for quality schemes in higher education are accountability and improvement. QA schemes in higher education are generally guided by these two drivers which, in turn, lead to development of policies, processes and procedures for assuring and enhancing quality of teaching and learning. The next section examines various approaches to quality that guide the nature of policies and processes related to quality in universities.

2.4 Approaches to Quality in Higher Education

The literature illustrates that the drivers of accountability and improvement have led to two broad and opposing approaches to quality in higher education. These two strands of quality have been mostly termed as quality assurance (QA) and quality enhancement (QE) in the literature (Biggs, 2003; D’Andrea, 2007; Lomas, 2004; McKimm, 2009). The focus of QA is on accountability while QE places an emphasis on improvement (Biggs, 2003; Sachs, 1995; Teelken & Lomas, 2009). These two approaches to quality decide the purpose of QA processes and how these processes should be implemented. This in turn leads to the development of policies and processes related to quality in higher education.
In order to understand the nature of these policies and processes, it is essential to understand the nature of the two broad approaches to quality.

Several characteristics of these two approaches to quality have been mentioned in the literature. For instance, the philosophy of QA is instrumental and is more concerned with externally driven accountability (Biggs, 2001; Sachs, 1995). Accountability refers to assuring students, society and government that quality is well managed and this is generally the main focus of external reviewers. On the other hand, the philosophy of QE is transformative and is more concerned with procedures that focus on developing, promoting and improving quality internally (Biggs, 2001; Sachs, 1995). Lomas (2007) argues that QA is concerned with ensuring that services of the university are fit for purpose whereas QE aims to improve the quality of teaching and learning by disseminating good practices in universities, the dimension of quality as enhancement. Gosling and D’Andrea (2001) believe that the focus of QA is on quality assessment, whereas the focus of QE is on the development.

Both versions of quality exist in universities at policy and practice level and are key drivers for assuring the quality of higher education. Policies and processes aimed at QA generally come from external bodies at national level whereas policies and procedures aimed at QE are internally derived. McKimm (2009) suggests that a context for good practices in quality assurance can only be set when “demands from external agencies combine with subject discipline-based practices and institutional culture” (p. 186).

For instance, the focus of policies and processes that emanate from national bodies in Australian higher education is on accountability and they generally advocate quality assurance, while the focus of policies derived from within universities is on individual and corporate development and they are usually based on quality improvement strategies (Sachs, 1995).

The literature also demonstrates that in practice approaches to quality in higher education involve the elements of both accountability and improvement. Williams (2002) reports that institutional reviews in UK universities are focused on QA but also involve the elements of QE through dissemination of good practices. Knight (2006) notes that the distinction between QA and QE is not hard edged because “assurance has always been expected to enhance and enhancement involves some judgement of the state of existing quality processes” (p. 186). It is argued, therefore, that there is no clear-cut distinction
between QA and QE. They form two ends of a continuum upon which all of the quality assurance processes fall.

At one end of the continuum there are those approaches to quality that look back to what has already been done and make a summative judgement against external standards (Biggs, 2001) with a focus on compliance (Hodson & Thomas, 2003). The agenda is managerial rather than academic, with accountability a high priority. Procedures are top-down and bureaucratic, and climate adversarial rather than collegial (Biggs, 2003). Historically, this end of the continuum might be called the punitive or accountability end.

At the other end of the continuum there are those approaches to quality which are concerned with assuring that teaching and learning fits with the purpose of the institution now, with commitment to upgrade and improve it in the future by requiring that procedures are in place that lead to quality enhancement (Biggs, 2001). Quality enhancement (QE) is not concerned with quantifying aspects of the system, but with reviewing how well the whole institution works in achieving its mission, and how it might be improved (Biggs, 2003). This end of the continuum might be called the improvement or enhancement end. The approaches at this end of the continuum are characterized as bottom-up, supportive, collaborative, cooperative, inclusive, and as being participative in nature.

It is critical to examine the nature and characteristics of these two contrasting approaches of QA and QE that guide the development of quality assurance policies and processes at national and institutional level in higher education. It is also important to examine the impact of QA and QE approaches on improving the quality of teaching and learning in universities. Discussion of these two approaches to quality will contribute towards an understanding of the nature of QA processes in universities.

2.4.1 Quality Assurance

Discussion in this section develops in two parts. The first part examines the nature and characteristics of QA approaches in order to understand the nature of QA processes. The final part deals with the impact of QA approaches in improving the quality of higher education in general and of teaching in particular. This part also focuses on perceptions of academics about the effectiveness of QA approaches in higher education. In this section, the term ‘quality assurance’ refers to all policies, processes and actions through which quality is maintained and enhanced (Lim, 2001; McKimm, 2003).
A. Nature of Quality Assurance (QA) Approaches

The nature of QA approaches is top-down and structure is bureaucratic, under greater centralized control, with an emphasis on measurement (Biggs, 2001; D’Andrea, 2007; Sachs, 1995; Stensaker, 2008; Teelken & Lomas, 2009). As a consequence, the autonomy of institutions comes into question due to the possibility of external interference. Gosling and D’Andrea (2001) observe that imposition of QA derives from a “lack of trust by the public, government and institutional managers” that is “damaging to the ethos of the university” and “collegiality is being lost and replaced by excessive bureaucracy” (p. 10). They further contend that bureaucratic demands of QA create a compliance culture that “dampens creativity, rewards conformity and slows down the responsiveness of the system to a rapidly changing environment” (p. 10).

Quality assurance practices are primarily external in nature and are generally carried out by external agencies. These approaches are usually “built around an assessment of an institution’s past performance and is circumscribed by economic indicators” (Sachs, 1995, p. 4). The focus of QA practices is on minimum acceptable standards, as defined by external bodies (Biggs, 2003), by looking at “what has happened” (Henderson-Smart & Winning, 2006, p. 144). These practices are judgmental in nature, with a focus on past actions of the institution (Sachs, 1995). Because these approaches deal with past documentation, they do little to improve quality in the future. However, the provision of suggestions to institutions for future improvement has been noted as a trend in QA approaches.

The proponents of QA are of the view that quality can be assessed “so long as the ‘right’ instruments are developed” (Sachs, 1995, p. 4). The emphasis is on achieving results by assessing performance indicators. Performance indicators are a quantitative measure of outputs in terms of institutions’ goals (e.g., minimizing drop-out) or educational processes (e.g., maximizing student satisfaction) (McKimm, 2009) and provide the basis for identification of trends, strengths and deficiencies in quantitative terms and not qualitative judgements. In doing so, no attempts are made to understand the nature of processes involved. Strengths and good practices are generally rewarded.

In QA practices, the managers define the aims, goals and mission of the universities; establish criteria to monitor and evaluate educational outcomes; as well as measure the degree to which these aims and goals have been achieved. These QA practices indicate
the managers’ lack of trust towards academics and require increasing production of documentary evidence to demonstrate quality (D’Andrea & Gosling, 2005). Gosling and D’Andrea (2001) also argue that “emphasis on documenting evidence is a time-consuming distraction from the real business of teaching and research” (p. 10).

Accountability approaches promote conformity to external requirements rather than excellence and have “imposed forms of central control that are antithetical to academic culture” (D’Andrea & Gosling, 2005, p. 4). These approaches damage trust within academic communities because they imply surveillance of teachers more than working alongside them. Similarly, Ramsden (2003) argues that these practices have more the characteristics of administrative burden than of an exciting intellectual journey. He further argues that improving teaching implies that lecturers – and by implications, departments, faculties and universities – must learn which needs imagination. The external QA approaches, however, hinder use of imagination.

Harvey and Williams (2010a) report the “repeated concerns about the artificiality of quality assurance processes in higher education” (p. 84). They note that the perception of academics is that QA approaches have no real link with the quality of their academic work, i.e. teaching and research, and that they take these approaches as a burdensome extra. As a consequence, QA approaches have failed to be a part of the everyday activity of academics. Anderson (2006) observes that despite the commitment of academics to the quality of research and teaching, they resist QA processes within universities.

Most QA systems are based on accreditation, evaluations, and on external audits and reviews. For instance, Van Kemenade et al. (2008) claim that most countries in the world have adopted external evaluation systems such as accreditation and institutional audits for QA purposes in higher education. The main elements of the external quality framework in England and Northern Ireland are a combination of institutional audits and discipline level investigations, while in Scotland and Wales there is a trend of enhancement-led institutional audits with a focus on learning experiences of students (McKimm, 2009). Raban (2007) argues that enhancement-led external scrutiny implies an invitation to develop QA processes at institutional level that are equally “supportive and not punitive” (p. 80). Quality audits check the effectiveness of organisations in achieving their goals (Woodhouse, 2003) with a focus on accountability (Dill, 2000).
B. Impact of QA Approaches and Perceptions of Academics

One of the significant issues in the area of quality assurance is assessment of the impact of QA-oriented approaches. Wahlén (2004) assessed the impact of a national quality audit of Swedish higher education institutions between 1995 and 2002 and found that audits have resulted in the development of policies and structure of institutional quality work. Likewise, Carr, Hamilton and Meade (2005) believe that external QA approaches have a powerful initial role as a catalyst, validated university-led reform, and are a necessary prerequisite for internal improvement. Danø and Stensaker (2007) argue that external QA practices are of great importance for the development and initiation of an internal quality culture in higher education.

Woodhouse (2003) reports that external quality audits have the potential to increase an institution’s ability to improve. He explains that improvements were recorded in New Zealand and Australian universities as a result of the activities of audit bodies. Similarly, Dill (2000) notes that academic audits help in initiating and developing QA systems within institutions and reported that capacity of colleges and universities in UK, Sweden, New Zealand and Hong Kong was improved as a result of audits.

Gift and Bell-Hutchinson (2007) examined the outcomes of QA programme reviews in the University of the West Indies and found that academics have increasingly implemented the recommendations of review teams, which contributed to the enhancement of teaching and learning. Carr et al. (2005) report that the introduction of external QA practices has resulted in improved teaching and research in the University of Otago, New Zealand. However, Harvey and Newton (2004) argue that impact studies strengthen the view that QA is more about compliance and thus has contributed little to enhance and transform students’ learning experiences.

Despite the fact that external QA approaches motivate institutions to develop internal processes, academics have raised concerns about their worth. D’Andrea and Gosling (2005) argue that there is little evidence that conformity to quality procedures results in any “fundamental changes” (p. 177) that help in improving the educational experience of students. D’Andrea (2007, p. 211) insists that QA procedures neither bring about an “improvement in teaching and learning at the micro level” nor do they necessarily create an improved attitude among academics towards QA activities. Ramsden (2003) asserts
that external QA practices usually “display a flawed understanding of the essentials of teaching and learning” (p. 220).

In the same way, Harvey and Williams (2010) reviewed 15 years of contributions to *Quality in Higher Education* and reported that external quality evaluations are not good at encouraging improvement, especially from the perspective of accountability. They list two significant issues contributing to failure of QA practices. First, they damage trust. Second, the contributors on the whole regarded the use of industrial models of QA and TQM in particular to be of little use in the higher education setting.

D’Andrea and Gosling assert that if “current quality management systems in higher education do not contribute to the improvement of the educational experience or positively impact student learning, then they are an expensive exercise in futility” (2005, p. 177). Similarly, Gosling and D’Andrea (2001) argue, if the key issue is accountability to the taxpayer, then it is hard to “defend the value for money spent on the quality assurance process itself” (p. 10). Hoecht (2006) reports that the current QA system in the UK comes with high opportunity costs and is not necessarily expected to bring real improvements in teaching and learning.

The studies also demonstrated the concerns of academics about QA practices in higher education. For example, Teelken and Lomas (2009) interviewed 40 academics in the UK and the Netherlands and found that they were worried about an increased emphasis on QA and control. Hodgson and Whalley (2006) argue that it must be accepted that many university academics are suspicious of anything associated with external monitoring of quality, which they perceive as having little to do with improving the standard of the university’s work. However, they further suggest that “monitoring of the quality of a university’s learning and teaching”, in practice, should be linked with the “continual work of improving and enhancing” the quality of learning and teaching (p. 510).

On the basis of the literature cited in this section, it can be concluded that there is no clear evidence that external QA practices or accountability-led approaches bring about any improvement in learning outcomes for students. However, there is some evidence that external QA practices might motivate institutions to develop their own QA processes aimed at enhancing the quality of teaching and learning. It is argued, therefore, that universities need to place an emphasis on internal QA processes aimed at improving the quality of teaching and learning. However, the function of external QA practices should
be to check whether internal QA processes are working appropriately and to support them.

2.4.2 Quality Enhancement

Discussion in this section develops in two parts. The first part examines the nature and characteristics of QE approaches in order to understand the nature of QE processes. The final part deals with the impact of QE approaches in improving the quality of education in general and of teaching in particular. In this context, the term ‘quality enhancement’ refers to continuous improvement of quality through dissemination of good practice (McKimm, 2003). The emphasis is upon self-regulatory approaches of institutions and on students’ learning experiences. These approaches take into account the autonomy of individuals, departments and institutions. These approaches assure quality by continually striving to improve teaching and learning in institutions (Biggs, 2003). Ramsden (2003) argues that these approaches treat ‘areas for improvement’ for teachers as research problems, and not as congenital weaknesses.

A. Nature of Quality Enhancement (QE) Approaches

Quality enhancement approaches place an emphasis on collaboration and engagement of those who are affected by improvements. D’Andrea and Gosling (2005) argue that engaging academic staff in the process of researching their teaching practices increases ownership of improvements, encourages a scholarly approach to teaching and informs decisions at all levels of the institution. Similarly, the collaboration between teaching development centres and departments is also emphasized. Biggs (2003) argues that QE approaches are designed to improve the ongoing system of teaching and learning that encourages superior teaching, and teaching development is supported.

Sachs (1995) believes that QE approaches are generally based on specific needs and interests of various units within the university rather than externally imposed practices and thus can be used as a developmental tool to bring transformation and improvement within institutions. The focus of these approaches is on enhancing the experiences of participants through practices such as peer reviews. The activities are usually planned and carried out internally and consider the interests of universities. This view of quality prevents external interference and empowers participants by giving them the “opportunity to influence their own transformation” (Sachs, 1995, p. 5).
Chapter 2: The concept of quality in higher education

The idea of quality, from the perspective of QE, centres on the dynamic nature of quality. It is based on the assumption that quality is a dynamic process and cannot be attained in an absolute sense. The institutions in this view constantly aim for quality that leads to continuous improvement. Boyle and Bowden (1997) argue that this notion of quality is essentially goal-directed, but not in a narrow and static sense, with a constant struggle to achieve goals which are constantly under review. This view of quality, therefore, refers to setting of teaching and learning goals at an individual unit level and at an institutional level with constant review and evaluation of goals and targets.

Quality enhancement approaches view quality as the responsibility of institutions and believe it can be achieved through continuous improvement (Amaral & Rosa, 2010). Mizikaci (2006) argues that QE approaches focus on the “pursuit of continuous improvement” and are predicated on the idea that “achieving quality is central to the academic ethos” (p. 38). This view of quality is based primarily on the assumption that it is the academics who can best understand the matters involved in quality. The responsibility of universities is thus to manage quality by making best use of institutional autonomy and teachers’ academic freedom (McKimm, 2003). The focus of Western European higher education evaluation procedures is more on quality as enhancement than as standards (McKimm, 2009).

Quality enhancement approaches generally follow the ‘whole institution’ approach by involving individual teachers, departmental/course teams, and the whole institutional infrastructure (Biggs, 2003; D’Andrea & Gosling, 2005) with an emphasis on a range of teaching and learning activities, from “curriculum development to the communities of practice” (D’Andrea, 2007, p. 211). The process of QE is dynamic and emphasis is on changing the status quo, which is regarded as inadequate in some way. In addition, these approaches use a “formative feedback process to bring about change” (D’Andrea, 2007, p. 211). Hodgkinson and Kelly (2007) argue that QE is more about fostering a culture of continuous improvement and innovation.

In quality enhancement approaches, the strategies to improve teaching and learning go beyond the teaching of individual teachers and are aimed at the majority of academics. D’Andrea (2007) argues that the focus of QE activities is on institutional learning and they have a “potential to engage staff in bringing about improvements in teaching and learning” (p. 211). D’Andrea and Gosling have defined ‘improvement’: “whereas change can be for the better or worse, improving something implies changing it for the better and
improvement suggests that status quo is being regarded as inadequate in some way” (2005, p. 3).

B. Impact of Quality Enhancement (QE) Approaches

The literature suggests that quality enhancement approaches generally have a positive impact on enhancing the quality of teaching and learning in universities. For instance, Alean-Kirkpatrick, Hänni and Lutz (1997) explored the impact of internal QE practices for teaching in the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology in Zurich and found that such practices had a significant impact on the quality of teaching at the institute.

Quality enhancement approaches, however, need a sufficient amount of effort from all concerned in order to implement the processes, and improvements in QE are relatively difficult to measure. Filippakou and Tapper (2008) believe that change in quality agenda, with a focus on QE, may require “higher education institutions to put considerable time and energy into developing different interpretations of the meaning and purposes of quality agenda” (p. 97). They further argue that it is important to think about how to evaluate whether or not QE has actually occurred.

Kember (2009) used a ‘student engagement questionnaire’ as a quality enhancement initiative at programme level in a research-intensive university in Hong Kong and reported that it was particularly helpful in “identifying strengths and possible areas for improvement”, because it was “highly diagnostic” (p. 7). Weusthof (1995) examined the nature of self-evaluation and internal quality assurance procedures at the faculty level in Dutch universities. He suggests that self-evaluation procedures and internal quality assurance processes are more likely to improve the quality of education.

Horsburgh (1998) examined internal quality assurance processes in two institutions, one each in New Zealand and the UK, and how these internal QA/QE processes contribute to transformation. She emphasizes the need to place a stronger focus on self-regulation approaches and that responsibility for quality assurance should be given to the internal teaching teams. The limited research about the impact of internal quality assurance is because internal processes are still developing (Harvey & Williams, 2010a).

2.4.3 Relationship between Approaches to Quality (QA and QE)

While the last two subsections examine the nature and the key characteristics of two broad approaches to quality (quality assurance and quality enhancement), this section
examine in depth the nature of the relationship that can be established between them. The literature shows that there is growing tension between these two approaches. Sachs (1995) argues that there is a conceptual distance between the purposes of these approaches. The focus of QA approaches is on accountability whereas QE approaches place an emphasis on improvement. Both approaches have also raised questions about whether QA processes should be externally imposed or internally developed.

Harvey and Williams (2010) observe a clear tension between the uses of QA practices as an instrument for accountability or for improvement of academic quality. Danø and Stensaker (2007) argue that improvement and accountability are incompatible and external QA “tends to tilt to either side” (p. 81). For Filippakou and Tapper (2008), the quality agenda in higher education is related to both constraints and freedom. They believe that the idea of QE provides more space for freedom and is less bounded, whereas QA practices are about making judgements against defined criteria.

Quality assurance practices are generally related to external evaluations and thus are opposed by academics. For instance, Van Kemenade et al. (2008) argue that lack of acceptance of external evaluation systems in higher education is connected with “too much control and too little improvement” (p. 184) and thus the level of commitment decreases. Hoecht (2006) also reports that the majority of the academics in two universities in the UK perceived quality assurance as a “form of control and an encroachment on their professional autonomy” (p. 547) and felt “they were less trusted and more controlled than they had been in the past” (p. 556).

Sachs (1995) argues that QA practices are generally aimed at “proving the value, worth or excellence of a particular object, issue, program or set of activities” (p. 5) whereas QE practices are aimed at improving the quality of programmes and processes by identifying areas for improvement. Quality assurance is usually regarded as a means of improving overall quality but the perception is that it pays less attention to teaching and learning (Lomas, 2004). Quality enhancement, on the other hand, adopts a more transformative approach and is more about the quality of teaching and learning.

Quality assurance practices generally make use of quantitative approaches, whereas QE practices make use of qualitative approaches. McMillan and Parker (2005) report that qualitative data may be more useful than quantitative data in evaluating the quality of programmes. D’Andrea (2007) argue that QA practices place too much reliance on
measurable outcomes and, as a consequence, these practices “focus primarily on what is measurable thus sidelining significant, and often important, less measurable data on the higher education system, such as the processes of curriculum development, knowledge of pedagogical theory, and scholarly reflections on teaching and learning” (p. 213).

The literature illustrates that many academics have raised concerns about QA approaches. For example, academics in two UK universities perceive that current quality agenda, introduced by the QAA, promotes increased managerialism, bureaucracy and interference (Cartwright, 2007). McNay (2006) also reports that the perception of 77 percent of academics in the UK is that QA practices encourage conformity in teaching. Stefani and Matthew (2002) argue that academics rarely value something that has been imposed upon them. They further assert that although developmental approaches take more time, energy and cost, they are more likely to lead to real change and improvement because those involved in its implementation believe in it and will, therefore, put more effort into making it work.

Fourie and Alt (2000) report that national QA policies in South African universities place emphasis on conformity to formal QA procedures and consequently the attention of academics has been diverted from teaching and research. They suggest that QA policies should promote an improvement-led culture in universities in order to improve the quality of teaching. Coates (2005) insists that QA practices need to take account of student engagement with such activities that are likely to lead to productive learning. He further reports, however, that this is not the case in QA policies of Australian universities.

Two important issues that need to be considered while adopting any of the approaches to quality in higher education are cost and assessment. Blackmur (2010) notes a significant failure in QA policies and academic literature of higher education to incorporate cost considerations in their methods of analysis. He further argues that the concept of quality improvement has not been clearly defined and improvements in the quality of higher education are desirable only if the costs are justified.

The tensions between the two approaches to quality can also be discussed in terms of their impact in improving the quality of higher education. Kristensen (1997) examined the impact of national quality assurance practices in quality improvement at Copenhagen Business School and reports that internal quality monitoring is more effective than external quality monitoring in producing continuous improvement. Houston (2008) also
suggests shifting the “focus of quality activities from accountability and control to improvement” (p. 61).

In a review of 15 years of articles published in Quality in Higher Education, Harvey and Williams (2010a) report that QA practices have resulted in “clear documentation and transparency” although they could be better aligned to everyday academic activity (p. 107). They also argue that internal processes are still developing but the “link between external processes, internal processes and improvements in teaching and learning seem to be tenuous and patchy” (p. 107). Houston (2010) argues that despite the significant expansion and harmonization of QA mechanisms in higher education, the evidence of positive effects of the processes on the quality of teaching and learning is limited.

While QA practices essentially comprise both improvement and accountability aspects, Bowden and Marton (1998) argue that the focus needs to be on improvement. If the improvement aspect of quality assurance is addressed in the right manner, it is expected that the evidence for accountability will be developed from within. However, it is less likely that a focus on the accountability aspect of quality assurance, in practice, will result in improvement of teaching and learning practices. Bowden and Marton (1998) further argue that although accountability is an essential feature of QA system, a focus on accountability is counter-productive.

One of the critical questions for quality assurance at policy and practice level is whether it is feasible to combine both approaches to quality, i.e. accountability and improvement, in a balanced strategy. Most scholars conceive these two approaches as conceptually and practically distinct, with mutually exclusive goals of evaluation and based on different methods (Houston, 2010). Despite the conceptual distance between the two approaches to quality, many academics believe that it is possible to combine them by bringing them into a useful overlapping relationship (Sachs, 1995; D’Andrea, 2007). For this, Sachs (1995) suggests beginning the quality improvement process by “mapping of areas for improvement” and then to “integrate that mapping process through the identification and documenting strengths” (p. 5). This documentation then serves as the basis for evidence of excellence to assure stakeholders.

Kristensen (2010) claims that external QA practices in the last 20 years have improved quality in higher education but it would have been much better if both external QA and internal QE processes were in balance. Elton (2001) argues that the focus of external
reviews should be on QE because assurance in itself contains a negative concept. It is, therefore, argued that QA should follow from QE, because an institution dedicated to QE will provide QA as a by-product and, conversely, one dedicated to QA has no incentive to extend this to QE.

Hodgson and Whalley (2006) argue that external monitoring of quality could lead to enhancement by incorporating it into a university’s own well-developed procedures for monitoring and enhancement with the assistance of specialist academics “involved in the development of academic work” (p. 509). However, they believed that the starting point should not be external monitoring but an institution’s own procedures. Such internal monitoring is also expected to recognize the existence of external monitoring.

Van Kemenade et al. (2008) suggest that a solid base of quality in an organisation can only be built if there is “enough control and enough stability” (p. 184) and there is, therefore, a need for a balance between them. To improve the quality of teaching and learning, many academics suggest a variety of strategies that are inclined more towards quality enhancement and sometimes with less emphasis on accountability. Filippakou and Tapper (2008) suggest that QA and QE are “differing interpretations of the quality agenda that complement one another” and “both are needed to gain a more complete picture of policy development” (p. 97). They further argue that the use of the “two approaches in conjunction with each other in order to interpret the policy making process gives each of them a greater reality” (p. 97).

In summary, there is no clear evidence that student learning experiences can be improved either by implementing only an accountability model or only an improvement model of quality. There is a need, therefore, to incorporate both approaches to quality and to maintain a balance between them. In order to make QA practices more effective, there is a need to maintain balance between internal and external processes by combining both collegial and managerial as well as improvement and accountability aspects (Danø & Stensaker, 2007; Ramsden, 2003). However, the challenge for universities is to ensure that both of these approaches are consistent with each other and work comfortably together. The next section is focused on such models of quality in higher education that are designed to fulfil both external demands for accountability and internal needs of improvement.
2.5 Models of Quality in Higher Education

This section examines whether external demands for accountability, which are evident in quality assurance policies of higher education at national level, can be met through quality improvement or by integrating both QA and QE approaches to quality. Sachs (1995) argues the need to avoid duplication in the processes while measuring quality to promote efficiency and effectiveness of institutions. Biggs (2003) discusses quality assurance in terms of *retrospective QA* and *prospective QA* and presented the idea of the ‘reflective practitioner’ as a model for prospective QA. He argues that *prospective QA* renders *retrospective QA* (p. 275). Gosling and D’Andrea (2001) also emphasize the need for such a quality system that not only “performs a regulatory function but one that functions to improve the quality of educational experience” (p. 11), i.e. one that provides both judgemental and developmental functions.

2.5.1 A Quality Improvement Model (Sachs)

Sachs (1995) presents a quality improvement model that emerged from a project at the Griffith University. This model focuses on developing quality improvement strategies at sub-faculty level and comprises three distinct but complementary phases involving ‘plan-do-check-act’ – a quality improvement cycle. Phase I focuses on conceptualisation and preparation to develop knowledge and theoretical understanding of the concepts. Phase II is concerned with the implementation of plans and with documentation of the projects. The final phase focuses on reflection on the processes and outcomes of each project. For this reason, input was sought from participants in order to identify areas for improvement and from external evaluators to fulfil accountability demands.

Sachs (1995) claims this model fulfils both improvement and accountability purposes. The quality improvement model is premised on five principles. First, it takes into account the national pressures of quality in higher education by keeping in mind that activities and the processes involved are designed within institutional culture. In doing so, consideration is given to designing such processes that are “contextually acceptable” and “complement existing institutional practices” (p. 5). Second, the activities designed at the departmental level should have an “explicit relationship with both the particular faculty and University Mission, values, goals and objectives” (p. 5).
Third, the responsibility for the planning, implementation and evaluation of activities should be given to those academics who are committed to the processes. In such cases, the role of the “project team should be supportive but facultative rather than controlling” (p. 6). Fourth, activities should be focused on enhancement of knowledge and practice rather than “application of traditional methods used by business for quality assurance” (p. 6). Finally, activities should be focused on a developmental approach, rather than a judgemental approach in which change is imposed (Sachs, 1995).

Sachs (1995) argues that the quality improvement model not only satisfies internal needs for improvement but also takes into account external pressures of accountability which are inherent within QA. As a result, the model attempts to bridge the gap between both approaches to quality (QA and QE) and creates a delicate balance between external accountability demands at a national level and internal developmental or transformative needs of the institutions in their own contexts.

2.5.2 A Model of Prospective Quality Assurance (Biggs)

Biggs (2001) presents the idea of the ‘reflective practitioner’ as a model for prospective quality assurance. The model is particularly aimed at enhancing the quality of teaching and learning. It comprises three stages: the quality model (QM) that articulates an espoused theory of teaching; continual improvement of current practice through quality enhancement (QE) with a focus on staff development; and making quality feasible (QF) by removing impediments to good teaching. Biggs argues that these stages of QM, QE and QF are essential ingredients in prospective QA and are elaborated as follows.

In the quality model (QM), teachers and institutions are required to have explicit espoused theory that should drive their teaching-related decisions. Teachers’ theories of teaching are usually related to their basic conceptions of teaching, i.e. teaching as transmitting knowledge, teaching as facilitating learning (Prosser & Trigwell, 1999) and influencing student learning outcomes. These theories of teaching are ordered into three levels of increasing complexity that move from teacher-centred approaches to teaching towards student-centred approaches to teaching.

In the quality model, the focus of Level 1 is on ‘what the student is’ and teachers using this level generally adopt a teacher-centred approach to teaching. The focus of Level 2 is on ‘what the teacher does’. The focus of Level 3 is on ‘what the student does’ and teachers using this level generally adopt a student-centred approach to teaching with a
focus on engagement of students. The quality model provides the framework at individual and institutional levels for adopting a theory of teaching with a focus on Level 3 thinking. The institutions are required to design their teaching delivery system (QM) based on Level 3 thinking and in accordance with their espoused theory (Biggs, 2003).

In the quality enhancement (QE) model, institutions are required to establish such “built-in mechanisms” that let “individual reflective teacher to continually review and improve current practice” (Biggs, 2001, p. 223). Biggs (2003) argues that quality enhancement is about getting teachers to teach better and the role of staff development is critical in this regard. Biggs further states that staff development should focus on teaching within the whole institution and not just on those individuals who present themselves voluntarily.

In the quality feasibility (QF) model, institutions are required to remove such policies and structures that are impediments to quality teaching and which prevent the quality model from operating effectively (Biggs, 2001). Some quality assurance procedures might be two-edged in that while aimed at enhancement they may actually serve to unintentionally assure or diminish quality. These procedures might be called marginal procedures and include: external examiners; validation panels; distinguished teacher awards; and student feedback questionnaires (Biggs, 2001). For example, Biggs (2001) argues that teaching awards “encourage a Level 2 theory of teachers-as-performer” and not as “reflective practitioners” (p. 231). These awards focus on the teacher and not on the quality of teaching. Similarly, student feedback questionnaires do summative evaluations “using standard questions across all courses” and they emphasize, therefore, “the actor, not the script” (Biggs, 2001, pp. 231-232).

2.5.3 A Quality Development Model (D'Andrea and Gosling)

D’Andrea and Gosling (2005) propose a quality development (QD) model which aims to address the tensions between competing models of quality. The quality development approach is primarily an “integrated educational development model that incorporates the enhancement of learning and teaching with the quality and standards monitoring processes in the university” (Gosling & D’Andrea, 2001, p. 11). In the QD model, the learning communities and quality activities complement each other in maintaining continuous quality improvement of student learning. The model focuses on a formative approach, replacing a summative process. It places an emphasis on learning instead of teaching and includes a wide range of activities such as: design of curricula, choice of
content and methods, various forms of teacher-student interaction, assessment of students, and the broader aims of learning via activities of institutional learning communities.

The QD model attempts to integrate the processes of QA with QE within institutions by identifying changes to the educational process that can bring about improvement. The QD model encourages greater reflective practice throughout the entire educational process that in turn addresses many of the expectations of both internal and external quality systems. In common with other quality activities, QD is a dynamic process. The work of QD involves applying new measures of quality that are developmentally focused and centred on managing and integrating three major areas of work in universities: academic development, learning development and quality development (D’Andrea & Gosling, 2005; Gosling & D’Andrea, 2001).

**Academic development** refers to the development of staff and emphasizes connection and integration between three key dimensions of pedagogical activities, i.e. curriculum development, learning and teaching activities, and scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL). The focus of academic development is on the academic role instead of being on academics, and the “way these three areas are integral to this role” (D’Andrea & Gosling, 2005, p. 181). **Learning development** places emphasis on the comprehensive support system for student learning, enabling them to increase their learning skills that can be applied to any learning situation in or outside the university. **Quality development** involves holistic development, implementation and evaluation of educational provisions. Activities include: curriculum development, professional development and engagement of students in practices that are aimed at helping them to achieve best results in their current studies and prepare them for lifelong learning. It also provides guidance on appropriate mechanisms to evaluate learning outcomes.

D’Andrea and Gosling (2005) endorse that “emphasis of QD is not on documentation produced only for quality assurance purposes” but it also focuses on the “collection of useful evaluative data” that can be used for improving the “educational experience of students” (p. 181). In these cases, “the outcomes are not measurable scores but development of skills and processes” that are “determined by academics to be of value to the student’s learning experience” (p. 182). In contrast to external QA practices, the QD model restores trust in academics and it is expected that they will “investigate and evaluate their work” and will find ways to improve quality through a development process (p. 182).
In the quality development model, QA and QE activities support each other to improve the quality of teaching and learning. The model follows the whole institution approach and “brings together the typically separated functions of quality assurance and educational development” (Gosling, D’Andrea & Blackwell, 2005, p. 56). It facilitates dialogue between quality assurance and educational development offices about policies and procedures of quality assessment and accomplishes both internal and external requirements. This dialogue leads to more effective dissemination of policies within an institution, with even less duplication of effort. There is a delicate balance between control and autonomy of the institution. The model fuels the process of continuous quality improvement.

D’Andrea and Gosling (2005) argue that the QD model is a “win-win model for the entire higher education sector” (p. 187). They further argue that the model, if used properly, not only satisfies accountability needs but also affirms “trust in academics by allowing them to do what they do best: develop, ensure, enhance, and deliver educational programmes” (p. 187). It provides opportunities for students to “achieve their educational goals in a supportive learning community” (p. 187). The model needs commitment, willingness, and involvement of academics in order to succeed. It places emphasis on academics to create learning communities, which requires commitment, participation and collaboration on their part.

2.6 Conclusion

To sum up, quality assurance schemes have their origin in business and industry. Two important drivers behind these schemes are accountability and improvement, which have led to two broad approaches to quality in higher education, i.e. quality assurance and quality enhancement. There is, however, no clear evidence that learning experiences of students can be improved either by adopting an accountability model (i.e. QA approaches) or an improvement model (i.e. QE approaches) of quality. A balance of approaches is needed. The literature suggests that quality enhancement approaches have a more positive impact on student learning outcomes than quality assurance approaches, but there is also evidence that quality enhancement might occur as a consequence of quality assurance schemes. It is, therefore, argued that QE is an integral part of QA and universities need to work at integrating these two strands of quality. Three models provide a useful framework in this regard: Sachs’ quality improvement model (1995),
Biggs’ model for prospective quality assurance (2003), and the quality development model of D’Andrea and Gosling (2005).
Chapter 3
Key International Practices for Assuring and Enhancing the Quality of Teaching in Universities

3.1 Overview

Chapter 2 examined the concept of quality and the nature of approaches to quality in higher education in general. This chapter focuses on key international practices for assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching in universities. It is presented in two parts. The first part examines the five international practices aimed at assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching in universities, namely: evaluation of teaching and courses; professional development; scholarship of teaching and learning; recognition and rewards for teaching; and teaching portfolios. It also pays attention to the nature of these practices and whether they are characterized by quality assurance, quality enhancement, or a mix of both. The second part deals with the factors that the literature suggests influence QA processes for teaching in universities.

3.2 Review and Evaluation of Teaching and Courses

Review and evaluation of teaching is a common practice in higher education for assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching and learning. Hounsell (2009) observes that the practice is considered “not only as a necessary step towards accountability, but also as an integral part of good professional practice and the systematic development of teaching expertise” (p.198). The process, therefore, has both accountability and improvement aspects, which reflects the nature of approaches to evaluation.

Approaches to teaching evaluation are both formative and summative. Formative evaluation is usually “implemented while the course is being taught”, while summative evaluation is consistently “administered at the end of a course” (Davidovitch & Soen, 2006, p.355). By purpose, formative evaluation practice is focused on enhancing the quality of teaching (Hounsell, 2009) while summative evaluation is typically used for administrative purposes, for example, for performance appraisal, distribution of funds, and for making personnel decisions.

To achieve their purposes, both formats of evaluation typically rely on more than one source of feedback. The use of multiple sources of feedback is appropriate because each
source has unique advantages and limitations (Hounsell, 2009) that are likely to influence the purpose of evaluation. Three main sources of feedback that are widely recognized in current teaching evaluation practices in universities include: feedback from students, feedback from colleagues and professional peers, and self-generated feedback (Hounsell, 2009; Ngware & Ndirangu, 2005). The following subsections examine in depth each of these evaluation practices in higher education as a tool for accountability or improvement.

### 3.2.1 Student Evaluation of Teaching and Courses

One of the common practices for assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching in universities is to seek feedback from students on the quality of teaching and courses. Researchers now believe that student evaluations of teaching and courses play an important role in assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching in universities and, therefore, has become one of the central pillars of quality agenda (Jara & Mellar, 2010; Nair, Adams & Mertova, 2008; Williams & Cappuccini-Ansfield, 2007). The practice has placed students at the centre of QA schemes. The assumption underlying the use of student opinions in evaluating the teaching quality of lecturers is that teaching is primarily undertaken to benefit students and they are, therefore, logically best placed to judge its effectiveness (Gosling & D’Andrea, 2001).

The literature suggests that several different approaches are prevalent in universities for seeking feedback from students on the quality of teaching and courses. Some of the prominent approaches include: questionnaires and pro forma surveys, emails and web boards, focus groups, informal discussions and student-staff liaison committees (Harvey, 2003; Hounsell, 2009). Feedback obtained using these approaches is usually in both qualitative and quantitative forms and provides a multi-method approach to quality with an opportunity to verify the data (Bean, 2005). However, the most widely used approach to evaluation in universities is currently student evaluation surveys. It is the intent and purpose of these surveys that determines the approach used.

### A. Student Evaluation of Teaching: Focus on QA and QE

National level student evaluation surveys are generally conducted for the sake of QA whereas the intent of institutional surveys is to improve the quality of teaching and learning. For instance, Williams and Cappuccini-Ansfield (2007) report that the aim of the National Student Survey (NSS) in the UK is to measure the quality of teaching and to
provide information to the public. They further observe that the survey results are generally considered an essential part of the revised QA framework for higher education in the UK. They note that the survey is designed as a broad brush instrument in a single format that can be used at all higher education institutions. Consequently, the evidence to date about the value of these types of surveys in improving the quality of teaching remains inconclusive.

By contrast, institutional level surveys are more focused on improving the quality of teaching within institutions. The Student Satisfaction Survey (SSS) in the UK is an example of an institutional survey (Jara & Mellar, 2010; McKimm, 2009). It adopts such an approach that students’ views of their total university experience are obtained, analysed and reported with an intention to “effect change and improvement within the institution by means of a continuous satisfaction feedback cycle” (Williams & Cappuccini-Ansfield, 2007, p. 161). The cycle begins with seeking feedback from students and ends with the provision of information to them about the planned changes and improvements that have resulted from the findings.

B. Purpose of Student Evaluation of Teaching

The results of national and institutional surveys are generally reported to several user groups depending on the purpose. Most widely reported purposes of student evaluations include: judgmental, focused on quality assurance; diagnostic, focused on quality enhancement; administrative, focused on performance appraisal and for making personnel decisions; and provision of information to current and potential students to help them in making choices around courses (Nair et al., 2008; Palermo, 2003; Ramsden, 2003). In fact, three broader purposes of student evaluation surveys are QA, QE and use of results for recognition and rewards. It is important, therefore, to discuss each of these purposes.

The use of students’ opinions for QA purposes is based on the premise that students are in the best position to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of individual teachers. The data resulting from national evaluation surveys are typically viewed as an indicator of performance in teaching and learning. The Course Experience Questionnaire in Australian universities, for example, is used for measuring the quality of teaching and learning at national level (Ginns, Prosser & Barrie, 2007). These types of surveys are mandatory and measure the effectiveness of teaching in universities (Zabaleta, 2007). In
many instances, these surveys are also used for the allocation of performance-based funding to faculties and universities (Barrie & Ginns, 2007).

However, the linkage of funding with performance in teaching and learning may have negative effects on the quality of teaching. It is likely that universities might look to improve their performance on student surveys to attract the funding instead of actual focus on improving the quality of their teaching and learning. Furthermore, these surveys are typically administered at the end of a semester and the data resulting from them are time-lagged (Barrie & Ginns, 2007). As a result, the data cannot identify the nature of any particular problem and so an essential element of improvement is not addressed. Likewise, there is mounting evidence that summative student evaluations are not a reliable and valid measure of teaching performance of academics (Zabaleta, 2007).

A lack of focus on improvement in national evaluation surveys has led to the initiation of student evaluation schemes at institutional level. For instance, Barrie and Ginns (2007) report that most universities in Australia have developed student feedback surveys internally for improving their performance in teaching and learning. Palermo (2003) believes that these surveys serve as a diagnostic tool for individual academics to improve the quality of their teaching. Similarly, seeking feedback from students at faculty level to inform improvement in teaching and learning (Barrie & Ginns, 2007) has also been noted as a trend. However, academics have raised concerns over the use of institutional surveys for performance appraisal (Kember & Wong, 2000).

There is also evidence of formative feedback being sought from students for improving the quality of teaching and courses. This approach provides valuable information to individual teachers with the intention of bringing about improvement in their teaching (Zabaleta, 2007). The underlying assumption is that academics will use the results of the formative feedback to remedy areas of weakness by reflecting on their teaching practices. It is common to report the results of internal evaluations to staff developers with a view to providing practical advice to academic staff for improving the quality of their teaching.

Strengthening the relationship between the accountability-led external surveys and enhancement-led internal surveys is central to improving the quality of teaching. This is because universities, in practice, need to satisfy both external accountability demands and internal improvement needs. Barrie and Ginns (2007) observe that the local enhancement-led surveys in Australian universities are strongly linked with institutional and national
outcome measures. Local improvement, in such cases, leads to improvement in an institution’s position in national rankings. In contrast, they argue that if the “measures used to plan and direct local improvements bear no theoretical relationship to the measures used to monitor and reward national quality” (p. 278) then it would be difficult for these local initiatives to have an impact on national measures.

The use of student evaluation results in making personnel decisions is also common. The practice is intended to recognize and reward scholarly activities of academics in teaching. However, the use of student evaluation results for performance appraisal and personnel decisions is questioned by many (Nair et al., 2008; Zabaleta, 2007). Zabaleta argues that measuring teaching performance in performance appraisal and personnel decisions is similar to that of a “stick-and-carrot” approach where “high marks result in awards or promotions, while low marks carry some type of punishment that often results in the dismissal of teachers” (2007, p. 56).

It appears that concerns raised by academics about the use of student evaluations in performance appraisal and personnel decisions are based on perceived serious flaws in the practice. Many researchers believe that student evaluations are biased towards instructor leniency, expected grades, students’ motivation, lecturers’ physical appearance, popularity of teachers, and class size (Davidovitch & Soen, 2006; Washer, 2006; Zabaleta, 2007). Davidovitch and Soen (2006) report a correlation between instructors’ leniency towards grading and students’ ratings. They argue that the practice is also criticized as there are “claims that professors deliberately decrease the difficulty of their courses in order to obtain higher ratings” (p. 356). Paradoxically, such practices in the evaluation process may cause a decrease in the quality of teaching.

C. Concerns about Student Evaluation of Teaching

The literature illustrates that concerns have been raised about some aspects of student evaluations. First, the growth in number of evaluation surveys has led to “questionnaire fatigue” (Hounsell, 2009, p.204). Second, academics believe that students might not have the necessary skills and abilities to evaluate the quality of teaching and courses (Moore & Kuol, 2005; Washer, 2006). The practice also largely ignores those aspects that lead to improvement in teaching. It has deviated from its original aim of QE towards evaluation of teaching performance by the managers (D’Andrea, 2007). Fourth, questions have been raised about the use of national surveys in judging quality inside disciplines because
standard questions in mandatory surveys largely ignore the nature of teaching within disciplines (Biggs, 2003; Williams & Cappuccini-Ansfield, 2007). Finally, the summative use of evaluation surveys in personnel decisions can be damaging because it discourages teachers from being innovative (Biggs, 2003). In such a case, teachers are limited to traditional ways of teaching and they may not try to use innovative approaches to improve the quality of their teaching and student learning.

D. Factors that influence Student Evaluation of Teaching

The literature suggests a number of measures to improve student evaluations. Six key factors can be identified that are likely to raise the status of this practice in terms of its original aim. These factors include: the use of evaluation results for diagnostic purposes; to create awareness among students that their feedback will be valued; a regular cycle of data collection, data interpretation, reporting of results, and purposeful action; engagement of all those concerned in evaluation process; and an emphasis on the collaboration between staff developers and those involved in the evaluation process.

A first measure is to use evaluation results for diagnostic purposes by identifying strengths and areas for improvement. For instance, Kember (2009) argues the success of this strategy in a research-led university in the Hong Kong by utilizing the results as a diagnostic tool to identify strengths and potential areas for improvement. For this purpose feedback was sought both in quantitative and qualitative forms followed by an extensive discussion on results between the departmental chair and an education professional with a focus on identifying strengths and areas for improvement.

It is essential to create awareness among students that their feedback will be valued by addressing the concerns raised by them. For example, Nair et al. (2008) report that the key factor which influenced response rates in Monash University, Australia, is that “students needed to feel that their feedback was valued by the institution and also that it was acted upon” (p. 231). Al-Issa and Sulieman (2007) also report that students at the American University of Sharjah perceive that teachers do not take their evaluation seriously. As a result, 30 percent of the respondents felt that students don’t take evaluation seriously. It is, therefore, suggested that reporting of evaluation results, along with planned actions to improve teaching and learning for students is of importance. It will not only create a sense of ownership among students but will also provide an
opportunity for them to know that the time spent in completing surveys will result in an improved experience for them and for future students.

The real value of the evaluation process is not limited to the collection of feedback responses; rather, it encompasses a regular cycle of: data collection, interpretation of data, reporting of results, and purposeful actions taken, based on feedback from all concerned (Bean, 2005; Harvey, 2003; Palermo, 2003). The reporting of results to academics for improvement purposes is essential. Ngware and Ndirangu (2005) note in the case of Kenyan universities that only a small percentage of academics (21 percent) are made aware of evaluation results. However, academics who were informed about results strongly agreed that results were useful in improving the quality of their teaching and professional development.

The literature shows that inefficient use of feedback data hinders improvement in the quality of teaching. Kember, Leung and Kwan (2002) report that there is little evidence that the use of student feedback makes any contribution to improving the overall quality of teaching and learning. The potential reason, they suggest, is that academics pay insufficient attention to making use of feedback data to identify areas for improvement. They list two possible reasons for their not making an effective use of feedback data. They note that counselling was not provided to academic staff regarding use of feedback. They also note that the perception of academics is that universities do not reward good teaching and they feel, therefore, that there was no incentive for making use of feedback data for improvement.

Fifth, the engagement of all those concerned in evaluation processes is crucial to achieving the desired objectives. It is essential to promote a culture of participation in evaluation practices by involving both students and academics (Bean, 2005; Ghedin & Aquario, 2008) as the “team building nature” of the process leads to improvement of courses and their delivery (Gapp & Fisher, 2006, p.165). The process may also need to help students in seeking constructive feedback (Hendry, Peseta & Barrie, 2005).

The final factor is to place an emphasis on the collaboration between staff developers and those involved in the evaluation process in order to provide support to academic staff. For instance, Hounsell (2009) observes that improvements in teaching are much more likely to occur when individual teachers not only receive feedback but also “draw on expert help in exploring how they might best capitalise upon strengths and address weaknesses” (p.
Davidovitch and Soen (2006) report significant differences in teachers’ overall evaluation scores before and after the initiation of professional development activities. This process, however, may require the linkage of evaluation practices with professional development activities under staff development units (Palermo, 2003).

Student evaluations are being used widely for the purposes of QA, QE, and for personnel decisions. On the basis of the literature, it is argued that the focus of evaluation needs to be on the developmental aspects of teaching and learning. To rephrase Kember et al. (2002), any student evaluation system that does not appear to demonstrate overall improvement in the quality of teaching and learning, cannot be considered satisfactory and it is, therefore, difficult to justify its continuation. The interpretation of data needs to be focused on identifying strengths and potential areas for improvement. Likewise, provision of appropriate support and specialized advice to academics, by experts from academic development centres, is necessary. Finally, it is essential to recognize and reward those academics who show improvement in their teaching practices as a result of reflection. The next section is focused on peer review.

3.2.2 Peer Review of Teaching

One of the strategies aimed at improving the quality of teaching and learning in higher education is ‘peer review of teaching’. McMahon, Barrett and O'Neill (2007) argue that peer review of teaching was launched with a view to using the feedback process to improve teaching standards and students’ learning experiences. Data collected by peers are a valuable source to improve the teaching effectiveness of individual teachers. The term “peers” generally refers to colleagues from the same department, from another department, or a specialist from a central educational development unit (Gosling, 2002; Zakrajsek, 2006) reviewing plans and assessments, and observing and gaining feedback on practice.

Varied terms have been used for ‘peer review of teaching’ in the literature depending upon its nature and purpose. It has been mostly termed as: observation of teaching, peer observation of teaching, peer review of teaching, and third-party observation (Fullerton, 2009; Peel, 2005; Shortland, 2004). However, within this thesis the term ‘peer review’ will be used as almost all of the terms convey the same meaning. Peer review of teaching is the “process by which an individual’s teaching is observed by another with the intention of providing feedback or eliciting a discussion that can enable the person
observed to enhance the quality of their teaching and their students’ learning” (Fry & Ketteridge, 2009, p. 472). The practice is not limited to the observation of lecturers in the classroom but is open to any type of teaching activity.

Variant forms of peer review of teaching can be found in the literature depending on the purpose. For instance, Gosling (2002) identifies three models of peer observation of teaching in higher education: the evaluation model, the developmental model, and the peer review model. These models are primarily based on the nature and purpose of peer review which then decides the nature of the relationship between the observer and the observed. It is interesting to note that the three models identified by Gosling (2002) encompass variant forms of peer review of teaching.

In the **evaluation model**, an individual teacher is observed by a senior member of academic staff to assess his/her teaching performance with a view to identifying good or poor performance as part of performance appraisal, and to provide input for personnel decisions. It appears that the focus of this model is on accountability.

In the **development model**, an individual teacher is generally observed by educational developers or by expert teachers in the department to improve teaching competencies. The purpose of observation is to provide feedback to individual academics in order to enhance their teaching practices. Observations are generally carried out as a “part of a training course for new lecturers or as part of a development process for individual lecturers or the whole department” (Gosling, 2002, p. 2). The focus of this model is on QE.

In the **peer review model**, an individual teacher is observed by another teacher who is generally a discipline-based peer. The purpose is to engage both the observer and the observed in discussion about teaching, with self and mutual reflection practices. The process provides non-judgemental and constructive feedback both to the observer and the observed and involves benefits for both. This model appears to be a collaborative process with a focus on quality enhancement.

### A. Purpose of Peer Review of Teaching

Various trends in peer review of teaching are generally guided by their purposes. Two major drivers for the initiation of peer review in universities are the judgemental, with a focus on QA, and the developmental, with a focus on QE (Hatzipanagou & Lygo-Baker,
However, Lomas and Nicholls (2005) endorse that the use of the practice has recently moved from a focus on QA towards a focus on QE. Similarly, Hammersley-Fletcher and Orsmond (2005) argue that the practice “provides a vehicle for encouraging academics to develop their reflective thinking about their role as professional lecturers, and to seek and engage in developmental processes as a result” (pp.222-223).

Douglas and Douglas (2006) identify three purposes of peer review from the perspective of 40 academics in the UK. First, feedback from the practice provides an opportunity for academics to reflect on their own teaching performance. Second, they found that the process benefits both the reviewee and the reviewer. The respondents were of the view that “they learnt quite a lot from observing” as well as “from being observed” as it provided an opportunity to identify good practices (p.9). Third, peer review was perceived to be a compliance procedure and a means of keeping staff “on their toes” (p.10). Lomas and Nicholls (2005) observe that purposes of peer review vary “along a continuum from accountability and individual performance review at the judgemental end of the scale to wholly developmental reasons” (p.138).

The literature suggests the three major purposes of peer review schemes that are likely to fall on this continuum. First, peer review schemes are supposed to satisfy the external demands for accountability. For example, higher education institutions in the UK took initiatives to develop peer review schemes as a result of strong focus on it within external quality reviews (D’Andrea & Gosling, 2005; Washer, 2006). These schemes are generally used as a managerial tool to ensure that standards in teaching are being met (Hatzipanagos & Lygo-Baker, 2006).

Second, it is generally assumed by academics and staff of professional development centres that peer review is a developmental process with a focus on QE. The assumption is strengthened by the fact that the practice benefits both the observer and the observed and provides a rare opportunity for an observer to learn from colleagues (Fullerton, 2003). The intent of the process is to help academics examine their teaching practices for improving the quality of their teaching and for enhancing students’ learning outcomes (Lomas & Nicholls, 2005). Developmental peer review is a formative rather than a summative process with a focus on continuous professional development of academics by identifying areas of teaching and learning that require in-depth consideration (Bingham & Ottewill, 2001). The process can be formal as part of an academic development, or informal (Bell & Mladenovic, 2008).
Third, and sitting between the purposes of accountability and developmental, peer review schemes are also widely used in many universities for internal performance management, performance appraisal and in personnel decisions. For instance, new and probationary academics at many UK universities are expected to complete mandatory professional development programmes (Fullerton, 2003; Washer, 2006). These programmes require new lecturers to observe other lecturers and be observed by other lecturers in a number of teaching sessions. In many cases new lecturers are also required to be observed by a mentor, staff developer or by a course tutor from the programme (Fullerton, 2003). The focus of the process is on the development as well as on accountability because the results of observation are used to inform probation and personnel decisions (Fry & Ketteridge, 2009).

**B. Steps in Peer Review of Teaching**

Traditionally, an observation process involves three steps: the pre-observation meeting, the observed session, and the feedback/follow-up meeting (Fullerton, 2003; Gosling, 2005; Millis, 2006; Washer, 2006). In a pre-observation meeting, the observer and the observed agree on the ground rules and discuss a range of topics related to the process. The second phase deals with the session that is being observed. In the final phase, both parties exchange ideas and reflect on the practice with a focus on giving and receiving developmental feedback. Closing the loop is of central importance in the process. For this to happen, Washer (2006) argues, the observer should provide a written reflection on the experience by identifying development needs of the observed.

**C. Benefits of Peer Review of Teaching**

The central element of peer review schemes is the nature of the relationship between the observer and the observed, which is generally guided by control over the practice. To illustrate, McMahon et al. (2007) suggest two types of models for peer review: type-A and type-B. In type-A models, the control over the data and other key elements of practice remains with the person being observed. In type-B models, the control over the data remains with someone other than the person being observed. They explored the dimensions of type-A models in practice and report that their use at the University College Dublin was fundamental to encouraging improvement where the person observed has a control over five key dimensions of the practice: the choice of observer, focus of observation, form and method of feedback, resultant data-flow, and the next steps.
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The relationship between the observer and the observed is likely to influence the value of peer review in enhancing the quality of teaching. Hatzipanagos and Lygo-Baker (2006) argue that the developmental nature of the practice can be enhanced by strengthening the relationship between the observer and the observed. However, it will need to create an environment that encourages reflection, discussion and critical thinking about teaching with a long-term aim of improving students’ learning (Bennett & Barp, 2008). This environment is primarily developmental, supportive, non-judgemental, non-threatening and confidential (Bell & Mladenovic, 2008; Lomas & Nicholls, 2005; Washer, 2006).

The effective peer review of teaching is intended to encourage the debate between the observer and the observed about various aspects of teaching practice. D’Andrea and Gosling (2005) argue that a genuine peer review scheme offers good opportunity for developing a dialogue about teaching. They further argue that such schemes consider all aspects of the learning process and promote conversations about teaching, curricula, course design and assessment, continuous professional development, and the reward processes. This requires a framing of the practice within the broader aims of “assisting departments to provide a high quality educational experience for its students and to encourage all staff to reflect on the effectiveness of their own teaching and identify their development needs” (Gosling & D’Andrea, 2001, p.13).

The practice involves benefits both for the observer and for the observed and for both new and experienced academics. For instance, Gosling and D’Andrea (2001) insist that all academics with teaching responsibilities, irrespective of their grade or status, participate in the process. Washer (2006) argues that “there will always be the potential to learn valuable lessons from both observing others’ practice (good and bad) and from getting feedback from being observed” (p.244).

On the basis of the literature, it is argued that potential benefits of peer review can be achieved only if the scheme is practised from a pure developmental premise. Gosling (2002) emphasizes that an ‘opportunity to learn’ is reduced if the practice is focused on investigating under-performance, determining performance-related pay or promotion decisions. It is argued, therefore, that there is a need to separate the developmental aspects of the practice from accountability.
D. Concerns about Peer Review of Teaching

Doubts have also been raised by academics about the use of peer review (Lomas & Nicholls, 2005). However, Gosling and D’Andrea (2001) believe that hostility to the teaching observation practices in the UK was due to its association with “management processes to determine promotion and performance-related pay” (p.13). They reported that the purpose of peer review conducted by subject reviewers was to “achieve a summative judgement of the teaching observed” (p.13). This practice neither involved any formative feedback by subject reviewers nor required any reflective practice on the part of the person observed and thus it was used as a quality control mechanism rather than as a genuine developmental tool (D’Andrea & Gosling, 2005).

Studies have confirmed the positive impact of the developmental peer review schemes in improving teaching practices. For instance, Bell and Mladenovic (2008) reviewed studies about the impact of peer review as a part of academic development and it was confirmed that the practice has a positive impact in improving the teaching quality of tutors provided it is carried out by experts. Hatzipanagos and Lygo-Baker (2006) explored the views of inexperienced lecturers whose teaching was observed by members of an educational development team. They report that new lecturers noted “significant change in their understanding of the learning and teaching environment” as a result of observation by educational developers (p.429). Lomas and Nicholls (2005) also report the positive impact of the scheme in a case study.

To conclude, the literature demonstrates that the two broad approaches to peer review of teaching are judgemental and developmental. The judgemental practice is more about accountability, with little evidence of its contribution to improving the quality of teaching. On the other hand, the developmental practice is focused on enhancing the quality of teaching and its positive impact has been observed. In addition, it is argued that the process needs to be framed in such a way that it benefits both the observer and the observed. For the success of the process, a positive relationship between the observer and the observed in a constructive and non-threatening environment is of importance. It is argued that the process should encourage debate about teaching. Furthermore, the developmental practice should be recognized and rewarded. Finally, the practice can be strengthened in collaboration with experts from educational development units.
3.3 Professional Development of Academic Staff

Universities are putting determined efforts into professional development for academic staff because of its importance in improving the quality of teaching and learning. To facilitate meaningful learning for students, Davidovitch and Soen (2006) remark that effective teachers are expected to have a conceptual understanding of teaching and learning. This highlights the need to develop academics professionally in teaching and learning practices. The significance of professional development is also evident from the fact that it has become an essential element of QA schemes. This section is focused on the key ideas about professional development of academics and how these initiatives support quality assurance and quality enhancement of teaching.

A number of initiatives have been taken at national and institutional level to promote professional development for academic staff as a means of assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching and learning. One of the important initiatives in this regard has been the establishment of ‘professional development centres’ in universities globally over the last two decades. In many cases these centres have been established as a result of national initiatives and exist within universities under a variety names. For example, 74 such centres were established in the higher education sector of England (Gosling & Hannan, 2007) in 2005 by the support of Higher Education Funding Council for England (McKimm, 2009; Teelken & Lomas, 2009).

The literature suggests that most professional development activities for academics in universities are carried out through these professional development centres. However, these activities are generally more focused on new academics. For example, it is now mandatory for new and probationary academics with teaching responsibilities in UK universities to enrol for professional development programmes (Fry & Ketteridge, 2009; Kember, 2009). D’Andrea and Gosling (2005) report that these programmes are nationally accredited in 90 percent of universities in the UK. Furthermore, these programmes are mandatory at the national level (Fry & Ketteridge, 2009).

It is argued that engaging new academics in professional development programmes will provide an opportunity for them to learn about innovative teaching practices. In fact, these programmes offer many benefits for new academics in improving the quality of their teaching practices and developing their confidence to teach (Bell & Mladenovic, 2008). Pickering (2006) also reports that these programmes have the potential to
influence the novice lecturers in their teaching practices. One of the reasons put forward in the literature for engaging new academics in these programmes is that younger instructors have a greater tendency towards improvement in the quality of their teaching (Davidovitch & Soen, 2006). However, this strategy of “concentrating on new appointments is in danger of leaving the dominant culture untouched” (D’Andrea & Gosling, 2005, p. 75).

3.3.1 Focus of Professional Development Activities

The focus of professional development activities is usually on enhancing the teaching practices of academics. For this, universities have adopted several approaches towards their professional development programmes. These programmes require academics to be engaged in the practices of, for example, peer review, mentoring schemes, reflective practices, and teaching portfolios during various stages of the programme. New academics in UK universities need to produce evidence of being observed and observing others as part of their professional development (Washer, 2006). Likewise, Bell and Mladenovic (2008) report the use of peer observation as a framework for professional development of academics in a programme at the University of Sydney. They further reported that “tutors found the exercise to be helpful and that most tutors intended to change their teaching practice as a result of the exercise” (p.747).

The literature also indicates a trend in mentoring for developing the teaching practices of new academics. D’Andrea and Gosling (2005) suggest different forms of mentoring schemes, namely: formal mentoring as a part of initial professional development; peer mentoring; informal mentoring; and mentoring in more hierarchical manner in which a senior and experienced faculty member helps the newcomer. They further report that mentoring activities at Miami University include: observation of classroom teaching; consultation on teaching projects; discussion in small-group teaching; joint attendance at seminars on teaching; and advice on publishing and probationary issues.

It is now common for new academics to develop their teaching portfolios as a part of their evidence that professional development has occurred. The literature indicates that portfolios have an impact on developing reflective practices in academics (Groom & Maunonen-Eskelinen, 2006). The literature also suggests that the focus of many professional development activities, such as: peer review, mentoring schemes, reflective practices, and teaching portfolios, is on new academics and is generally carried out as a
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requirement for a professional certificate in university teaching and learning (or as the name may be). The intent of such activities is to enhance the reflective practices of academics. These activities, therefore, place a major emphasis on developing participants as reflective practitioners (Pill, 2005) and they reflect on their practices by “keeping a diary, journal or log-book, or by writing a reflective commentary on their teaching” (Fry & Ketteridge, 2009, p.474).

For enhancing the teaching practices of new academics, professional development activities need to be focused on their engagement with literature on teaching and learning. For this Fry and Ketteridge (2009) suggest that participants be asked to read the “research of some of the key figures working in higher education research and practice” (p. 478). Pill (2005) further argues that course leaders, staff developers, and other role holders with responsibility for professional development of academics require an explicit knowledge and in-depth understanding about the concepts involved in professional development. It is, therefore, highly important to disseminate research outcomes in the area.

Professional development activities described up to this point have focused on the development of individual academics. It is, however, essential that the focus of activities should not be limited to individuals but that universities adopt a ‘whole institution’ approach to improve the quality of teaching. Biggs (2003) argues that “staff developers, for their part, need to continue to consult with individuals, but also with departments on their teaching programmes, and with administration to get the institutional policies and procedures right on teaching-related matters” (p.5). It is argued, therefore, that the role of teachers, staff developers and administrators is important in this regard.

To adopt a ‘whole institution’ approach, it is crucial to disseminate the work of ‘centres for academic development’ with a focus on teaching (Bluteau & Krumins, 2008). For this to happen, the best practices need to be shared across the whole institution. At an individual level, Biggs (2003) suggests two domains of knowledge that individual academics need to address for improving their teaching practices. First, they need to formally conduct research in their subjects with a unique focus on teaching and learning in their disciplines. The second domain deals with personal experiences of the teacher.

3.3.2 Impact of Professional Development Activities

The positive impact of professional development activities on the teaching practices of academics has been observed in many studies. In a qualitative study of 33 part-time
teachers from UK universities, Knight, Baume, Tait and Yorke (2007) report that formal training within institutions (focusing on such factors as: buddying and mentoring, support from and discussion with colleagues, observing others’ teaching) helped teachers make positive changes in their teaching. Gibbs and Coffey (2004) investigated the impact of teacher training courses in 22 universities from 8 countries and report a small but significant increase in student-focused beliefs of academics who experienced training compared to those who did not. Coffey and Gibbs (2000) argue that training programmes influence academics to adopt student-focused rather than teacher-focused approaches to teaching and which, in turn, influence student learning outcomes.

In conclusion, a positive impact of professional development activities on the teaching practice of academics has been observed. These activities are generally more focused on new and probationary academics and have been designed accordingly. The most common practices in this regard include: peer review of teaching, mentoring schemes, reflective practices, and teaching portfolios, along with various conceptual courses to understand the nature of teaching and learning. However, the focus of developmental activities on new academics has raised the possibility that the majority of academics might not benefit from these practices. Finally, it is argued that the focus of activities needs to be on the whole institution and on staff developers, and those involved in the process keeping up-to-date on the latest developments in the area.

3.4 Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL)

The concept of the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) is central to QE strategies in universities. The growing importance of SoTL in improving the quality of teaching and learning is also evident in the literature. For instance, Boshier and Huang (2008) argue that the work on scholarship of teaching (SoT) has moved teaching from the “periphery to the centre of the university” (p.645). Boyer (1990) is among the pioneers in this area and thus his work on the scholarship of teaching as been cited frequently in the literature. Scholarship of teaching is variously defined in the literature and, mostly, it refers to an evidence-based approach to improving the quality of teaching and student learning within and across disciplines by engaging academics in inquiry into teaching and learning, informed by disciplinary knowledge, critical reflectivity and pedagogical research (Brew & Prosser, 2003; Kreber, 2005; Ramsden, 2003).
3.4.1 Background to Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

Boyer (1990) identifies four categories of scholarship as: scholarship of discovery, which deals with research; scholarship of application, which deals with how to put knowledge into practice; scholarship of integration, which sees knowledge as relationships between parts and the whole; and scholarship of teaching, which deals with teaching and learning. Boyer (1990) and his colleagues, at the Carnegie Foundation, conducted a study in the USA and found that universities were placing too much emphasis on scholarship of discovery, scholarship of application, and scholarship of integration, and not enough on scholarship of teaching.

Gibbs (2002) offers a useful account of Boyer’s (1990) four categories of scholarship in relation to their contribution to teaching and learning. He argues that scholarship of discovery is the “least likely of all types of scholarship to benefit undergraduate learning” (p.10). For him, scholarship of application appears much more likely to benefit students through generation of examples, case materials, and supervised internships. Scholarship of integration is highly likely to benefit students through production of textbooks, provision of learning resource materials, and by the organization of frameworks that help students to conceptualize complex fields of study. Finally, scholarship of teaching is essential to good teaching because it focuses on improving the quality of teaching and student learning. Like Boyer, he argues that scholarship of discovery is most rewarded and scholarship of teaching is valued least of all.

The privileged status of research over teaching was also revealed by D’Andrea and Gosling (2005) who argue that “reality in the higher education today is that research remains dominant in the lives of academics, in terms of their professional identities, professional affiliations and professional location” (p. 154). Benson and Brack (2009) believe that growing pressure from governments to enhance research in universities and the association of rewards and incentives with disciplinary research has prevented the commitment of academics to teaching. In order to grant a similar status to teaching in the academy as that of research, D’Andrea and Gosling (2005) argue that it would need to be identified with research activities in some direct way. SoTL can serve as this bridge between research and teaching in higher education.
3.4.2 Importance of SoTL in Improving the Quality of Teaching

The significance of SoTL in improving the quality of teaching and learning can be viewed in terms of developing teaching expertise and reflective practices. Kreber and Castleden (2009) believe that both the teaching expertise and reflective practices on teaching are essential to improving teaching quality of academics and student learning. For this to happen, Kreber’s scholarship of teaching model (SoT), provides a useful insight into reflection practices, knowledge construction into teaching, and how reflection can be informed by knowledge (Kreber, 1999; Kreber, 2005; Kreber & Cranton, 2000). The SoT model can be viewed in three aspects. The first aspect of the SoT model suggests that academics need to engage in three kinds of reflections—content, process, and premise reflection—in order to practise scholarship of teaching.

Second, the SoT model distinguishes three domains of knowledge in teaching, namely: instructional knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and curricular knowledge (Kreber 1999; Kreber & Cranton, 2000). Kreber (2005) argues that three kinds of reflections might occur in three domains of knowledge. Instructional knowledge refers to the all aspects of instructional design, for example, organizing lectures, preparing teaching materials, writing learning objectives, constructing tests. Pedagogical knowledge refers to how students learn and how to facilitate this learning. Curricular knowledge refers to the “knowledge of the goals, purposes and rationales for our classes, courses or programs” (Kreber, 2005, p. 327).

The final aspect of the SoT model suggests that reflection may be informed either by an academic’s personal teaching experiences, by their formal knowledge of research and theory, or by both. To acquire research-based or theory-based knowledge, academics are required to be engaged in formal inquiry into teaching and learning. However, academics may also use the findings of such research by consulting the relevant academic literature or by browsing pedagogical brochures intended for non-educationists, or through participation in teaching-related workshops and conferences (Kreber, 2005; Kreber & Castleden, 2009). The model is not limited to the identification of “knowledge domains but is concerned with the construction of knowledge, through reflection, in each domain” (Kreber, 2005, p. 327).

The focus on scholarship of teaching as an initiative for improving the quality of teaching and learning is evident in many universities. Brew and Prosser (2003) report that
academics at the University of Sydney are taught about the skills of conducting scholarly inquiry into teaching and learning (i.e., pedagogical skills) to address the aim of SoTL. To promote scholarship of teaching at department level, the university rewards departments for scholarly activity related to teaching and learning by allocating 0.5 percent of its teaching budget to them under The Scholarship Index. A focus on SoTL is also evident in universities in Canada, Australia, USA and elsewhere because it has now become a mechanism for promoting staff in these universities (Boshier & Huang, 2008).

In an attempt to understand what constitutes scholarly work on teaching and learning, D’Andrea and Gosling (2005) suggest two major dimensions of SoTL: pedagogical research (Ped R) and pedagogical development (Ped D). In this context, Ped R refers to engagement of academics in applied research on teaching and learning in their own disciplines for a better understanding of practice. It is independent of an academic’s own teaching and is aimed at national and international audiences. Ped D refers to engagement of academics in informal research into their own teaching to improve practice and is aimed at a local audience.

D’Andrea and Gosling (2005) argue that both, Ped R and Ped D, have a common focus on the relationship between teaching, the learner, and the subject matter. Both terms refer “either to activities, or to outputs that derive from these activities” (p. 157). Many academics believe that SoTL acts as a bridge between research and teaching as it encompasses both Ped R and Ped D (D’Andrea & Gosling, 2005). It is, however, important to understand how the relationship between teaching and research can help in improving the quality of teaching in universities.

3.4.3 Teaching-Research Nexus

Considering the importance of both teaching and research in improving the quality of teaching in the context of SoTL, this section is focused on the relationship between teaching and research – the teaching-research nexus. Several studies have been conducted on the relationship between teaching and research with an aim to investigate whether effectiveness in research can benefit teaching or vice versa. Grant and Wakelin (2009) argue that the concept of the teaching-research nexus is typically associated with the “process of enriching teaching practice by including aspects of an academic’s current research, or that of colleagues, in order to support student learning and one’s teaching practice” (p.133).
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Studies have suggested a range of relationships between research and teaching: positive, negative, and zero (Elsen, Visser-Wijnveen, van der Rijst & van Driel, 2009; Halse, Deane, Hobson & Jones, 2007). Many academics have a common belief that research can benefit teaching (Elsen et al., 2009; Gibbs, 2002) because both are positively correlated (Smeby, 1998). However, these potential benefits have not always been realised in practice (Elsen et al., 2009) and “empirical evidence is pretty clear that, on average, it does not [occur]” (Gibbs, 2002, p.8).

Quantitative studies suggest little or no relationship between research and teaching effectiveness (Robertson, 2007) whereas qualitative studies have mostly indicated a “strong belief in the existence of, and need for, a symbiotic relationship in which involvement in research enhances teaching and, to a lesser extent, involvement in teaching stimulates research” (Robertson & Bond, 2005, p.510). In a meta-analysis of 58 published studies, Hattie and Marsh (1996) observe a zero relationship between teaching and research or at best “very loosely coupled” (p.529). These results are consistently confirmed in their later studies and they reveal that teaching effectiveness and research productivity are nearly uncorrelated at an individual academic and department level (Hattie & Marsh, 2004; Marsh & Hattie, 2002).

Conversely, Smeby (1998) report the results of a survey of 1592 academics where research activities of most academics (more than 95 percent) helped them to improve their teaching. Elton (2001) also reports a strong belief in the teaching-research nexus on the part of academics. Likewise, Grant and Wakelin (2009) interviewed 12 academics who perceive that their engagement with research informed their teaching practices. However, they further observe that this relationship is one way and teaching engagements do not appear to inform research practices. Similar results are reported by Taylor (2007) about the perceptions of academics in four universities in England and Sweden.

It can be concluded, therefore, that the concept of SoTL is essentially linked with enhancing teaching practices of academics by engaging them in inquiry-based strategies. The scholarship of teaching (SoT) model (Kreber, 1999) provides a valuable framework for academics to engage in scholarly activities related to teaching. The focus of D’Andrea and Gosling (2005) on Ped R and Ped D also appears relevant. Finally, it is argued that while there is little evidence to support the commonly held view that the linkage of teaching and research can benefit academics in improving their teaching practices, there is a need to lessen the gap between teaching and research. As D’Andrea and Gosling
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(2005) comment, the reality is that “we are all both teachers and researchers” and the “present separation between teaching and research damages both” (p.148). They argue that knowledge cannot be communicated without adding to it and it cannot be added to without communicating it.

3.5 Recognition and Rewards for Teaching

One of the significant factors in improving quality of teaching is the commitment of academics to scholarly activities in teaching. In many instances this commitment of academics to teaching is linked with the status, recognition and rewards associated with teaching. For example, Lomas and Nicholls (2005) report the results of a study by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching that found “academics are very often more interested in their teaching than research, but feel forced to give up the intrinsic satisfactions of teaching for the external rewards of research” (p.140). To enhance the quality of teaching, they suggest that universities need to increase the status of teaching by setting out ways to recognize and reward good teaching and this, in turn, will increase the commitment of academics to teaching.

The fact that the research enjoys a greater status than its counterpart, teaching, is predominant in most universities. D’Andrea and Gosling (2005) acknowledge that the “three ‘Rs’ – resources, rewards and recognition – are in abundance for research, whereas the opposite has been true for teaching and learning” (p.146). It has now become a widespread phenomenon that academic staff associated with research activities reap more rewards, intrinsic as well as extrinsic, than those associated with teaching who mostly gain only intrinsic rewards (Hattie & Marsh, 2004; Moore & Kuol, 2005). The lack of recognition and reward for teaching has led to the neglect of teaching (Gibbs, 2002). The current perception of academics is that their universities do not value and reward teaching to the extent that it deserves (Kember et al., 2002).

In recent times, however, a growing emphasis on rewarding teaching excellence has been noted globally. For instance, the National Teaching Fellowship Scheme has been initiated in the UK to recognize and reward individuals who are excellent teachers and promoters of learning (Lomas & Nicholls, 2005). The growing emphasis on ‘rewards for teaching’ has also been noted by Gibbs (2002) who reports that more than two-thirds of institutions in the UK have overhauled their recognition and reward systems. Because of an increased
focus of the UK government on improving the status of teaching, many universities in the UK now publicly proclaim their commitment to teaching (Parker, 2008). It is, therefore, argued that the focus on recognition and rewards for teaching is more likely to encourage academics and universities towards quality teaching.

3.5.1 Nature of Recognition and Rewards for Teaching

The literature indicates that recognition and rewards for teaching are mainly focused on incentives for institutions, fellowships and grants, teaching excellence awards, and rewards in tenure, promotions, and pay bonuses. The focus of these incentives is on encouraging institutions and academics to engage in activities aimed at enhancing the quality of teaching in universities. At the national level, incentives for institutions are generally in the form of funding for teaching and learning, fellowships and grants, and teaching excellence awards. The intent of these national-level incentives is to promote teaching and learning by taking initiatives through national bodies such as the Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC), in the case of Australia.

It is now common internationally that a specific amount of funding is allocated to universities by funding bodies for promoting teaching and learning. As a result, universities have to provide evidence to the funding bodies of their focus on teaching. Universities in England are required to show explicitly in their human resource schemes that they “value teaching by rewarding and promoting good teachers” to receive a specific amount of funding from the Higher Education Funding Council for England (Palmer & Collins, 2006, p.194). Universities, in collaboration with national bodies, are also taking initiatives to reward individual staff for participating in teaching-related professional development activities and research projects.

For example, schemes such as the Fund for Developing Teaching and Learning and the National Teaching Fellowship have helped universities to raise the profile of teaching in the UK (Palmer & Collins, 2006). The Centre for Excellence in Teaching and Learning at Coventry University has also put into place a recognition and reward strategy to support the professional development of academics in teaching (Bluteau & Krumins, 2008). Academics are rewarded with monetary bonuses for undertaking teaching-related projects. After completion of the projects, the participants are not only encouraged and supported to attend conferences to showcase their work, but their work is also added to
the learning object repository for the purpose of sharing it with the broader community both nationally and internationally.

Another initiative to reward teaching excellence in individuals at national and at institutional level is that of ‘teaching excellence awards’. Halse et al. (2007) report that outstanding teachers in Australian universities are rewarded through teaching excellence awards by the Carrick Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education (subsequently ALTC, now Office for Learning and Teaching). They further remark that the purpose of the initiative was to “counter the privileged position of research by improving the importance and status of teaching in universities” (p.731) and to raise the profile of teaching. It is, however, argued that there is a need to shift the focus of awards from individuals to the whole institution.

The ‘whole institution’ approach can play a significant role in improving the quality of teaching at an institutional level. Biggs (2003) argues that good teaching should be seen as a collective responsibility and, therefore, the focus should be not on what the individual teacher does, but on how he/she contributes to the teaching system within the university for enhancing future teaching. For this to happen, he argues, teaching excellence awards should place an emphasis on developmental teamwork: “curriculum development, tutor mentoring, decisions as to delivery and assessment – that makes it possible for the star teacher to perform (p.273)”. To adopt the ‘whole institution’ approach in award schemes, it is critical to disseminate awardees’ teaching expertise and good practices to the broader community (Skelton, 2004).

To raise the profile of teaching at an institutional level, a shift in trend globally towards an emphasis on teaching in the appointment, tenure, and promotion processes has been noted. For instance, Parker (2008) reports that many universities in the UK have reviewed their career development policies and shifted towards a focus on the ‘quality teaching’ as a legitimate route for career progression. Marshall and Pennington (2009) also note a “potentially far-reaching shift” in criteria with equality between teaching and research (p.487). Parker (2008) observes that 91 percent of UK universities have adopted criteria that recognize formal parity between teaching and research in the case of senior and principal lecturers. However, this formal parity does not apply to the higher and more prestigious rank of professor where the focus is on research.
The focus on teaching in UK universities is evident with the creation of teaching-only posts, in addition to teaching and research posts and research-only posts. Parker (2008) reports that clear promotion criteria have been established for staff in teaching-only posts. The growth of teaching-only posts over the last decade has risen to a quarter of all academic positions in the UK (Court, 2007). Oxford (2008) reports an increase of 37.87 percent in the number of teaching-only academics in UK, compared with a rise of 2.85 percent and 3.08 percent for teaching and research posts and research-only only, respectively, in years 2003/4 to 2006. Seldin (2004) argues that the “familiar professional paradox is crumbling” on many campuses, because for years “professors were hired to teach, but were rewarded for research and publication” (p.2). It shows a shift in trend towards teaching in the quality regime. This shift in trend towards teaching has also led to the need for universities to provide high-quality and often practitioner-based teaching for their students.

To sum up, the low status of teaching relative to research is one of the impediments to improving the quality of teaching. However, institutions are now taking initiatives and are re-examining their commitment to teaching by finding ways to reward it. Many universities now have official policies that take into account the quality of teaching in the processes of performance appraisal, teaching excellence awards, and in personnel decisions. However, the perception of academics is that there is a mismatch between policies and practices that reward good teaching (Kember et al., 2002). Such perceptions of academics might influence their commitment and efforts to improve the quality of teaching.

### 3.6 Teaching Portfolios

The shift in emphasis towards quality teaching is not without demands. For instance, faculty members are being held accountable and, therefore, are being asked to provide solid and visible evidence of their teaching effectiveness in the classroom (Seldin, 2004; Stefani, Mason & Pegler, 2007). Knight (2006) also reports that it is now common in Canada to expect a teaching portfolio from academics seeking tenure or promotion. Stefani et al. (2007) observe that it has often been the case that promotion and tenure committees are provided with little actual information about teaching performance.
The assessment of teaching performance has also been an issue. Taylor (2007) reports that the perception of academics in two universities in England is that the low status of teaching relative to research, particularly in rewards, may be because it is much easier to assess and compare performance in research than in teaching. In a large survey of US academics, Boyer (1990) finds that 68 percent of respondents perceived that their institutions need better ways to evaluate scholarly performance in teaching. It is, therefore, important to examine ways to assess the quality of teaching.

The literature suggests that teaching portfolios are being used widely in the Western world, not only for assessing teaching quality but also for enhancing the teaching practices of academics. Stefani et al. (2007) describe the teaching portfolio as “a factual description of one’s teaching strengths and achievements” (p.89). They further argue that teaching portfolios can be used for making more sound decisions on promotion and tenure and for the professional development of individual academics. Seldin (2004) argues that the “two most often cited reasons for preparing teaching portfolios are to provide evidence for use in personnel decisions” and the performance improvement in teaching (p.15). However, Fry and Ketteridge (2003) argue that the “distinction between these two types of portfolios can sometimes be blurred” (p.242).

The teaching portfolio provides a valuable insight into the teaching performance of an individual faculty member over a period of time. Fry and Ketteridge (2003) state that it is a personal record of achievement and professional development that demonstrates the “level of attainment, scope of experience, range of activities, and/or progression as a university teacher” (p.473). It is a collection of materials that provides information about the teaching performance of a faculty member including his/her most significant teaching accomplishments (Devanas, 2006; Seldin, 2004). The teaching portfolio not only provides a factual record of teaching efficiency but “can also include documentation and resource materials that give an indication of the scope and quality of one’s teaching performance” (Stefani et al., 2007, p.89).

### 3.6.1 Purposes of Teaching Portfolios

Teaching portfolios, in practice, are assembled for several purposes. The most widely cited purposes in the literature include: a document to demonstrate how the quality of one's teaching has evolved over a time; a tool for self-reflection about areas in need of improvement; to demonstrate teaching effectiveness while applying for a new position;
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for performance appraisal; for tenure and promotion decisions; to assess achievements in professional development programmes; to apply for teaching awards or grants; and for sharing expertise and experience with young academics (Fry & Ketteridge, 2009; Harland, 2005; Seldin, 1997; Seldin, 2004; Stefani et al., 2007).

One of the factors responsible for the low status of teaching in recognition and reward processes is the lack of reliable procedures for assessing the quality of teaching. The value of teaching portfolios is important in this regard as they are generally based on the triangulation of data and, therefore, provide the fairest way to evaluate quality of teaching while making personnel decisions (Seldin, 2004). The teaching portfolios provide longitudinal data from multiple sources and thus allow tenure and promotion committees, to counter possible biases in any single source of data (Tigelaar, Dolmans, Wolfhagen & van der Vleuten, 2005). Consequently, the committees can readily judge improvements in teaching over a period of time and can recognize the full range of activities that faculty members engage in, inside and outside of the classroom (Seldin, 2004).

Teaching portfolios also have great value in improving teaching quality for academics. Seldin (2004) argues that they provide factual and philosophical data to faculty members allowing them to reflect upon their classroom practices and to improve their teaching performance. The practice of developing a portfolio stimulates the process of self-reflection because collecting work samples and other types of illustrative artefacts requires faculty members to look back at what they have done and analyse what they have accomplished (Devanas, 2006; Van Tartwijk, Driessen, Van Der Vleuten & Stokking, 2007). The practice also encourages reflective thinking because academics are generally asked to include a section on reflection in their portfolios.

These reflection sections in portfolios are particularly required in the case of practices such as review and evaluation of teaching. Stefani et al. (2007) argue that academics are required to include evidence of reflection on the practices of: student evaluations, peer review, unsolicited comments from students and peers, and self evaluations. The process also requires academic staff to ponder on personal teaching activities, rethink teaching strategies, and plan for the future (Seldin, 2004). Likewise, Stefani et al. (2007) suggest the use of the e-teaching portfolio as a tool for the professional development of academics and for encouraging reflection. Seldin (2004) also believes in the value of the e-portfolio as an improvement tool.
3.6.2 Key Elements of Teaching Portfolios

There are varied forms of teaching portfolio depending on the intended purpose. A teaching portfolio developed for performance appraisal would be very different from one aimed at encouraging reflective practices (Harland, 2005). Stefani et al. (2007) propose a model of teaching portfolio primarily based on five aspects of teaching: roles, responsibilities and goals, teaching evaluations, contributions to institution or profession, activities to improve instruction, and an honour or recognition.

Fry and Ketteridge (2003) suggest that teaching portfolios should include three key components: an index of the portfolio, collection of selected material drawn from the practice with evidence, and a commentary that discusses the evidence. An index or ‘map’ is an outline of items included in the portfolio. The materials drawn from the practice require the “inclusion of authentic piece of evidence about the teaching and support for learning of the practitioner” (p.244). A commentary elaborates the evidence by showing that the practice is a product of reflection practices.

Glassick, Huber and Maeroff (1997) suggest the inclusion of documentation about applied scholarship in the portfolio and particularly how the scholarship of teaching might be captured in material form. However, Seldin (2004) argues that a teaching portfolio is not an “exhaustive compilation of all of the documents and materials that bear on an individual’s teaching performance”, it should rather encompass only thoughtfully chosen information on teaching activities, along with evidence of their effectiveness (p.3). It is crucial that the focus of teaching portfolios be on the quality rather than the quantity of information (Fry & Ketteridge, 2009).

To increase the value of teaching portfolios in achieving their purposes, it is argued that particular attention should be paid to the expertise of academics in authority to assess portfolios. For example, Seldin (2004) argues that the teaching portfolio will have a genuine value for its use in personnel decisions only “when those who make tenure, promotion, and retention decisions learn to trust the approach” and are aware of it. Stefani et al. (2007) also question whether the heads of departments and other line managers understand the concept of portfolio.

In conclusion, teaching portfolios have huge potential not only for improving the quality of teaching but also for assessing the quality of teaching in personnel decisions. The triangulation of data in teaching portfolios provides valuable insight into the teaching
performance of academics and supports their use in recognition and rewards processes. The multiple sources of data provide an opportunity for academics to think upon their practices and how these practices can be enhanced as a consequence of reflection. It is also essential that the teachers, mentors and chairs of personnel decision committees understand the portfolio approach.

### 3.7 Key Factors in Quality Assurance of Teaching

This section examines in depth the key factors that the literature suggests enhance the quality of teaching in universities. These factors are strongly linked with the five practices aimed at assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching as discussed earlier in the chapter. In most cases, these factors are essential prerequisites for the success of strategies aimed at improving the quality of teaching.

The first of these factors is to develop awareness of the concepts involved in QA processes among all concerned, including students, teachers and academic leaders. McKimm (2009) argues that awareness of the “concepts, terminology and expectations of national agencies concerned with quality, coupled with increasing competence and understanding of teaching and learning processes” encourages academics to “feel more engaged with and contribute more effectively towards the development and enhancement of a quality culture in higher education” (pp.196-197). For establishing a quality culture in developing countries, Al Attiyah and Khalifa (2009) suggest an increased focus on creating awareness and a sense of ownership among all concerned.

The role of academic leadership is important in improving the quality of teaching. For example, Ramsden (2003) asserts that there are “piquant correspondences between good leadership for teaching and good teaching” (p.237). He further emphasizes that effective leadership at all levels of an institution is essential for improving teaching and learning. Robertson (2002) advocates for a collegial leadership in this regard.

One critical factor in improving the quality of teaching is the coherence, consistency, and alignment of policies and processes focused on improving the quality of teaching. Gosling (2004) reviewed QA/QE practices in the UK and notes that “policy initiatives do not necessarily complement one another and one dominant policy can work against the success of another” (p.147). Ramsden (2003) also asserts that a university may have inconsistent criteria for rewarding quality teaching and may emphasize academic-led
approaches to quality but apply bureaucratic appraisal and performance management techniques. Consequently, academics might not put their efforts into teaching because of doubts about the processes.

Universities need to base their QA practices on collaboration, inclusion, engagement, and participation. D’Andrea and Gosling (2005) argue that “successful and strategic management of improving teaching and learning must be inclusive of all those who are affected by the improvements” (p.7). It is not only important to involve students, teachers and academic leaders in the processes but also to engage units (Newton, 2003; Tam, 2001). Universities need to create an environment that not only engages academics in a debate about university teaching but also encourages them to stimulate dialogue about policies. Engaging academic staff in a dialogue about the university’s policies for promoting good teaching is critical for improving the quality of teaching (D’Andrea & Gosling, 2005; Ramsden, 2003).

Another important factor is the evaluation of strategies aimed at improving the quality of teaching. D’Andrea and Gosling (2005) argue that the evaluation of approaches to quality is essential to the improvement of teaching and learning. It is argued that universities need to place an emphasis on learning outcomes for students in their QA and QE policies and procedures. This is because many academics view students’ learning as being at the heart of quality (Biggs, 2003; Houston, 2010; Prosser & Trigwell, 1999; Ramsden, 2003).

One of the prerequisites for the implementation of QA and QE policies and processes in universities is to implement them simultaneously by targeting the majority of academic staff and the departments. D’Andrea and Gosling (2005) suggest that the ‘whole institution’ approach has a greater capacity to effect change in the implementation of QA processes. It is argued that “unless the strategies to improve the quality of teaching and learning” are aimed at and adopted by the majority of academic staff (D’Andrea, & Gosling, 2005, p.5) “they will continue to remain peripheral to the main culture of the university” (Gosling et al., 2005, p.70). Consequently, the “change agenda must work both vertically, to include both bottom-up and top-down strategies, and also horizontally across organizational structures” (D’Andrea & Gosling, 2005, p.7).

To adopt the whole institution approach, the literature suggests the implementation of QA/QE processes through change agents. D’Andrea and Gosling (2005) assert that educational developers often prefer to work with those individuals who are seen as
‘change agents’. They claim that there are numerous reports on the success of this strategy particularly in the case of the National Teaching Fellowship scheme (UK) and in the Carnegie Academy schemes (US).

While the factors or the conditions described above are relevant to the implementation of QA/QE processes for teaching in all universities, Lim (2001) identifies a number of conditions that may inhibit the implementation of QA schemes in higher education. In view of experiences of the UK, Australia and other developed countries, he argues that the limited presence or partial absence of these conditions makes it difficult for the universities in developing countries to execute QA schemes. The conditions include: the presence of qualified academic staff; academics in full-time employment; availability of sufficient physical, electronic and administrative support services; appointment and promotion is based on academic merit and not on political/social connections; and presence of a fair degree of academic freedom and an environment where constructive criticism is not penalized.

3.8 Conclusion

The literature indicates that QA processes for teaching are interconnected with each other in most aspects. In most cases, these processes have the characteristics of both QA and QE and, therefore, can be implemented for either goal or outcome. Academics have raised concerns about the value of judgemental aspects of the processes of improving the quality of teaching. It is argued, therefore, that universities need to adopt developmental approaches to quality with an emphasis on enhancing the teaching practices of academics. Universities also need to encourage such approaches to quality that promote scholarly debate and dialogue about teaching. The genuine value of QA practices lie in the whole institution. The literature suggests that most QA processes are linked with rewards. Finally, it is suggested that universities should also work on the factors that impede policies aimed at QA of teaching.
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4.1 Overview

This chapter outlines the methodological choices involved in this research. Consistent with the objectives, this study employed a mixed method research approach and was conducted in three phases. Because of the complexity of the methodology, this chapter is presented as five sections. The first section outlines the overall methodology as applied to the research questions. This section also provides the rationale for the choice of methods and explains how the three phases of this research are connected using the mixed method design. The next section provides an explanation of template analysis as it was applied in Phase I of the study. The third section provides details about the use of the Delphi technique in Phase II. The fourth section outlines the interview procedures adopted for Phase III of the study. The final part provides justification for the integration of all three phases of the study. The chapter concludes with commentary on the ethical considerations involved in the work.

4.2 Research Approach

This section describes the research approach and the rationale for using this approach. The basic principle that underlies the selection of a research approach is that it follows from the research questions (Johnson, Onwuegbuzie & Turner, 2007; Punch, 2009). This research has been guided by one overarching question, that is: how can the quality of teaching in Pakistan universities be improved? In order to answer this broad question, the other key research question is: what approaches are being used currently in research-led universities to improve the quality of teaching? This study used a mixed method research approach because neither qualitative nor quantitative approaches appear to be satisfactory in addressing such broad questions. Mixed method research includes at least one quantitative and one qualitative method (Caracelli & Greene, 1993). It involves the collection, analysis, interpretation and integration of both quantitative and qualitative data in a single or series of studies that investigate the same underlying phenomenon (Creswell & Plano Clark 2007; Hanson, Creswell, Plano Clark, Petska & Creswell, 2005; Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2006).
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The rationale for using a mixed method approach follows from the main objective of the study, namely, to develop a framework of quality assurance (and enhancement) processes for teaching for Pakistan universities based on the experiences of research-led universities. The study was originally planned to be carried out in two phases. The main objective for Phase I was to identify and classify QA processes for teaching in research-led universities using the policy and practice documents of these institutions. Such an investigation into the literature of policy and practice documents required a qualitative approach to inquiry because this provides more in-depth understanding of these rich and varied sources and enables nuanced undertakings to be revealed. This phase of the study suggested a potential ‘framework of QA (and QE) processes for teaching’ for Pakistan.

However, such a framework of QA (and QE) processes for teaching needs to take into account the factors that are likely to influence the implementation of various aspects of the potential quality assurance processes in Pakistan universities. The main objective for Phase II of the study, therefore, was to assess the desirability and the likely acceptability of various aspects of QA/QE processes for teaching in Pakistan universities by seeking opinions from academic leaders in Pakistan universities. This required a quantitative survey approach because of a range of opinions, aim of developing consensus using a diverse group, diverse location of the experts, time constraints, etc.

The survey identified a problem with likely acceptability but did not explain it. The study was extended, therefore, to the third qualitative phase by conducting interviews to enable a more in-depth examination of the reasons for the likely low acceptability of QA/QE processes for teaching in Pakistan universities.

Because phase 2 and phase 3 of the study were particularly concerned with Pakistan, the personal and professional experience of the researcher in the higher education sector of Pakistan also informed some of the perspectives and provided the researcher insights into some of the interpretations and choices made. The role of personal and/or professional experience in framing research project has been highlighted by Mason (2002) who argues that data generation and analysis paired with the personal experience of the researcher adds value to the research because such a contribution enables the linkage of researcher’s experiences with those of the respondents. Marshall and Rossman (1999) also argue that the use of a researcher’s personal and professional experience can benefit the research through understanding the research context and the emerging findings from the data generated (Reiter, Stewart & Bruce, 2011). Marshall and Rossman (1999), however,
caution that the personal experience and the interests of the researcher should not bias the study. While conducting this study, the researcher was particularly mindful of this pitfall and the following precautionary measures were taken to address the issues of bias in each phase of the study: quality checks, objectivity and reflexivity procedures. These procedures are discussed in section 4.3.3.

The development of a framework of QA processes for teaching for Pakistan universities based on the experiences of research-intensive universities and the perceptions and understandings of Pakistan universities is a multi-layered and complex undertaking. The mixed methods approach was not only consistent with the objectives of the study but also enabled the examination of a complex issue.

**4.2.1 Mixed Method Research Design: Rationale**

The literature outlines five basic steps in designing a mixed method study, namely, the purpose of the study; type of data to collect; rationale for using both quantitative and qualitative methods; identifying data collection and analysis procedures; and identifying data integration procedures (Greene, Caracelli & Graham, 1989; Hanson et al., 2005; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998). Mixed methods allow the data to be collected concurrently or sequentially and they can be integrated at one or more stages (Hanson et al., 2005). In this study, the data were collected sequentially for all three phases and both the data collection and data analysis were performed separately. However, data integration occurred at two stages. First, the data were interpreted separately for each phase of the study, followed by a sequential integration. Second, the data were integrated at the final discussion stage.

Mixed methods researchers classify research designs according to the way they treat the relationship between qualitative and quantitative approaches to inquiry. For example, Creswell and Plano Clark (2007) identify four designs: triangulation, embedded, exploratory and explanatory design. Similarly, Greene et al. (1989) identify five mixed methods designs: triangulation, complementary, development, initiation and expansion design. Triangulation design uses both qualitative and quantitative approaches in parallel. In embedded design, a secondary data is added to a design. In exploratory design, an initial qualitative exploration provides the basis for developing a quantitative study. In explanatory design, quantitative data are explained with the help of qualitative data. Similarly, triangulation, complementary, development, initiation and expansion mixed
methods designs are focused respectively on convergence of results, elaboration, informing development, discovering contradictions, and on expanding the range of inquiry (Caracelli & Greene, 1993; Greene et al., 1989).

This study used two mixed methods designs: exploratory and explanatory (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007), or development and complementarity (Caracelli & Greene, 1993; Greene et al., 1989). For Phase I and Phase II of the study, the exploratory, or development, design was used. For Phase II and Phase III of the study, the explanatory, or complementarity, design was used. Because both mixed method designs were applied to Phase II of the study, this design is termed a hybrid mixed method design. The hybrid mixed method design is illustrated in Figure 4.1. It is essential to understand the features of the two designs involved in hybrid mixed method design.

Figure 4.1: The hybrid mixed method design (Exploratory and Explanatory)

A. Exploratory (or Development) Design

The exploratory (or development) design is a type of sequential mixed method design and comprises two phases. In this design qualitative data are collected and analyzed in the first phase and quantitative data in the second (Punch, 2009). Priority is usually given to the qualitative data. The integration of the data generally occurs at the data interpretation and discussion stage (Hanson et al., 2005). The developments from the initial qualitative phase are connected to a subsequent quantitative component of the study. The intent of the first qualitative method is to inform the development of the second quantitative method, for example, to develop an instrument (Caracelli & Greene, 1993; Greene et al., 1989).
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The exploratory (or development) design is best suited to exploring a phenomenon and is particularly useful when there is a need to develop and test an instrument because one is not available (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). This design first explores the phenomenon qualitatively by developing themes from within the qualitative data. On the basis of the results of the first phase, an instrument is developed to be used in the second quantitative phase. Creswell and Plano Clark (2007) suggest two common variants of this design: the instrument development model and taxonomy development model. Each of these models begins with an initial qualitative phase and ends with a quantitative phase. They differ in the way the two phases are connected and the relative emphasis on each method.

An instrument development model connects qualitative and quantitative methods through the development of an instrument. The focus of this variant is on the quantitative phase of the study. In the taxonomy development model, the initial qualitative phase is conducted to identify important variables, develop a taxonomy or classification system, or to develop an emergent theory while the second quantitative phase tests these results in more detail. The focus of this variant is on the qualitative aspect of the study (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). All these features are consistent with the objectives of the study and thus provide the rationale for using this design in Phase I and Phase II of the study.

In this study, the primary purpose of the exploratory design was to develop a framework of QA processes for teaching for Pakistan universities based on the experiences of research-led universities. The data were collected and analyzed in two sequential phases. In Phase I, the qualitative data, in the form of policy and practice documents, were collected and analyzed. In Phase II, the quantitative data were collected and analyzed using the Delphi technique. Out of the five broad purposes of mixed method design (Caracelli & Greene, 1993; Greene et al., 1989), the purpose of this design was development because the results from the first qualitative phase were used to inform the content, sampling, and the data collection for the second quantitative phase of the study.

The main objective of the first qualitative phase was to identify and classify QA processes for teaching in research-led universities while the second quantitative phase was used to assess the desirability and likely acceptability of these processes in Pakistan universities. The first qualitative phase was focused on an in-depth investigation into the nature and the dimensions of QA processes, whereas the focus of the second quantitative phase was on developing a framework of QA processes by seeking opinions from academic leaders in Pakistan. Both methods were implemented sequentially, priority was given to the
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qualitative method and the data were connected by building the second quantitative phase on the qualitative one. It is an integrated design because the results from the first method were integrated into the form and the focus of the second method. An additional integration of all results also occurred at the final interpretation stage.

B. Explanatory (or Complementarity) Design

The explanatory, or complementarity, design is also a type of sequential mixed method design and comprises two phases. In this design, the quantitative data are collected and analyzed in the first phase and the qualitative in the second (Punch, 2009). The intent of the qualitative method is to illustrate, explain, elaborate and enhance the results of the quantitative phase (Caracelli & Greene, 1993; Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). Priority is generally given to the quantitative data. The integration occurs at the data interpretation and discussion stage (Hanson et al., 2005). The quantitative data provide a general understanding of the problem, while the qualitative data refine and explain those statistical results by further exploration (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007).

In explanatory mixed designs, qualitative and quantitative methods are used to measure overlapping but also different facets of a phenomenon (Caracelli & Greene, 1993; Greene et al., 1989). In this design the qualitative data are used primarily to augment quantitative data in order to explain it further (Hanson et al., 2005). These characteristics provide the rationale for using this design for Phase II and Phase III because it helped in achieving the main purpose of the study, that is, to develop a sustainable and likely acceptable framework of QA processes for Pakistan universities. Of the five purposes of mixed method designs (Caracelli & Greene, 1993; Greene et al., 1989), this mixed design was used to elaborate, enhance, illustrate and clarify the results of the first quantitative method with the help of the qualitative method.

In terms of Phase II and Phase III of the study, the first quantitative phase was conducted in order to assess the desirability and likely acceptability of various aspects of QA processes for teaching in Pakistan universities, while the second qualitative phase was conducted to identify the potential reasons for the likely low acceptability of QA processes in Pakistan universities. Both methods were connected sequentially and priority was given to the first quantitative method. The complementarity purpose of this design was apparent because both methods were integrated to yield a more comprehensive understanding of the phenomena (likely acceptability of approaches to assuring teaching
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quality). An additional integration of all results occurred at the final interpretation stage. Figure 4.2 provides a diagram of the overall research methodology used for this study.

Figure 4.2: Diagram of the overall research methodology
4.3 Phase I Study

This section describes the procedures adopted while conducting Phase I of the study. The main objective for this phase was to identify and classify QA/QE processes for teaching in research-led universities. This phase was focused on an in-depth investigation into the nature and the dimensions of QA/QE processes for teaching in research-led universities. The intent of this phase was to inform the development for Phase II: the development of an initial draft for the potential framework of QA/QE processes for teaching for Pakistan universities. It was evident from the nature of these objectives that a qualitative approach to inquiry was more appropriate for this phase of the study.

The second reason for using a qualitative approach in this phase was the nature of the data because the data were in the form of policy and practice documents. For the analysis of these practice documents a qualitative technique was used to provide an in-depth understanding of the data. Consequently, a particular form of data analysis technique, template analysis, was used (see section 4.3.3). The following three subsections provide details about the sample, the data collection procedure and the data analysis technique. The rationale behind each of these decisions is also provided.

4.3.1 The Phase I Research Sample

The Universitas 21 (U21) institutions served as a population for Phase I of the study. U21 is an international network of 23 leading research-intensive universities in 15 countries. The network facilitates collaboration and cooperation between member universities on matters related to teaching, learning and research. The rationale for selecting this network as a population of the study is that the network claims that all U21 member institutions are comprehensive universities and provide a strong QA framework to the network’s activities. Likewise, this network was selected because of its publicly expressed commitment to quality assurance (and QE) of teaching that is evident from substantial number of documents and guidelines about the subject on the websites of member universities.

One of the strong reasons for selecting U21 institutions as a population is that this global network provided diverse perspectives on QA of teaching because its member institutions are drawn from 15 countries. Researchers believe that this diversity in sampling is
important in qualitative studies (Creswell, 2007; Miles & Huberman, 1994) because this also increases the likelihood that the findings will reflect different perspectives.

The literature demonstrates that qualitative studies generally employ purposive sampling techniques (Creswell, 2007; Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Mason, 2002; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Silverman, 2005) instead of random ones as used by their quantitative opponents. In this phase of the study, the purposive sampling was used to identify unique cases that were particularly informative for an in-depth investigation (Kreuger & Neuman, 2006). The technique also allows for selection of samples on the basis of their relevance to the research questions. Mason (2002) argues that the key question in sampling is whether the sample provides access to enough data with the right focus to address research questions. On the basis of these characteristics, the purposive sampling technique was used for this qualitative phase. Currently, the U21 network comprises 23 universities in 15 countries. At the initial stages of data collection and analysis for this phase in 2008, this network comprised 20 universities. Out of 20 universities, 15 were selected as a sample of the study. Out of these 15 sample universities, 3 universities were from Australia, 2 from Canada, 4 from the UK, and 1 university each from Hong Kong, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Singapore and USA. Five universities from China, Japan, South Korea and Sweden were dropped from the sample due to unavailability of source documents or because the documents were not accessible in English language. The University of Delhi (India) became the member of U21 network in late 2008. However, the documents concerning QA of teaching were not available on the university’s website. Two universities, from the Netherlands and the USA were not included in the sample due to their recent membership. The list of all 23 member U21 institutions by country, along with 15 sample universities, is provided in Appendix A.

4.3.2 Data Collection

The data for Phase I of the study were collected through a web search of U21 institutions. It was found that a substantial amount of documentation concerning QA of teaching is publicly available on the websites of the U21 member universities. In many cases, these documents were available under the heading ‘teaching and learning’. The web search resulted in 229 policy and practice documents concerning QA of teaching from 15 sample institutions. The list of these documents, by institution, is provided in Appendix B. These
documents served as the basis for Phase I of the study. The next subsection is focused on
the method for analysis of these documents.

4.3.3 Template Analysis

For the analysis of the 229 policy and practice documents, a particular form of qualitative
approach, template analysis, was employed, which allows for analysis of qualitative data
thematically. It is, therefore, also referred to as codebook analysis or thematic coding
(Crabtree & Miller, 1992; King, 1998). The essence of the technique is that the templates
are produced by coding themes in the data. Template analysis starts with an a priori set of
themes. However, new themes are added to the original template as the textual data is
read and interpreted (King, 1998). Likewise, themes may undergo revision as the analysis
proceeds and thus template strategies adjust emergent themes (Crabtree & Miller, 1992).

Template analysis occupies a position between content analysis and grounded theory
(King, 1998). In content analysis, codes are tightly defined, largely predetermined and
allow statistical and qualitative analysis of the data, whereas in grounded theory, there is
no a priori definition of codes (King, 1998; Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Strauss & Corbin,
1998). Template analysis involves the construction of a template in a highly flexible way
by starting with only a few defined codes, that is, a priori (King, 1998; King, 2006).

The template comprises codes that represent themes identified in the data through careful
reading and rereading of the text (King, Carroll, Newton & Dornan, 2002). Miles and
Huberman (1994) argue that the process starts with a few general themes derived from
reading the literature and more themes and subthemes are added as the dataset is further
reviewed. Once a set of themes is identified, the next step is to identify how these themes
are linked to each other in a hierarchy, starting with broad and general themes and
moving towards narrower, specific and focussed ones (Kent, 2000; King, Bell & Thomas,
2003).

Template analysis comprises five steps. It begins with the identification of an a priori set
of themes along with other significant themes in the data set related to research questions.
These themes are then coded and organized in a meaningful and useful manner to form a
hierarchy. This process leads to the development of an initial template. This template is
then applied to the whole data set, and codes are added to the template as new themes
arise. This leads to the creation of the final template which serves as the basis for the
interpretation and analysis of the dataset, and enables conclusions to be drawn about the main themes within the data. Figure 4.3 shows these five steps in the template analysis.

Figure 4.3: Diagram of steps in template analysis (adapted from King, 1998)
A. Identification of a priori Themes

The first step in template analysis is the identification of an a priori set of themes. These themes are those features or characteristics that are relevant to the research questions and recur several times in the data. King et al. (2002) argue that an a priori set of themes reflect areas that are particularly salient to the aims of the research project. For the identification of themes, two sources were used. First, the literature was reviewed with a particular focus on quality assurance of teaching in higher education. The second source for the identification of themes was the initial reading and coding of a small sample of documents regarding QA/QE of teaching from The University of Auckland.

Given the prominence of five themes in the quality assurance literature and in the documents from The University of Auckland, concepts such as review and evaluation of teaching and courses; professional development of academic staff; scholarship of teaching and learning; recognition and rewards for scholarly teaching; and teaching portfolios were identified as a priori themes. These themes facilitated the initial coding of the data set and provided tentative classification of QA processes for teaching.

The main benefit of using a priori themes is that they accelerate the process of initial coding which is generally time-consuming. However, the danger associated with their use is in placing an emphasis only on the data which fit with themes and overlooking the material that does not relate to these themes. It is crucial, therefore, to keep the themes tentative – equally subject to redefinition or removal (King, 2006). In the case of this study, the initial set of themes was modified, with some dispensed with altogether when found to be inappropriate to the actual data examined.

B. Initial Coding of the Data Set

The second step in the template analysis was the reading and rereading of the data and carrying out an initial coding. Codes are tags, names or labels and coding is, therefore, the process of putting tags, names or labels against pieces of the data (Punch, 2009). The pieces of data may be individual words or small or large chunks of the data, and are usually termed as ‘themes’. The process of assigning labels to the themes is, therefore, to attach meaning to pieces of the data. Themes are those features that recur several times in the data within and/or across transcripts (King, 2006). However, this is not a hard and fast rule. Codes are not only specified for the themes found in most or in all transcripts but
they can also be assigned to those salient features that occur in only one or in a minority of transcripts (King et al., 2002).

In this study, the initial coding was carried out through a narrow reading and analysis of the text and was originally focused at sentence level. The initial coding of the data from The University of Auckland revealed that the number of themes was growing rapidly. It was, however, difficult to manage the growing quantity of themes. The unit of analysis was thus extended to the level of paragraph with a focus on the themes that emerged from paragraphs. Such a detailed reading, although time-consuming, provided a deeper understanding about the nature of QA processes for teaching. In addition, the initial coding was refined on the basis of a pilot study of a small sample of documents from The University of Auckland.

For the initial coding, the documents were read and reread in order to identify meaning chunks. If these identified chunks of the text were found to be encompassed by one in the a priori set of themes, the code was attached to the chunk of that original theme. If the chunk of text was not covered by the a priori themes, then either an existing theme was modified or a new theme was devised and thus a new code was attached accordingly. Even if a single feature in the data was found to be relevant to the research questions but was not covered under the existing themes, a fresh theme was devised for it. All 229 policy and practice documents were coded through this process of theme identification. Some examples of initial coding based on a priori themes are indicated in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1: Examples of coding and classifying the text into themes and subthemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excerpts from the policy documents of sample U21 universities (Underline – Themes and/or subthemes)</th>
<th>Coding and classification as themes and subthemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After an extended period of research and consultation, an advisory paper concerning the need for a new student feedback process was submitted to and approved by UNSW’s Senior Management Group in April 2003 (Lee &amp; Boyle, 2003). After further consultation and development work, facilitated mainly by the CATEI Implementation Group, trials of the Process were conducted in 2004 and full implementation is proceeding in 2005 (University of New South Wales, 2007a).</td>
<td>Research-based policies and processes; Pilot projects, Collaboration in developing policies and processes (contains more than one themes – main themes and subthemes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University is committed to recognising and promoting excellence and innovation in curriculum development &amp; teaching. Excellence in teaching is identified and rewarded through the University’s Teaching Excellence Awards. Innovation is encouraged through Teaching Improvement Grants. University appointment, continuation and promotion policies place importance on the development and demonstration of teaching ability and excellence (University of Auckland, 2004b).</td>
<td>Recognition and rewards for teaching, Rewards in tenure and promotions, Teaching excellence awards and Teaching improvement grants (Themes and subthemes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The aim of the policy is to recognise, reward and encourage teachers renowned for the excellence of their teaching, who have made a broad and deep contribution to enhancing the quality of learning and teaching at the University (University of Queensland, 2006).</td>
<td>Rewards and recognition for teaching excellence; Emphasis on enhancing T/L (Theme, subthemes)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Template analysis usually allows two types of coding for the segments of text: hierarchical and parallel. In hierarchical coding the groups of similar codes are clustered together to produce more general and higher-order codes. On the other hand, parallel coding classifies the chunks within two (or more) different codes at the same level (King, 1998). In this study, both types of coding were used because most aspects of QA processes were interrelated with each other horizontally and/or vertically. The coding can be carried out either on the printed documents or electronically by using qualitative data analysis packages (Cassell, Symon, Buehring & Johnson, 2006; Caudle, 2004; Denzin & Lincoln, 2000a; Fielding & Lee, 1998; Fielding, 2000; Gibbs, 2002a; Weitzman, 2000). In this study coding was initially carried out manually on the printed documents. In the second stage coding was carried out electronically using the qualitative data analysis software NVivo7. The use of the software was mostly limited to producing and rearranging the structure of the templates and to classification of themes.

**C. Development of Initial Template**

The third step in template analysis is the production of an initial template. It can be produced after carrying out an initial coding on just one document or it can be delayed until coding of all data has been completed. However, King (2006) reports that it has been produced in most studies at a point between these two extremes, i.e. after coding a subset of documents. There are both advantages and dangers associated with producing an initial template at an early stage. It may prevent researchers from approaching fresh documents with an open mind. They might approach the data that fits precisely into the template, and ignore those that are relatively difficult for the template to cover. On the other hand, the production of an initial template at an early stage helps in focusing on areas of greatest relevance to the research questions (King, 2006).

In this study the initial template was produced after coding 13 documents from The University of Auckland and 46 documents from 3 Australian universities. The initial coding of these 59 documents and 5 a priori themes enabled the development of an initial template. The comprehensiveness of the initial template is an important consideration. Although, it is largely a matter of personal preference and linked to the needs of the projects, King (2006) suggests not producing too comprehensive a template at the initial stages. In this study, the ‘node explorer’ feature in NVivo7 was particularly helpful in producing and rearranging the structure of the initial template. For producing an initial
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template, the themes were grouped into similar categories that were arranged in a hierarchy of codes, from broad themes to the narrower ones. King (2006) asserts that there can be as many levels of coding in the hierarchy as it is useful to distinguish.

D. Development of Final Template

The fourth step in the template analysis is the application of the initial template to the whole data set in order to develop the final version of the template. In this study, the initial template was applied to each document; all relevant segments were coded on it; and it was modified if the related data were not adequately covered by it. This process led to the development of the final template. The process of coding and modification may require the adjustment of previously coded transcripts. King (2006) asserts that the modification of a template generally takes one or more forms, such as: inserting a theme, deleting a theme, changing the scope of a theme, and changing the classification of a theme.

In this study the new themes were defined and codes were added accordingly for the new chunks that emerged from within the documents and which were not covered by existing themes. All such themes were deleted if the material they covered was better included under a different code. Similarly, if a theme was either too narrowly or too broadly defined to be useful, it was redefined at a lower or higher level as per the needs of the data. King et al. (2003) argues that the final template allows researchers to decide whether a theme initially classified as a subcategory of a higher-order theme fits better as a subcategory of a different higher-order theme. For example, one a priori theme– the teaching portfolio–was added as a subtheme under the category ‘recognition and rewards’. While developing the final template, NVivo7 provided automated procedures for re-coding. This process of coding, modifying and re-coding led to the development of the final template.

The format of the final template is important. King (2006) reports that the final template might be in a linear format or in a mind-map style of layout. A well-designed linear template serves as a tool for writing up the findings. However, one of the disadvantages of a pure linear format is its inflexibility in showing relationships between the themes. On the other hand, the mind-map style is preferred in order to indicate the relationship from a particular lower-order theme to a higher-order theme. Various functions of NVivo also
help in producing mind-map style templates (Langley & Kakabadse, 2007). In this study, mind-map style templates were employed in keeping with the nature of the QA processes.

**E. Interpretation of the Final Template**

The final step in template analysis is the interpretation of the data and the writing up of findings. In this study, the final version of the template was not the end product of the analysis but it provided guidelines for interpretation of the data. The interpretation of the data is not just a matter of simply summarizing a document’s contents as indexed under each theme, but it is guided by objectives of the study. King (2006) suggests some measures in this regard: listing themes, prioritizing and openness. Listing themes refers to compiling a list of themes occurring in each document. The list provides an overview of thematic coding. Prioritizing refers to interpretation of the data by making judgements about the salient features of themes.

The pitfall of ‘failing to prioritise’ can result from narrowing the focus of interpretation too soon. This may happen when the researcher is guided so strongly by the initial research questions that all themes which are not directly relevant are disregarded (King, 2006). To counter this, the template analysis requires openness. Using these measures, the data were interpreted and the findings were written up accordingly. For this, King (2006) suggests the use of direct quotes from the documents. Generally, it should include some shorter quotes to clarify particular points, and longer quotes that give the reader a flavour of the original accounts. For this study, both shorter and longer quotes were used.

**F. Quality Checks and Reflexivity**

The reliability and validity of the data analysis is crucial in qualitative studies. However, most qualitative researchers believe that these concepts are related to quantitative studies. Consequently, King (2006) suggests some quality checks while employing template analysis, instead of reliability and validity. He further suggests reflexivity on the part of the researcher. Quality checks and reflexivity procedures are generally employed at one or more stages of the coding (Wayne, 2007).

Two quality checks were used in this study while analyzing the data: an independent scrutiny of analysis and an audit trail (King, 2006). In independent scrutiny, an expert codes a sample of data independently followed by a discussion with the researcher about the similarities and differences in themes (Wolfe, 2007). This technique can be used at all
five stages of template analysis. In this study, the coding process was discussed and shared with a doctoral student from The University of Auckland who was also engaged in a similar type of qualitative study. As per agreement, both exchanged expertise in coding. Likewise, the different versions of templates were shared with supervisors as a measure of independent scrutiny.

An audit trail refers to the documentary record of the steps and the decisions made while moving from raw transcripts to the final version of the template and the interpretation of the data (King, 2006). Likewise, the research material can be archived by keeping the data in an organized way. In this study the data were archived in the form of policy and practice documents, a list of publications that emerged from study, the different versions of templates, the diagrams of thematic codes, and other contextual information. The archived material and various versions of templates were held electronically in NVivo7. Finally, reflexivity refers to the reflection practices while conducting research (King, 2006) and this is required throughout the research process. In this study, the researcher was careful that his personal experiences did not influence research process. Quality checks also encouraged reflexivity.

4.4 Phase II Study

This section outlines procedures adopted for conducting Phase II of the study. To develop a framework of QA processes for teaching for Pakistan universities, the focus of this phase was on assessing the desirability and likely acceptability of various aspects of eight categories of QA processes for teaching that emerged from the template analysis (in Pakistan universities). For this phase, the Delphi technique was used. Following subsections provide an overview of the Delphi technique, the rationale for using the Delphi, and details about selection of the sample, data collection and analysis procedures. The rationale behind each decision is also provided.

4.4.1 Overview of the Delphi Technique

The Delphi technique provides an opportunity to solicit, integrate and interpret collective wisdom generated by a prestigious panel of experts. The Delphi technique was originally developed in a series of studies by the RAND Corporation in the 1950s (Dalkey, 1969; Okoli & Pawlowski, 2004; Preble, 1983; Roberts-Davis & Read, 2001). The Delphi exercise is an iterative process of data collection and analysis designed to converge the

Three essential features of the Delphi exercise are: anonymity, controlled feedback, and statistical group response (Briedenhann & Wickens, 2005; Dalkey, 1969). Opinions are sought from the group members anonymously through a questionnaire which reduces the influence of dominant individuals. Controlled feedback refers to the iterative process of data collection and analysis in sequential rounds. Statistical group response is a tool to assure that the opinion of every member of the group is represented in the final response and consensus is achieved (Okoli & Pawlowski, 2004).

4.4.2 Rationale for Using the Delphi Technique

Several characteristics of the Delphi technique attract researchers towards its use. It is a “method for structuring a group communication process so that process is effective in allowing a group of individuals, as a whole, to deal with a complex problem” (Briedenhann & Wickens, 2005, p. 88). The technique involves much less effort on the part of participants in responding to a well-designed questionnaire than participating in a conference (Dalkey, 1969; Okoli & Pawlowski, 2004). It provides an opportunity for individuals to revise their own opinions in the light of the views of other stakeholders (Rayens & Hahn, 2000; Taylor et al., 2007). Consequently, the Delphi technique is being used extensively as a multipurpose tool by government planners and policymakers (Averch, 2004).

The rationale for using the Delphi technique for this phase can be viewed in terms of the main objective of the study: to develop a framework of QA/QE processes for teaching for Pakistan universities. Based on the experiences of U21 institutions, Phase I provided an initial draft for the potential framework of QA processes for Pakistan universities. However, such a framework also needs to take into account the factors that are likely to influence the implementation of QA processes in Pakistan universities. This phase was focused, therefore, on assessing the desirability and likely acceptability of various aspects of QA processes for teaching in Pakistan universities for the sustainability of the potential framework. Although the desirability and the likely acceptability can be assessed through
a traditional survey approach, the Delphi technique presented a stronger methodology for this study.

The complex issue of assessing the desirability and likely acceptability of QA processes requires opinions from experts in the area of QA who also have an adequate knowledge about the social, economic, political, cultural and the developmental aspects of Pakistan universities. The Delphi technique was appropriate because it provided an opportunity for soliciting, integrating and interpreting collective wisdom generated by a well-qualified panel of experts (Chen, 1990; Preble, 1983). It provided an opportunity to seek opinions from the recognized experts with specialized knowledge in the area and provided access to information about the topic (Vázquez-Ramos, Leahy & Hernández, 2007).

One of the benefits of the Delphi is that it is a group method. The research indicates that group judgements, decisions or responses are more accurate than any individual expert’s responses (Eggers & Jones, 1998; Franklin & Hart, 2007; Woudenberg, 1991) or face-to-face discussions (Riggs, 1983). Among other group decision methods, the Delphi is more feasible as it does not require the experts to meet physically (Okoli & Pawlowski, 2004).

The Delphi technique is also useful in the case of relatively limited numbers of experts with knowledge about research questions. The Delphi panel size requirements are modest and it allows for soliciting opinions from a panel of 10 to 18 members (Okoli & Pawlowski, 2004). In this study the Delphi technique was particularly useful because of the limited number of experts in the area of QA/QE, as the concept is relatively new in Pakistan universities.

One of the advantages of the Delphi technique is that it solicits opinions from participants anonymously and provides an opportunity for them to revise their responses in the light of feedback from group (Taylor et al., 2007). Eggers and Jones (1998) report a series of experiments conducted by Dalkey, who discovered that “when anonymous and controlled feedback was provided to members of a decision making group, more accurate decisions were produced than when such groups reached decisions by face to face discussions” (p. 54).

The Delphi technique has also been shown to be useful in cross-cultural research and in policy development (Judd, 1972; Kurth-Schai, Poopatarachewin & Pitiyanuwat, 2000). Kurth-Schai et al. (2000) emphasize that the Delphi is particularly useful in generating educational policies due to its ability to accommodate multiple interpretations. Both of
these aspects (the cross-cultural context, and policy development) are evident in this study because of the inclusion of U21 institutions and implications of the study for developing quality assurance policies for Pakistan.

The Delphi technique has applications in higher education. For instance, the researchers have reported the use of the Delphi method in higher education for developing goals and objectives, improving curriculum, assistance in strategic planning, in developing criteria and in developing and improving policies (Linstone & Turoff, 1975; Murry & Hammons, 1995; Preble, 1983). The Delphi allows educators to effectively identify trends, needs or other factors related to a particular area of education (Yousuf, 2007). All these features of the Delphi are consistent with the nature of the study and, therefore, justify the use of technique for this phase.

4.4.3 The Delphi Panel of Experts

Forty-one academic leaders in Pakistan universities were selected as the Delphi panel of experts. They were primarily selected on the basis of positions they hold. Out of 41 Delphi experts, 11 were the members of the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) and the remaining 30 were the Directors of Quality Enhancement Cells (QECs). The QAC is an Advisory Body to the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) and to the HEC in Pakistan for the matters relating to quality assurance of higher education. The QAC is also responsible for developing mechanisms for assuring and enhancing the quality of higher education in Pakistan. Out of 11 members of the QAC, 6 were vice-chancellors of universities.

The QECs have been established at the institutional level in Pakistan and are responsible for the implementation of QA/QE processes in universities. The QECs are headed by Directors. The members of the QAC and the Directors of QECs are academics from higher education and are representative of universities throughout the country. All the Delphi experts served as the sample of the study using a purposive sampling technique.

In the Delphi technique, the sample consists of qualified and highly trained experts with a specialized knowledge and deep understanding of issues (Hsu & Sandford, 2007; Hung, Altschuld & Lee, 2008). In this study the Delphi experts fulfil the criteria in three ways. First, the experts are leaders in Pakistan universities and were selected on the basis of the positions they hold. Second, they are continually trained professionally in the area of QA through workshops arranged by the HEC. Finally, the QAC is responsible for developing policies regarding QA in higher education at a national level and the Directors of QECs
are responsible for implementing these policies at an institutional level. It is argued that the involvement of the Delphi experts with such characteristics in this study increases the ownership of the framework in Pakistan universities.

### 4.4.4 The Delphi Procedure

All 41 experts were contacted via email and 31 agreed to participate in the study. The Delphi is an iterative process of data collection and analysis and generally comprises two to four rounds (Graham et al., 2003; Nelms & Porter, 1985). Traditionally, the first round of the Delphi solicits opinions from the experts qualitatively. In this study the qualitative round of the Delphi was based on the findings of Phase I of the study. In addition to the qualitative base, the Delphi process comprised two quantitative rounds. The Round I questionnaire was sent to the experts via email, the respondents returned the questionnaire, and the responses were analyzed. In the second round questionnaire, the feedback was provided to the experts in the form of first round group responses along with individual responses. Keeney, Hasson and McKenna (2001) argue that the feedback should be provided to the panel members with their own responses as well as those of the group.

In the second round the questionnaire was again sent to 31 experts via email. This round of the Delphi provided an opportunity for the participants to reconsider their responses in the light of group opinions. The first round of the Delphi resulted in 21 responses from the experts and the number was reduced to 16 in the second round (see Table 6.1, Chapter 6). To increase the response rate, follow-up emails and phone calls were made to the experts. To protect anonymity, the emails were sent individually to each expert from the researcher’s email address. However, the identity of the experts was known to the researcher. Table 4.2 presents the summary of the steps and activities involved in the Delphi technique.

#### A. Criteria for the Consensus Development

The lack of universally agreed consensus criterion is a common issue in the Delphi (Hung et al., 2008; Murry & Hammons, 1995). There are varied consensus criteria and typically researchers define a single consensus criterion depending on the nature of the study. Many researchers have suggested the use of the median with interquartile range and the spread of responses as criteria (Hung et al., 2008; Lang, 1994). Others have preferred the
use of median values in their studies (Hsu & Sandford, 2007; Keeney, Hasson & McKenna, 2006). In short, the choice of the consensus criteria ranges from the use of measures of central tendency (i.e., mean, median and mode) to measures of dispersion (i.e., standard deviation, interquartile). However, the literature illustrates that the median, mode and interquartile range are the most frequently used consensus criteria in Delphi studies.

Table 4.2: Summary of steps and activities involved in the Delphi technique with two rounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps in the Delphi</th>
<th>Activities in the Delphi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Selection of Experts | a. Identification of potential experts  
b. Invitation to participate  
c. Acceptance of invitation |
| Qualitative Round | a. Development of Delphi Questionnaire – On basis of Phase I study  
b. Six-point Likert-type scale |
| Round I Questionnaire | a. Distribution of Delphi Round I  
b. Collect Delphi Questionnaire I  
c. Data analysis and apply four consensus criteria  
d. Development of Delphi Questionnaire II |
| Round II Questionnaire | a. Development of Delphi Questionnaire II  
b. Distribution of Delphi Questionnaire II (Feedback about group and individual responses)  
c. Collect Delphi Questionnaire II  
d. Data analysis and apply four consensus criteria |
| Final consensus | a. Determine level of consensus  
b. Determine level of desirability  
c. Determine level of likely acceptability  
d. Interpretation of Data |

Because of the lack of a universally agreed consensus criterion, the researcher applied four consensus criteria for the analysis of responses in both rounds of the Delphi. The idea of using more than one method for the consensus development is derived from the concept of methodological triangulation, in which all methods corroborate each other (Creswell, 2007; Mason, 2002; Silverman, 2005). While applying various criteria for the consensus development at the initial stages of the data analysis, the researcher observed that many criteria in the literature are the subset of these four consensus criteria. The values of the mean, median, mode, interquartile range and the percentages of responses were used in the four consensus criteria applied in this study.

The first of the four consensus criteria states that an item would achieve consensus if 30 percent or more of the ratings do not fall simultaneously in the lower third and in the upper third of the scale (Elwyn et al., 2006). The second criterion states that an item would achieve consensus if the value of the disagreement index for a specific item is less than one (Fitch et al., 2001). Disagreement index (DI) is defined as the value of IPR
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(Inter-Percentile Range) divided by the value of IPRAS (Inter-Percentile Range Adjusted for Symmetry), as explained in Appendix C. The third criterion states that an item would achieve consensus if it fulfils the conditions of Interquartile Deviation $\leq 1.5$ and Mode-Median $\leq 1$ (Kurth-Schai et al., 2000). The fourth criterion states that items with Quartile Deviation (QD) value of zero would achieve consensus along with items of QD=1.00 for which the percentage of generally positive or generally negative responses is more than 60 percent (Rayens & Hahn, 2000). The details of these four consensus criteria are provided in Appendix C.

B. The Delphi Round I Questionnaire

The first round of the Delphi is usually qualitative, in which opinions are sought from the experts through an open-ended set of items. This round forms the basis for subsequent rounds (Holden & Wedman, 1993). Participants are asked to suggest measures that reflect the needs of the study (Beattie & Mackway-Jones, 2004). The analysis of the qualitative responses in the first round of the Delphi leads to identification of key themes (Powell, 2003). The questionnaire for the quantitative round of the Delphi is usually based on the key themes emerging from the qualitative round (Keeney et al., 2006).

In this study the questionnaire for the first quantitative round of the Delphi was based on findings from the template analysis carried out by the researcher and drawn from 229 policy and practice documents about QA/QE of teaching from 15 sample U21 institutions. The development of a questionnaire on the basis of the results of template analysis is justified in two ways. First, it is consistent with the main objective of developing a ‘framework of QA/QE processes for teaching’ for Pakistan universities based on the experiences of research-intensive universities. Second, the development of a Delphi questionnaire on the basis of themes derived from policy and practice documents of U21 institutions strengthened its base, because it derives from more than the opinions of a small group of experts.

The Delphi Round I questionnaire comprised 127 items that represented the key aspects of QA processes for teaching. The experts were asked to assess these aspects separately for their desirability and likely acceptability in Pakistan universities. In addition to opinions on 127 aspects of QA processes, the respondents were also asked to add any aspects of QA that they considered to be critical for assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching in Pakistan universities. The respondents were further asked to make comments,
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if they wished, on any of the suggested aspects of QA processes for teaching in the context of Pakistan universities.

In the first quantitative round, 31 questionnaires were sent to the experts via email. The experts were asked to assess the desirability and likely acceptability of various aspects of QA processes in Pakistan universities by rating them on the six-point Likert scale, ranging from highly desirable (6) to not desirable at all (1) and from highly acceptable (6) to not acceptable at all (1). The Delphi Round I questionnaire appears in Appendix D. Of the 31 questionnaires, 21 were returned in Round I.

C. The Delphi Round II Questionnaire

Because consensus had already been achieved on 125 aspects for their desirability in the first round, the participants were not asked to assess desirability in the second round of the Delphi. The second round of the Delphi questionnaire, therefore, comprised only those 85 items that did not fulfil all of the four consensus criteria for likely acceptability. The experts in this round were asked to rate these 85 items on the six-point scale ranging from highly acceptable (6) to not acceptable at all (1).

The Delphi Round II questionnaire provided additional information to the participants. First, participants were informed about the group response, along with their individual responses, against each specific item in the first round of the Delphi. The group response for each item was provided to participants in the rating scale columns (i.e. under ratings of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6) of the questionnaire. The number in each square of the rating scale columns represented the number of participants who scored the item at that level in Delphi Round I. An individual response of participants for each specific item in the first round of the Delphi was indicated by an asterisk (*) in the relevant column (see Appendix E).

The participants were asked either to confirm their original response or to revise it in the light of group responses in Round I. Third, they were asked to identify any of the four potential reasons listed in the questionnaire (insufficient developmental resources such as expertise and infrastructure, cost, inappropriate governance and staff resistance) for low acceptability where they had rated an item as ‘not acceptable’ (3 or below) on the Likert scale. The four reasons were derived from the researcher’s personal experience of work in higher education in Pakistan. An ‘others if any’ category was also added to capture the full range of reasons.
The rationale for asking the participants to identify the reasons for the low acceptability of various aspects of QA/QE processes in Pakistan universities was the big gap between the desirability and likely acceptability of those aspects of QA/QE processes. Likewise, it was evident from the analysis of the first round of the Delphi that the likely acceptability of various aspects of QA/QE processes is low in contrast to their desirability in Pakistan. The Round II questionnaire appears in Appendix E. In Round II, 31 questionnaires were sent to the experts via email. Of the 31 questionnaires, 16 were returned in Round II. Considering overall consensus by this point had reached 89.76 percent, and given feedback from some respondents about survey fatigue, it was decided not to undertake any further rounds.

**D. Criteria for the Interpretation of Responses**

The Delphi responses were analyzed and interpreted in two stages. In the first, the four consensus criteria, as reported earlier, were applied to each item to determine whether consensus had been achieved. The second stage determined the level of consensus, level of desirability and the level of likely acceptability for various aspects of QA/QE processes in Pakistan universities. The level of consensus was measured in terms of high consensus, moderate consensus and no consensus. For this purpose, the values of quartile deviations were used (see Table 6.3, Chapter 6). The level of desirability or level of likely acceptability was interpreted in terms of *highly desirable* or *highly acceptable; likely desirable* or *likely acceptable; and likely not desirable* or *likely not acceptable*. This provided insight into the relationship between the nature of items and their level of desirability (level of acceptability) and the level of consensus. For this purpose, median values were used and the details of the criteria are provided in Chapter 6 (Table 6.4). These criteria for measuring the levels of consensus, levels of desirability and levels of likely acceptability were earlier used in a study by Holden and Wedman (1993).

**E. The Modified Scree Test**

A modified scree test was also applied to the data for the interpretation of responses in Round II of the Delphi in the case of likely acceptability. The purpose was to determine the level of consensus and to separate the *highly acceptable* items from the *not acceptable* items. The modified scree test is a form of factor analysis and the idea of its application to the Delphi has been presented by Zoski and Jurs (1991). The modified scree test is a useful statistical tool for analyzing data in order to separate the important and high
priority items from the larger mass of unimportant or trivial items (Zoski & Jurs, 1990). The test is also valuable in making policy decisions based on Delphi surveys (Altschuld & Thomas, 1991).

The modified scree test is a variant of the ‘scree test’ which was developed to separate the trivial factors, or scree, from the nontrivial factors (Zoski & Jurs, 1990). In the modified scree test, the mean values or weighted ratings are plotted along the y-axis and the items or statements are plotted in descending order along the x-axis so that a downward slope is produced. A straight line is drawn along the points with an angle less than 40 degrees along the x-axis. The items at the left side of the graph and above the scree line are important and the items at the right side of the graph and along or below the line are unimportant (Zoski & Jurs, 1990).

In this study weighted means were used in the modified scree test. The weighted mean values for all items were plotted along the y-axis. The items were plotted in descending order of mean values along the x-axis and a downward slope was produced. A straight scree line was drawn along the points with an angle of less than 40 degrees along the x-axis. A cut-off point of 58, at which the scree line and a downward slope intersected each other, emerged and it served as a reference point for the interpretation of the results. The cut-off point is a point along the scree line that divides the important issues from the trivial ones (Race & Planek, 1992). Interpretations were made about the highly acceptable, likely acceptable, likely not acceptable, and not acceptable at all items using the guidelines by Zoski and Jurs (1990) as explained in the preceding paragraph. With few exceptions, the results of the modified scree test were consistent with the results of other consensus criteria as discussed earlier.

4.5 Phase III Study

This section outlines the procedures adopted for Phase III of the study. The study was originally planned in two stages. However, it was extended to a third qualitative phase on the basis of the findings of Phase II. The findings of Phase II suggested that all aspects of QA processes are highly desirable in Pakistan universities. In contrast, the situation for the likely acceptability of QA processes was somewhat different depending on the nature of the various aspects. The findings revealed a significant gap between the desirability and the likely acceptability of various aspects of QA processes in Pakistan universities.
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As a result, the study was extended to a third phase in order to better understand the potential reasons for the low likely acceptability of QA processes in Pakistan universities. The low likely acceptability of various aspects of QA processes in Pakistan universities provides a strong justification for this phase of the study. In fact, the framework of QA processes for teaching for Pakistan universities cannot be developed without identifying and understanding the potential reasons for the low likely acceptability of various aspects of QA processes in Pakistan. For this phase, data were collected by conducting interviews with higher education academics in Pakistan. The following two subsections provide details about the sample of the study and the data collection and analysis procedures. This phase was used to illustrate, elaborate and enhance the results of Phase II.

4.5.1 The Phase III Research Sample

For this phase, 30 Directors of Quality Enhancement Cells (QECs) along with 22 lecturers and senior lecturers working at their PhDs at The University of Auckland, with teaching experience in Pakistan universities, served as a population. Using purposive and convenience sampling techniques, the 6 Directors of QECs along with all 22 lecturers and senior lecturers were selected as a sample. The selection of the Directors of QECs and the lecturers as a sample is justified as explained below.

The selection of the six Directors of QECs is justified because they participated in Phase II of the study and thus were aware of its nature. Similarly, they were particularly informative and aware of the academic culture of Pakistan universities because of their work experience in higher education in general and quality assurance in particular. The selection of the lecturers as a sample is justified because they are representatives from 13 public sector universities in Pakistan. Their selection as a sample is also important because many QA/QE processes are directly relevant to them. They also provided useful insight into the potential implementation of QA/QE processes for teaching in Pakistan universities. Their selection is also justified in terms of convenience sampling. Finally, many of them were enthusiastic about participating in the study due to its relevance to their profession.

4.5.2 Data Collection and Data Analysis

The data were collected in two stages. In the first, the semi-structured interviews were conducted with the six Directors of QECs in Pakistan. All these Directors participated in
both rounds of the Delphi. Consequently, they were aware of various aspects of QA/QE processes. They were asked to state the potential reasons for the low likely acceptability of various aspects of QA processes in Pakistan. In the second stage, three semi-structured focus group interviews were conducted with 22 lecturers (or senior lecturers) in 4 groups. The participants, in each focus group, were briefly informed about the nature of QA processes followed by the Delphi findings. The participants were then asked to state, each in turn, the potential reasons for the low likely acceptability of QA/Q processes in the context of Pakistan universities. The interviews were conducted in Urdu and were transcribed into English later.

The analysis of interviews was carried out using the same template analysis technique as used for the analysis of policy and practice documents from U21 institutions. Section 4.3 provides details of the template analysis. For this phase, the analysis started with four a priori themes: insufficient developmental resources, cost, inappropriate governance and staff resistance. These themes were listed in the Round II questionnaire as potential reasons for the likely low acceptability of various aspects of QA/QE processes in Pakistan universities. The rationale for using these four themes as a priori themes is because the experts, in the Round II, predominantly indicated these themes as potential reasons for the likely low acceptability of QA/QE processes.

The data were approached with an a priori set of themes and with a provision for other themes to emerge from within the data at later stages of the analysis. Four themes facilitated initial coding of the data set and provided tentative classification of the potential reasons for likely low acceptability of various categories of QA/QE processes in Pakistan universities. Using the qualitative data analysis software NVivo8, an initial template was developed after coding ‘meaning chunks’ within the data from the interviews. The initial template was applied to the data and final template was developed. The final template provided the basis for interpretation of the data.

4.6 Integration of Results

This study was conducted in three phases. All three phases were sequentially connected. The results from Phase I of the study were used to inform the development for Phase II, that is, the development of an initial draft for the framework of QA processes for teaching for Pakistan universities. Likewise, the results from Phase III of the study were used to
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illustrate, elaborate and enhance the results obtained in Phase II. The results were interpreted separately for each phase. An additional integration of the data from all three phases occurred at the final interpretation and discussion stage. The integration of the data at this stage was essential to achieve the main objective of the study. All three phases can be viewed in parts and thus were not sufficient in achieving the main objective alone. However, the integration of the results from three phases made achievement of the main objective of the study possible.

4.7 Ethical Considerations

There were no ethical concerns in Phase I because the data were publicly available on the websites of respective universities. However, the researcher applied for ethics approval to the University of Auckland Human Participant Ethics Committee for Phase II and Phase III of the study and permission was granted. In both phases, the participants were given the right to withdraw from the study at any time during the data collection and even after the data had been collected. In addition, the information sought through questionnaire and interviews was confidential and anonymity of the participants was preserved. The data were stored on the departmental computer or on a personal laptop, both of which were password protected.

As a part of ethical considerations, Participant Information Sheets were provided to the participants in order to explain the nature of their participation in Phase II and Phase III of the study. Participants agreeing to participate in both phases completed Consent Forms. Participant Information Sheets and Consent Forms for both phases can be found in the appendices (F-I). Copies of Participant Information Sheets and Consent Forms (for Phase II and Phase III) were also provided to the University of Auckland Human Participant Ethics Committee for the ethics approval and resulting permission letters are also in the appendices.

4.8 Conclusions

For this study, the hybrid mixed method design was employed. The study was conducted in three phases. For Phase I and Phase II, the exploratory mixed method design was used. For Phase II and Phase III, the explanatory mixed method design was used. For Phase I, the data were collected and analyzed using the qualitative method template analysis. The
results of the first qualitative phase were used to inform the development of the second quantitative phase, i.e. the development of a potential framework of QA/QE processes for teaching for Pakistan universities. For Phase II, the data were collected and analyzed quantitatively using the Delphi technique. Finally, the results of the third qualitative phase were used to illustrate, elaborate and enhance the results obtained from the second quantitative phase. For Phase III, the data were collected and analyzed qualitatively by conducting interviews and by using template analysis. The data were connected sequentially for all three phases. The results from all phases were interpreted separately. An additional integration of the data from all three phases occurred at the final interpretation and discussion stage.
Chapter 5  
Quality Assurance Processes for Teaching in Research-Led Universities

5.1 Overview

This chapter reports the results of Phase I of the study. This phase was concerned with the analysis of 229 policy and practice documents from Universitas 21 (U21) member universities relating to the assurance and enhancement of the quality of their teaching. The focus of the analysis was twofold. First, it aimed at identifying and classifying quality assurance processes for teaching in U21 institutions. Second, it examined the nature of the quality processes to determine their focus on either quality assurance or on quality enhancement.

5.2 Method

From the 15 sample U21 institutions, 229 policy and practice documents concerning QA of teaching provided the basis for this phase of the study. These documents are publicly available on the websites of the respective U21 institutions. Chapter 4 provides the rationale for the selection of the U21 network as a population for this phase of the study, and the subsequent selection of the sample universities as well as the documents. For the analysis of these documents, a qualitative technique, that of template analysis, was used. Template analysis technique allows the data to be analyzed thematically. It comprises five steps, namely: identification of an a priori set of themes; initial coding; development of an initial template; development of the final template; and interpretation of the final template. Chapter 4 provides details about the way these five steps were applied in this study. Figure 4.3 in Chapter 4 presents a diagram of these steps.

5.3 Overview of Data Analysis

The template analysis started with the identification of a priori themes. Two sources were used for this purpose. First, the literature that was particularly focused on QA of teaching in higher education was reviewed. The second source was a small sample of documents from The University of Auckland relating to quality assurance (enhancement) of teaching and learning which went through an initial reading and coding. Five themes emerged
from the literature and documents from The University of Auckland, namely: the review and evaluation of teaching and courses; professional development of academic staff; scholarship of teaching and learning; recognition and rewards for scholarly teaching; and teaching portfolios. These were termed as a priori themes.

The initial stage of the data analysis started from these five a priori themes. A sample of 59 documents from 4 universities in Australia and New Zealand was used to assess the coverage of the themes and to create the initial template. The meaning chunks within 59 documents were first coded by hand on printed copies followed by electronic coding using the qualitative data analysis software NVivo. Examples of the coding are illustrated in Table 4.1 in Chapter 4. The five a priori themes facilitated the initial coding of the data and provided the tentative classification of QA processes.

As a result of this process, an initial template comprising nine themes emerged, with a number of subthemes under each main theme. In addition, a general category about the features of quality was created in the initial template. Finally, the nine main themes and the general category in the initial template were applied to all of the remaining documents. The documents were reread to check that all the data were adequately covered by the nine main themes and the general category. In this process, the existing themes were modified, deleted or new themes were inserted as required by the dataset. This process led to development of the final template that provided the basis for the interpretation of the data.

The final template, in its refined form, resulted in 219 themes (main and subthemes) that represented various aspects of QA processes for teaching in the sample research-led universities. In the final template, there were eight main themes and one general category (first-level themes) at the first horizontal level of hierarchy and the vertical range of hierarchy was from two to five levels depending on the explanation of the main themes. Eight main themes in the final template represented eight broad categories of quality assurance processes for teaching in U21 institutions. Further analysis of the general category revealed various features of quality teaching in research-led universities. Figure 5.1 indicates the transition of first-level themes from the a priori stage to the initial template, and to the final template stage.
The final template revealed eight broad categories of QA processes for teaching with a number of subcategories under each main category. These eight categories are: teaching and learning plans, policies, and processes; system of audits and reviews; teaching quality appraisal processes; review and evaluation of teaching and courses; curriculum design, development, and approval; professional development of academic staff; scholarship of teaching and learning; and recognition and rewards for scholarly teaching. In addition, several complex subthemes were identified within each broad category in order to further explain its various aspects. Both major themes and subthemes provided a valuable insight into the nature of each process to determine its tendency towards QA or QE. Each of the eight broad categories of QA processes for teaching along with its corresponding major subcategories is indicated in Table 5.1.
Table 5.1: Classification of QA processes against their major subcategories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eight QA Processes</th>
<th>Major Subthemes against each Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Learning (T/L) Plans, Policies and Processes</td>
<td>T/L plans at faculty/institutional level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policies and processes in accordance with T/L plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitor and report progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Update policies and processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disseminate policies and processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System of Audits and/or Reviews at the Department, Faculty and Institutional Level</td>
<td>Internal audits/reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal audits/reviews in compliance with external</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External audits/reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public reporting on QA/QE measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Quality Appraisal (TQA)</td>
<td>TQA for schools/faculties through TLPIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allocate funding on the basis TLPIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TQA for academics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Approval</td>
<td>New proposals within departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approval from faculty/university committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal/external validation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development (PD)</td>
<td>PD activities for academics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PD certificate in university T/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incentives for PD activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and Evaluation of Teaching and Courses</td>
<td>Student evaluation at national level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student evaluation at faculty/institutional level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer review of teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purposes - Improvement, monitoring, and rewards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL)</td>
<td>SoTL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching fellowships and grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching-research nexus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition, Rewards and Incentives</td>
<td>Rewards in appointments, probation, tenure and promotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching excellent awards (institutional and national)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External and internal incentives – (For institutions and for individuals)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because the final template has its origin in 229 policy and practice documents focused on QA/QE of teaching in 15 sample U21 universities, it not only provided the basis for the classification of QA processes in research-led universities but also demonstrated how U21 institutions view quality teaching. The general category in the final template was included for this reason. While the focus of this analysis is on the processes of QA and QE, the role of ‘teaching quality’ is also important because it defines expectations. The findings of the analysis are, therefore, presented in two parts: first, the key features of quality teaching in U21 institutions (i.e. the general category), in section 5.4; and second, the eight broad categories of QA processes for teaching, in section 5.5. Section 5.6, the final section, is focused on the nature of the relationship between these processes.

**5.4 General Category: Features of Quality Teaching**

This section discusses the key features of quality teaching in research-led universities. These features emerged from the template analysis. In the final template, there were eight
main themes and one general category. There were 12 sub-themes in this general category of the final template. Further analysis of these sub-themes revealed an underlying connection to the concept of quality teaching as it is defined in research-led universities. In most instances, these features emerged from the analysis of teaching and learning plans and the guidelines that inform teaching in U21 institutions. In fact, these features define the values and expectations that quality teaching is intended to maintain in U21 institutions. The following 12 features of quality teaching are significant in this regard.

**Disciplinary expertise:** The research-led universities (that is, network of U21 institutions) believe that quality teaching requires teachers to have an in-depth knowledge of their disciplines gained through their engagement with current research in the discipline. For instance, The University of Auckland (2006b) believes that “teaching should be research-based, challenging, responsive to the needs of diverse learners, and underpinned by sound disciplinary and pedagogical expertise”. This feature of quality teaching appears to be consistent with the first of two domains of knowledge, suggested by Biggs (2003), which requires academics to conduct research in their disciplines with a particular focus on teaching and learning in order to improve their teaching practice.

**Pedagogical knowledge:** This feature of quality teaching requires teachers to have in-depth knowledge of ‘how students learn’, that is, pedagogical knowledge and skills aligned to this. It requires teachers to have an “understanding of a wide range of teaching, learning and assessment methods, of the principles which support student learning, and the ability to select and apply different teaching methods in appropriate contexts” (University of Auckland, 2004b).

**Scholarly engagement:** This feature of quality teaching requires teachers to be engaged in scholarly activities aimed at continually enhancing their teaching practices and the learning experiences of students. The activities may include professional development, self-evaluation; leadership activities; responsiveness to accountability; reflective practices; and the acquisition of information/technology skills.

**Focus on students’ learning outcomes:** The U21 institutions view quality teaching in terms of learning outcomes for students. It was evident that these universities are placing an increasing emphasis on enhancing the learning experiences of students. As a result, they are encouraging student-focused approaches to teaching and deep approaches to learning. For example, the principles that guide teaching and learning at the University of
Melbourne (2005) are “intended to promote culturally-sensitive and student-centred practices of good teaching which ensure an optimal teaching and learning environment for both Australian and overseas students of the University”. In the same way, the National University of Singapore (NUS) (n.d.f) view quality teaching in this way:

As an institution of higher learning, we are committed to the view of teaching as the activity of bringing about learning (facilitating learning). Learning can take place without teaching, but the teacher’s activity cannot be regarded as teaching unless it results in learning. Hence the quality of teaching depends on the quality of the learning outcomes facilitated by the teacher. (NUS, n.d.f)

**Engaging students in learning:** Quality teaching requires teachers to engage students in the learning process by using teaching methods and strategies that actively involve learners. Quality teachers understand that “students learn better when they are closely engaged with the subjects they are studying” (University of Auckland, 2004b). As a result, teachers employ “appropriate teaching methods and strategies that actively involve learners” (University of British Columbia, n.d.a). They encourage innovative “teaching practices that actively engage students” (University of Queensland, 2007f). Effective teaching fosters students’ personal engagement by recognizing and building on their prior experiences and knowledge. It engages students in the learning by relating their studies to professional and disciplinary contexts to enhance their employability.

**Engaging students in high-level activities:** This feature of quality teaching requires teachers to engage students in critical thinking and reflective practices by encouraging a dialogue between students and teachers and among students. For instance, ‘effective teaching’ at the University of Nottingham is expected to engage students with “high-level academic enquiry, reflection and debate, to think critically for themselves, ask questions, solve problems and achieve and articulate creative syntheses of knowledge, theoretical understanding and skills” (n.d.e).

**Inclusive experiences:** The focus of this feature of quality teaching is on the creation of inclusive teaching and learning experiences by the accommodation of diverse and flexible learning styles in curricula, teaching modes and also at the levels of support. For instance, the guidelines on learning that inform teaching at the University of New South Wales (2004a) state that “individual differences and cultural diversity are recognised, valued, and harnessed in both teaching and curriculum design”. Likewise, effective teaching at
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The University of Auckland (2004b) attempts to accommodate the “diverse learning styles and approaches in the curriculum, the classroom, and learning resources”.

**Focus on self-learning**: This view of quality teaching encourages students to engage in self-learning. Teachers are expected, therefore, to adopt strategies that support learning in collaboration and cooperation with peers (i.e. students). The rationale behind this is that “when students are encouraged to take responsibility for their own learning, they are more likely to develop higher-order thinking skills such as analysis, synthesis, and evaluation” (University of New South Wales, 2005).

**Alignment of activities with learning outcomes**: The focus of this feature of quality teaching is on the consistency of teaching methods, learning activities and assessment practices with desired learning outcomes. For example, the University of Edinburgh (2001a) states that the “methods of student assessment should match teaching aims and desired learning outcomes”. This view of quality teaching is consistent with Biggs’ (2003) model of constructive alignment. The key elements of the model include: the curriculum; teaching methods; assessment procedures; classroom climate including interaction with students; and institutional climate including procedures and rules (Biggs & Tang, 2007). This consistency among the components of the model is more likely to encourage deep engagement of students.

**Provision of feedback**: Quality teaching requires that teachers provide meaningful and timely feedback to students by adopting appropriate and diverse assessment methods. For instance, the teaching and learning profile at the University of Queensland (2007f) places an emphasis on enhancing the “quality and rigour of assessment practices and standards” to “ensure the provision of high quality and timely feedback”. Likewise, the principles that guide teaching and learning at the University of Melbourne (2007a) state: “Feedback is timely and focused on student development. Feedback is tailored to the individual student’s performance as well as the performance of the cohort overall”.

**Focus on the use of technology**: This aspect of quality teaching places an emphasis on the use of information and communication technologies in teaching and learning. For instance, the University of Hong Kong (2005) is “developing the use of new technologies both to support its teaching and research and as an integral part of its academic programmes”.
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Provision of support to students: Quality teaching in the U21 institutions is intended to support students in the learning process in order to enhance their experiences. Effective teachers “identify students who are experiencing academic difficulties and offer appropriate guidance or assistance” (University of Auckland, 2004b). This view of quality teaching is essentially linked with learning. Prosser and Trigwell (1999) argue that effective teaching needs to be defined in terms of helping students learn.

It can be concluded from the analysis of these features of quality teaching that these research-intensive universities view quality teaching in terms of enhancing students’ learning outcomes. In most instances, these features of quality teaching are consistent with student-focused approaches to teaching and deep approaches to learning. For example, the literature shows that deep approaches to study are based on students’ intentions to gain understanding and seek meaning from their studies by engaging them with learning tasks (Fry, Ketteridge & Marshall, 2009; Prosser & Trigwell, 1999; Richardson, Dawson, Sadlo, Jenkins & Mcinnes, 2007).

Furthermore, these features of quality teaching are consistent with the views presented by several scholars about quality teaching (Biggs, 2003; Fry et al., 2009; Prosser & Trigwell, 1999; Ramsden, 2003). Most of these scholars agree that the purpose of teaching is to facilitate learning and, therefore, quality teaching is being predicated on an understanding of how students learn as well as teachers’ awareness about learners’ needs (Fry et al., 2009). In most instances the key aspects of quality teaching in U21 institutions are consistent with the literature. However, it is argued that quality assurance processes for teaching also need to be designed in this context. The next section is particularly focused on eight broad categories of QA processes for teaching in U21 institutions.

5.5 Eight Categories of Quality Assurance Processes

The template analysis findings revealed eight broad categories of QA processes for teaching. This section examines in-depth each of the eight categories of QA processes for teaching. The analysis was focused on understanding the nature of each of these eight categories to determine their tendency towards either quality assurance or quality enhancement. The literature illustrates that there is no clear-cut distinction between these two contrasting approaches to quality (QA and QE) (see Chapter 2). They represent the two ends of a continuum along which a wide range of quality assurance processes fall. All
universities can be placed along a QA–QE continuum with reference to their QA practices relating to teaching and learning.

While seeking to understand the nature of QA processes for teaching, the analysis was guided by the work of Biggs (2003) and by the characteristics of QA and QE as discussed by many academics and researchers. For example, QA approaches are usually summative (Bingham & Ottewill, 2001); promote conformity (D’Andrea & Gosling, 2005; Dew & Nearing, 2004); have more characteristics of “administrative burden” (Ramsden, 2003, p.217); and are about accountability (Biggs, 2003; Sachs, 1995). QE approaches, on the contrary, are characterized by a sense of ownership; recognition and rewards; reflective practices; professional development; and by the dissemination of good practices (Lomas & Nicholls, 2005; McKimm, 2003; Raban, 2007). The focus of the next subsection is on the first category of QA processes that emerged from this study.

5.5.1 Teaching and Learning Plans, Policies and Processes

The analysis suggested that the commitment of U21 institutions towards excellence in teaching and learning begins with the development of teaching and learning plans at the department, faculty and institutional level. Generally these plans are developed on a five-yearly basis and are statements of teaching and learning goals and objectives, along with strategies to achieve them. The progress towards the goals is reviewed on an annual basis with a regular system of monitoring and reporting. In order to support the implementation of teaching and learning plans at faculty and at institutional level, policies, processes and guidelines are developed accordingly. These plans, policies and processes have a number of important features.

The first feature is that they tend to be externally motivated. The findings of the analysis suggested that the drivers behind developing and implementing teaching and learning plans in U21 institutions, in many cases, are external and generally motivated by incentives from funding bodies. For instance, the University of Nottingham (n.d.d) developed its Learning and Teaching Strategy 2002-05 “in response to the HEFCE [Higher Education Funding Council for England] Document 02/24, Teaching Quality Enhancement Fund”. Likewise, many activities in the Learning and Teaching Strategy 2007-09 of the University of Birmingham (2007d) are “funded by the HEFCE Teaching Quality Enhancement Fund”.
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It is also a feature of teaching and learning plans or strategies that the progress against identified targets is monitored on a regular basis by the faculties, universities and external bodies and is reported accordingly. For example, a policy document from The University of Auckland (2007) states: “The University reports twice yearly against its Strategic Plan to the University Council. Faculties report annually on selected themes in their Teaching and Learning Plans”. Likewise, a document from the University of Hong Kong (2005) states: “To fulfill our mission we have six major goals. These goals guide our planning strategies, which we review and update annually”.

Teaching and learning plans, policies and processes are generally developed at the faculty level with an emphasis on enhancing the quality of teaching and learning. However, attention is paid to the consistency and alignment of the faculty-level plans, policies and processes with those developed at the institutional level. For instance, the University of New South Wales (2007c) believes in a Learning and Teaching Plan for the Faculty (and school plans where they exist), which is “consistent with the UNSW Learning and Teaching Plan, 2005-07” and that teaching and learning “initiatives in the Faculty, Schools and Departments are aligned with the Faculty/School plans”.

It was also evident that U21 institutions have established a range of networks, centres, and committees at faculty and institutional level for supporting the development, implementation and review of teaching and learning plans, policies, processes and guidelines related to QA of teaching. For instance, the Committee on Education and the Learning and Teaching Unit at the University of New South Wales (2005) provide support to “Faculties in contextualising the implementation of UNSW learning and teaching policies in ways that are relevant to their students and staff”. Likewise, “the ‘Senate Teaching Quality Committee’ is responsible for overseeing teaching quality assurance in the HKU” (University of Hong Kong, 2006).

An important feature of this process is that a collaborative approach is encouraged while developing, implementing and evaluating teaching and learning plans, policies and processes by engaging faculties, departments, individuals and related committees in the processes. For instance, the teaching and learning strategy at the University of Glasgow (2006) was “initially drafted by a cross-institutional group of academic staff” and then was “developed through consultation with colleagues, academics, support staff and students”. Likewise, the University of New South Wales (2005) believes that a “meaningful policy is developed when the Faculties, Schools and individuals are engaged
in the development, implementation and evaluation of learning and teaching policies, plans and activities”.

One of the features of teaching and learning plans, policies and processes is that they place an emphasis on enhancing the quality of teaching and learning. For instance, the teaching and learning enhancement plan at the University of Queensland (1999a) places an emphasis on the “continuous enhancement of teaching and learning in the University by providing strategies for improvement”. In the same way, “Learning and Teaching related issues are given due prominence in the development of institutional and school policies, strategies and activities” at the University of Birmingham (2007d).

One of the features of teaching and learning plans, policies and processes is that their development and implementation is informed by international research and effective practice in this area. For instance, the Centre for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Melbourne (2005) provides “research-based advice in areas such as the design and implementation of quality assurance policies and processes”. Similarly, a document from the University of New South Wales (2007a) states: “In designing the CATEI Process [Course and Teaching Evaluation Process], the intention has been to incorporate what the latest and best research and good practice ideas tell us”.

Teaching and learning plans, policies, processes and guidelines in U21 institutions are reviewed and updated on a regular basis in order to consider the emerging needs of these universities in teaching and learning. For example, a document from the University of Hong Kong (2005) states: “these goals guide our planning strategies, which we review and update annually”. Likewise, a document from the University of Queensland (2006) states: “the guidelines are reviewed annually by the Teaching and Learning Committee following the receipt of recommendations from the Awards’ Shortlisting Committee”.

The final feature of the plans, policies, processes and guidelines is that they are widely disseminated (through seminars, web pages, brochures, booklets, etc.) to all concerned to create awareness of their benefits and to provide a way to act upon them. For instance, a document from The University of Auckland (2006b) establishes the importance of being “aware and having a good understanding of institutional goals, policies, guidelines and practices that are critical and relevant to teaching and learning”. Likewise, the University of Birmingham (2007d) ensures that their “staff are familiar with the University and the School/department Learning and Teaching Strategies, and [pay] due attention to the
content of these in the design, delivery, assessment and quality assurance and enhancement of teaching”.

To summarize, the starting point for assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching in universities is the development of teaching and learning plans, policies, and processes at department, faculty and institutional level. These plans are statements of teaching and learning goals and objectives along with strategies to achieve them. The policies and processes are developed accordingly. The analysis revealed that the focus of plans and policies is on enhancing the quality of teaching and learning with an emphasis on collaboration. They are widely disseminated. In many instances, these plans tend to be externally motivated by funding bodies. Progress towards the goals is monitored and reviewed on an annual basis and is reported to all concerned.

5.5.2 System of Audits and Reviews

One of the significant categories of QA processes for teaching in U21 institutions, which emerged from the template analysis, is an internal/external system of reviews/audits at department, faculty and institutional level for assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching and learning. Three types of audits/reviews are common in these research-led universities. These three types are the subcategories of the main process and can be distinguished on the basis of their focus and the drivers behind them. The focus of three types of audits/reviews is either on quality assurance, on quality enhancement, or on both. The drivers behind each of these subcategories vary from internal to the external. The following subsections are focused on each of the three subcategories.

A. Internal Audits and Reviews

The first subcategory an internal system of audits/reviews in compliance with institutional procedures aimed at assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching and learning. The analysis revealed that these types of audits and reviews are prevalent in eight sample universities and are usually conducted at the department, school and/or faculty level. They test the compliance of department-, school- and faculty-level QA procedures for teaching-related activities against those of the institution. The emphasis is on improving the internal QA and QE procedures of the departments, schools and faculties by providing support to them. These audits/reviews are usually aimed at identifying effective practices and emerging trends in the area and dissemination of these to the broader university
community (to other departments and schools). Likewise, support is provided to the schools and faculties in the case of identification of weaknesses or areas for improvement.

The analysis revealed three key steps in an internal system of audits/reviews. They begin with the provision to the audit panel of key documents, related to QA and QE of teaching and learning, by the department, school or faculty. In the second step, the audit/review panel conducts the audit by testing the compliance of the department, school or faculty-level QA procedures against those of the institution. The panel prepares a report which usually comprises commendations and recommendations. The audit/review process ends with follow-up activities for schools and faculties in the light of self-assessment and recommendations made by the panel. The following four features of this subcategory of audits/reviews emerged from the analysis:

The first feature is that most QA and QE procedures in this subcategory (internal audits and reviews) are based on self-monitoring of teaching-related activities by the school or faculty concerned, followed by a report to the QA and QE committees at faculty and institutional level. The analysis revealed that it is a flexible approach to QA and QE of teaching and courses and takes into account the needs of departments, schools and faculties. For example, a practice document from the University of Edinburgh (UoE) states:

> The College Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committees (CQAEC) are key committees that have responsibility for ensuring the implementation of all procedures relating to quality at an undergraduate level. CQAECs report annually to the Senatus Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee (SQAEC), which has a remit to consider internal quality audit and assurance procedures. These annual reports discuss the college’s procedures and practices in course monitoring, programme review, and external examining (UoE, n.d.m).

Another feature of internal audits/reviews is that they adopt a collaborative approach to QA. The audit/review is based on a department or faculty’s self-evaluation report. This report is usually prepared by engaging academic staff and students in the process. For instance, the audit process at the University of Glasgow (2007) requires departments to provide a Self Evaluation Report (SER) to the audit panel. This report is “prepared by the Head of Department in conjunction with other staff”. In addition, it is “strongly recommended that the authors of the SER consult staff and students on an early draft to
seek feedback on whether or not it is a fair representation of the Department and seek endorsement by staff and students before submission”.

It is also a feature of internal audits that they test the compliance of a school or faculty’s QA mechanisms against those of the institution with a view to identifying effective practices, areas for improvement, and to offer support on areas that need attention. For instance, the aim of audits at the University of Birmingham (2007) is “to identify, encourage and disseminate good practice, and to identify and eliminate weaknesses”. Similarly, the aim of audits at the University of Melbourne (2005) is to “identify best practice and areas for improvement within departments and to assist in establishing improved processes and performance outcomes on a continuous basis”.

The final feature of internal audits is that they provide opportunities for departments, schools and faculties to reflect upon or test the effectiveness of their QA systems. The audits encompass the elements of both QA and QE. For example, the nature of these reviews at the University of Glasgow (2007) is evident from a practice document that states: “an increased focus on recognising and promoting quality enhancement was also introduced to sit alongside the review process’s longstanding function in quality assurance”. The internal audits place emphasis on teaching and learning activities and their integrative nature is evident from the Birmingham Integrated Quality Assurance and Enhancement System (BIQAES) of the University of Birmingham (2007d); it “encompasses all of the arrangements that the University has put in place to monitor, review and enhance academic standards, the quality of its learning, teaching and assessment and the academic support given to students”.

To conclude, the internal audits/reviews are usually conducted at department or faculty-level. These audits are based on internal self-evaluation of QA/QE activities and test the effectiveness of the internal system in line with procedures of the institution. The focus of reviews is on enhancing the quality of teaching and learning by identifying effective practices and areas for improvements. Support is also provided to the departments and faculties by the institutions. Furthermore, monitoring aspects are not ignored. The next subsection is focused on internal systems of audits/reviews in compliance with external bodies.
B. Internal Audits and Reviews in Compliance with External Bodies

This subcategory is an internal system of audits and reviews, in compliance with external bodies, aimed at assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching and learning. The analysis revealed that this type of system of audits/reviews is prevalent in seven sample universities. The audits/reviews require universities to develop their own QA systems in compliance with the criteria developed by external bodies, in particular, funding bodies. The key steps in this second subcategory are approximately the same as those involved the first subcategory, that is, self-assessment by department/school, conduct of audit and review, and follow-up activities. The following key features of this subcategory of audits and reviews emerged from the analysis:

The first feature is that this subcategory has emerged as a result of a shift in ‘QA responsibilities’ from external bodies to the institutions. The institutions are, however, bound to respond to the initiatives and requirements of external bodies concerned with QA. In most instances, these external bodies are Quality Assurance Agencies and the Funding Bodies at a national level. The focus of audits has also shifted from QA towards QE. This shift in focus is evident from the following excerpt:

Between 2001 and 2003, SHEFC (now the Scottish Funding Council) developed a new, enhancement-led approach, to replace external subject review carried out by the Quality Assurance Agency. This approach, introduced in 2003, places a greater reliance and emphasis on internal institutional review processes to safeguard quality and standards and to promote enhancement. (University of Glasgow, 2007)

The next feature of this subcategory of audits and reviews is that they tend to adopt an integrated approach to QA of teaching. The assumption is strengthened by the fact that universities are required to submit enhancement-led reports to the external bodies. On the one hand, the focus of these audits and reviews is on the enhancement of teaching and learning. The accountability aspect is also evident because universities need to assure external bodies that quality of teaching and learning is maintained. For example, the University of Glasgow (2007) conducts internal reviews of teaching and learning activities but an annual report is “made to the Scottish Funding Council on the progress and outcome of DPTLA [departmental programmes of teaching, learning and assessment] reviews”.
The final feature of this subcategory is that audits/reviews require universities to provide information to the public on their capacity for assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching and learning. For example, the University of Birmingham (2007) provides “public information on the University’s capacity to assure the quality and standards of its awards”. In many instances, the requirement has been initiated by the funding bodies. For example, a practice document from the University of Nottingham (2004) states: “there is now a requirement for HEIs to publish information about their provision on a Teaching Quality Information web-site. The publication of information has been initiated by the Higher Education Funding Councils and sectoral bodies”.

In conclusion, this subcategory of audits/reviews has emerged as a result of a shift in QA responsibilities from the external bodies to the institutions. Also indicated is a shift in focus from QA activities toward QE. The audit activities, in this subcategory, are carried out within the institution in compliance with the external bodies. This subcategory thus tends to adopt an integrated approach to QA of teaching. The theme of audits is to enhance the quality of teaching and learning through internally developed procedures and to provide information to the public in this regard.

C. External Audits and Reviews

The third subcategory of audits/reviews is an external system of audits with an emphasis on assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching and learning. This type of audit/review is prevalent in seven of the sample universities and is generally known as ‘institutional audit’, ‘academic audit’ or an ‘accreditation process’. These audits are usually conducted on a periodic basis by national bodies and include audits of QA systems and activities related to teaching and learning. As an example, a document from the University of Nottingham (2004) describes: “Under the revised framework the QAA will continue with Institutional review, with the expectation that the primary responsibility for quality assurance lies with the institutions”.

The analysis revealed three key steps in external systems of audit/review. They begin with the submission of key documents by the universities to the audit bodies. These documents describe a university’s QA system. Appropriate evidence is provided by the university to the audit bodies for the support of their claims. In the second step, the audit teams monitor various aspects of quality assurance mechanisms, validate claims and make recommendations. Finally, the universities are required to respond to audit
recommendations concerning QA mechanisms. The following key features of this subcategory of audits/reviews emerged from the analysis.

The first feature of external audits/reviews is that they adopt an integrated approach to QA because the audit process involves aspects of both accountability and enhancement. The focus on both aspects is obvious at the Tecnológico de Monterrey University (n.d.b) since it needs to generate a Compliance Certification and Educational Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) “in order to ratify its accreditation”. Likewise, the accountability aspect of audits is evident from the following excerpt of The University of Auckland (2007): the New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit “conducts periodic audits on various aspects of academic quality at New Zealand universities. These audits are undertaken on the basis of an external review panel’s assessment and validation of a self-review portfolio prepared by each university”.

Another feature of external audits/reviews is that the universities are required to publish their audit reports with a focus on enhancement. The requirement is usually motivated by funding agencies. For example, the University of Glasgow (2007) publishes its DPTLA review on the Internet. The progress and outcome of the DPTLA review is reported to the QAA and to the Scottish Funding Council with a focus on QE. The complex and integrative nature of the audit is evident from the following excerpt:

DPTLA is also an integral component of the Scottish Funding Council’s quality enhancement framework. Consequently, the process is subject to scrutiny by QAA reviewers as part of the Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR) visit. DPTLA guidelines and reports form part of the documentation submitted for ELIR, and staff and students of departments that have been reviewed are invited to meet with the QAA reviewers to discuss DPTLA and learning, teaching and assessment issues generally. (University of Glasgow, 2007)

It can be concluded that a system of audits and reviews at department, faculty and institutional level is one of the broad processes that U21 institutions use for assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching and learning. Three subcategories of audits can be distinguished on the basis of their focus either on QE or QA and the drivers behind them. Their focus varies from QE to QA and drivers vary from internal to external. The focus of internal audits is on QE and activities are carried out within the institution. On the other hand, the focus of external audits is on QA and activities are carried out in compliance
with external bodies. Located in the middle, is a second subcategory which adopts an integrated approach to quality: internal audits in compliance with external bodies. The focus of this subcategory is on both QA and QE.

5.5.3 Teaching Quality Appraisal (TQA) Processes

One of the broad categories of QA processes for teaching in research-led universities, that emerged from analysis, is ‘teaching quality appraisal processes for departments, schools, faculties and for academic staff’. This strategy for assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching and learning is prevalent in ten sample research-led universities. The analysis revealed two prominent subcategories of this broad process. The first is TQA processes for departments, schools and faculties. In the second subcategory, there is a concept of TQA processes for academic staff generally in the form of performance reviews or professional development reviews.

A. TQA Processes for Departments, Schools and Faculties

The analysis revealed a subcategory of TQA processes aimed at examining the performance of departments, schools and of faculties on an annual basis through a set of teaching and learning performance indicators. This process places an emphasis on: monitoring and evaluating the quality of teaching and learning at faculty level; identification of areas for improvement in teaching-related activities, and subsequent action taken by faculties through reflective practices; the provision of assistance and support to faculties for improving their performance; and an allocation of funding to the faculties on the basis of their overall performance in teaching and learning.

This subcategory bears a close resemblance to the first subcategory of audits and reviews, namely: internal audits and reviews in compliance with institutional procedures. The difference is that, unlike internal audits, TQA processes monitor the performance of departments, schools and faculties through a pre-specified set of teaching and learning performance indicators (TLPIs). The template analysis revealed that this subcategory of TQA processes is prevalent in the sample universities from Australia. The key features of this subcategory are evident from the following excerpt:

The Teaching Quality Appraisal process encourages Faculties and schools to focus on a series of indicators of teaching and learning performance. These indicators do not replace other evidence of the quality of teaching processes and outcomes. They
provide a common set of information to alert Faculties and schools to areas requiring
greater attention or investigation. In this way they enable Faculties to make
judgements about areas for action and improvement in teaching and learning quality.
(University of Queensland, 2003a)

The significant TLPIs for monitoring the performance of schools/faculties include: the
development and implementation of teaching and learning plans by faculties with or
without school plans; staff-student ratios; participation of new academic staff in the
university learning and teaching programmes and certificates; provision of opportunities
for professional development of casual staff; implementation of course and teaching
evaluation plans and subsequent reflective practices; surveys of PhD students on the
quality of supervision; and the analysis of results of various types of student surveys
conducted for the evaluation of teaching and courses at faculty and institutional level.

While analysing the results of student surveys, attention is given to the comparison of
various survey results with each other; comparison of the results within departments; and
comparison of the current year’s results with those of previous years. Moreover, the
Teaching and Learning Committees at faculty level analyze the data on various TLPIs,
identify areas for improvement and recommend consequent action. In most cases, the
TLPIs are linked with the allocation of a specific amount of funding to the faculties. For
instance, the funding to faculties at the University of New South Wales (2007c) is
allocated on the basis of TLPIs.

TLPIs are usually viewed in terms of input and output indicators and qualitative and
quantitative indicators. It was apparent from the analysis that the nature of input and/or
qualitative indicators is developmental whereas the output and/or quantitative indicators
are of a judgemental nature. For example, a text from the University of New South Wales
(2007c) states: “Input indicators generally relate to initiatives, strategies and innovations
aimed at developing teaching and the student learning experience. Output indicators are
measures, usually quantitative, of student satisfaction and these are often [seen as] valid
surrogates for the quality of teaching and learning”.

In summary, this subcategory examines the performance of departments, schools and
faculties on an annual basis through a set of TLPIs. The analysis of TLPIs indicates that
the focus of the input or qualitative indicators is on development, whereas the output or
quantitative indicators are generally of a judgemental nature. However, the purpose of
both input and output indicators is to identify the areas for improvement and to provide support to faculties. Furthermore, most activities in the process are carried out internally, within the faculties. It is argued, therefore, that the overall focus of the process is on improving the quality of teaching and learning.

**B. Performance Appraisal Processes for Academic Staff**

The second subcategory of TQA processes is performance appraisal processes for academic staff. The analysis revealed that ten sample universities use an annual system of professional development review and performance review schemes for the appraisal of their academic staff. Professional development review schemes are generally implemented for the performance appraisal of new and probationary academics. These schemes provide a framework for ongoing professional development of new academic staff. On the other hand, the performance review schemes are aimed at the performance appraisal of all academic staff.

Similarities were observed in the procedures of professional development review and performance review schemes. In both cases, teaching-specific targets are defined for the following year in consultation with the reviewee. At the end of year, the progress against the preceding year’s defined targets is reviewed. The satisfactory contribution rating recommendation leads to the confirmation of probation or leads to rewards in tenure, promotion and salary progression. In the case of under-performance or contribution below expectation, performance improvement procedures are implemented. The following excerpt indicates the nature of procedures adopted in performance reviews.

Activity/Performance Review is a process whereby you and your reviewer meet, in a formal setting, to review how well you have achieved your goals for the previous year and agree your goals for the coming year. This will in turn inform your salary progression. The meeting also allows Departments/Schools to identify and respond to the development needs of staff. (University of Nottingham, 2008a)

Professional development reviews are essentially linked with the probationary period of new academics. For example, the performance of new faculty members at the University College Dublin (2006) is kept “under review against clear objectives and criteria during the probationary period”. Likewise, a quote from the University of Queensland (2007d) states: “all staff on probationary appointments shall be reviewed annually by the Head of
School or Centre/Institute Director (or his or her delegate)” and the probationary period “does not imply automatic confirmation of continuing appointment on completion”.

Template analysis revealed that both types of review schemes have common features. The first feature of both types of review schemes is that they tend to include teaching-specific targets. For example, a policy document from the University of Birmingham (2007d) states: “Ensure that all new academic staff include appropriate and specific teaching targets and related development activity plans [e.g. Post Graduate Certificate] in their probationary development plans, and that staff development reviews with established academic staff pay due attention to teaching and development of teaching”.

A second feature of professional development reviews and performance reviews is that they take into account the professional development needs of the reviewee and, therefore, provide a framework for ongoing professional development of academic staff. As a specific example, a practice document from the University of Nottingham (2008b) states: “the reviewer and role holder should discuss and agree professional and/or personal development, which may be required by the role holder to help them achieve their goals”.

A further significant feature of both review schemes is that they place an emphasis on the inclusion of targets that take into account the career aspirations of new faculty members. For instance, the review schemes at the University of Nottingham (2008d) enable “Departments or Schools to identify and respond to the development needs of staff, including both short-term development and more long-term career aspirations”. Likewise, an annual review at the University of Virginia (2003) is an “important part of a continuous career development and evaluation program”.

The template analysis revealed that an acceptable contribution rating in professional development reviews and performance reviews is generally recognized and rewarded in probation, promotion and salary progression. As an illustration, the University of Virginia (n.d.a) believes that “there should be a clear link between annual performance reviews and faculty rewards”. Similarly, a practice document from the University of Nottingham (2008d) states: “Performance Review process enables the Department or School to manage salary progression in a way which ensures that individuals are appropriately rewarded based on the contribution they make”.

The analysis revealed that an inadequate contribution rating in both review schemes leads to the provision of support to academic staff through performance improvement.
procedures. For example, a practice document of the University College Dublin (2006) states: “if performance difficulties/deficiencies are identified during the probationary period, these will be discussed with the Lecturer/Senior Lecturer in a timely manner and addressed through feedback”. In the case of a few sample universities, it has been noted that sanctions may be imposed on academics or their salary progression may be prevented if they are not able to achieve the targets even after the implementation of performance improvement procedures. For instance, the University of Virginia (n.d.a) clearly states: “the supervisor will take measured steps to require that performance be brought to an acceptable level within a prescribed period of time or, if performance does not improve to an acceptable level, will impose appropriate sanctions”.

The final feature of professional development reviews and performance reviews is the confidentiality of the process. The focus on the confidentiality of the reviews is evident. For example, a practice document of the University of Nottingham (2008a) states: “throughout all stages of the activity/performance review process, reviewers should treat with due respect and confidence information they receive from the reviewees”.

It can be concluded that the focus of both review schemes (professional development and performance reviews) in U21 institutions is on improving the quality of teaching and research. It was evident from the analysis that this subcategory of TQA processes is an internal process and, therefore, it is generally managed at the local level within departments or schools. It contains elements of both QA and QE. It was noted, however, that the elements of QE were more prominent in both of the review schemes because their focus is on the professional development of academic staff, particularly new staff.

### 5.5.4 Curriculum Design, Development and Approval

One of the categories of QA processes for teaching is QA processes used in curriculum design and development. U21 institutions use structured processes in the design of curricula, its development and approval, and in its review and evaluation. Significant aspects involved in the design of curricula include: clear articulation of course objectives, learning outcomes and the methods of assessment; presentation of subject matter in a coherent manner and consistent with the objectives; accommodation of diverse and flexible learning styles in curricula with incorporation of intercultural and international material; inclusion of research-based activities in courses; and encouragement of students
for self-learning. In addition, the analysis revealed the following key features of this process.

The first feature of this process is that the responsibility for the development of new courses lies primarily with the departments and schools. However, they need to gain formal approval from the committees established at faculty and institutional level. For example, the University of Edinburgh (2007a) “works on the premise that approval for a new or revised course should be obtained at school, college and university level”. A document from The University of Auckland (2007) also states that “proposals for new courses and academic programmes are generally developed within departments and schools, with appropriate consultation elsewhere within the University”.

The next feature of curricula design is that research-led universities place an emphasis on designing an engaging, contextualised and inclusive curriculum. As a consequence, “individual differences and cultural diversity are recognised, valued, and harnessed in both teaching and curriculum design” (University of New South Wales, 2004). One of the features of curricula design to emerge from the analysis is that, while designing curricula, particular attention is paid to the presentation of subject matter in a coherent manner and consistent with objectives. Likewise, the consistency of teaching method, learning activities and of assessment practices with the desired learning outcomes is emphasized.

Analysis revealed that the process of curriculum design is informed by research in U21 institutions. For example, the teaching and learning plan from the University of Queensland (2003) states: “curriculum must be responsive to many forces for change and there is a need to ensure that educational research and sound principles underpin proposed design changes”.

It is also a feature of curriculum design that U21 institutions are placing an emphasis on the use of learning technologies in the design of the curricula and its delivery. The University of Birmingham (2007d) is also embedding the “appropriate use of learning technologies in the curriculum”.

One of the features of the process of curriculum design for U21 institutions is regular review and evaluation of courses. The results are generally used for monitoring the quality of courses; for diagnosing areas for improvement followed by reflection; and in recognition and rewards. Academic heads and deans are responsible for monitoring the quality of courses through review and evaluation of courses at department and faculty
level. In addition, the efforts of academic staff are acknowledged, recognised, and supported by academic heads and deans. For instance, a practice document from the University of Edinburgh (2001a) states: “courses and curricula will be kept under review, seeking to maintain their articulation with school curricula”.

Analysis revealed the involvement of industry and professional associations in the development and review of courses in a few sample universities. There is also evidence of feedback being sought from a range of stakeholders (other than current students) on the quality of courses and their relevance to the professions. These stakeholders include past graduates and their employers, governments, the broader community and prospective students. For example, the University of Birmingham (2007d) believes in “appropriate development of the curriculum to enhance employability prospects” for students using “employer-engagement and interaction with Professional and Regulatory Bodies”.

The final feature of curriculum design revealed by the analysis is the provision of appropriate resources to academic staff to assist them in designing and developing courses and curricula. This kind of support is usually provided through training programmes and workshops. For instance, the University of Edinburgh (2007a) organises “an annual forum for course organisers which covers a wide range of themes”. Other relevant resources at the University of Edinburgh include: “adequate staff support (teaching and administrative), IT provision, library requirements and teachability (addressing the accessibility of teaching)”. In the same way, the University of Queensland (2003) considers “information resources and other services necessary to support curriculum as an integral part of the design process”.

In summary, the U21 institutions use a number of QA processes in curriculum design, development and approval. In most instances, these processes are based on QE. The focus on QE is evident because the process of curriculum design is informed by research. Likewise, the new courses are primarily developed within departments and schools. The developmental element is also evident. Appropriate resources are provided to academic staff to assist them in designing and developing courses. However, the monitoring and QA aspects have not been ignored. Departments need to gain formal approval for their courses from the committees established at faculty level.
5.5.5 Professional Development of Academic Staff

One of the broad categories of QA processes for teaching to emerge from the template analysis is the provision of professional development opportunities for academic staff. Analysis revealed that this category is prevalent in all sample universities and, in many instances, most themes in policy and practice documents were related to this category. Similarly, most subthemes in this category were also related to other categories. The main aim of this process is the continuous enhancement of teaching practices of academic staff through the provision of diverse opportunities for the ongoing high quality professional development. This process is based on the assumption that the developmental activities are more likely to be owned by academics when compared to those processes that are externally imposed.

The focus of professional development activities in U21 institutions is on improving the quality of teaching and learning. For instance, professional development activities at the National University of Singapore (n.d.b) are aimed at providing “participants with the initial impetus for ongoing efforts at improving the quality of their teaching, and to enable faculty to function effectively in the context of university education at NUS”.

The analysis revealed a number of important features of the professional development process. The first feature is that the emphasis on professional development of academics in research-led universities starts with the inclusion of teaching-related professional development activities in teaching and learning plans and policies. For instance, the focus on professional development is evident in the policy document of the University of Edinburgh (2005) that states: “current University policy is that new teaching staff should attend the TLA Professional Certificate in University Teaching Stages 1 and 2 as a contractual requirement”. The analysis revealed, however, that the U21 institutions pay attention to the alignment of professional development activities with their teaching and learning plans and policies.

Another key feature of professional development processes is the establishment of professional development centres at faculty and institutional level for the professional development of academic staff. These centres provide continual opportunities for the professional development of academics through orientation programmes, certificates, workshops and refresher courses. The diverse nature of these developmental activities is responsive to specific needs of individual academics in teaching. Faculty members are not
only supported in general pedagogical skills but also in discipline-specific skills related to teaching, IT and library. For example, the Centre for Academic Development at The University of Auckland (2007) offers “professional development programmes and activities related to teaching and supervision for academic staff at a variety of career stages”.

The next feature of professional development programmes and activities in the sample research-led universities is that their focus is on developing, supporting and strengthening the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL); encouraging and supporting academics in developing the teaching-research nexus; provision of assistance and support to faculty members in reflective practices; and the provision of support to academic staff for promoting inclusivity in curricula and in learning and teaching modes. For instance, the University of British Columbia (2007a) established an Institute for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning to “foster cross-disciplinary inquiry focused on Scholarship of Teaching and Learning”. Similarly, the University of Melbourne (2007a) designed a document to “support consideration of the University’s obligations in terms of the scholarship of teaching and to assist in the review and enhancement of the quality of personal teaching practices”.

It is also a feature of this process that academic staff are encouraged and supported by academic heads, deans and universities in undertaking professional development to enhance their knowledge, teaching skills, pedagogical skills, supervision skills, and IT literacy and library skills. For this purpose, a dialogue is encouraged with professional development centres established at department, faculty and institutional level. As an incentive, tuition fees are paid by the institutions to enrol academics in professional development courses or degrees. For example, a policy document of the University of Edinburgh (2005) states: “there is no fee for the programme for participants from the University of Edinburgh and lunches are provided. The costs are borne by the TLA Centre as part of its wider programme of academic staff development and training”.

The focus of professional development activities, in most instances, is on new faculty members. They are bound to attend mandatory induction and orientation programmes that provide advice on teaching, assessment, supervision, course design and on other teaching-related activities. They are further supported by career development schemes and foundation programmes in teaching. Peer mentoring schemes are also prevalent in U21 institutions to assist new academics in achieving teaching excellence. For instance, the
‘Partners in Teaching and Scholarship’ at the University of British Columbia (2007a) is a peer mentoring programme to assist “new teaching faculty achieve excellence in teaching, learning and scholarship. The program is characterized by an experienced faculty member from another discipline taking an active role in the development of a new faculty member by offering guidance, support and advice”.

A further feature of professional development processes is the growing interest of U21 institutions in offering university teaching qualification certificates to academics in order to enhance their teaching practices. The practice is prevalent in 11 sample universities. In some institutions, the participation of new and probationary academics in these types of certificates is mandatory (included as a contractual requirement) and an essential component of their professional development. In a few universities, these certificates are accredited by the professional bodies. The completion of certificates confers a number of benefits on academics as it is emphasized in recognition and rewards procedures. For example, the University of Queensland (2007f) offers a “graduate certificate in higher education [GCHE], particularly for new staff with limited teaching experience”.

An important feature of this process is the use of peer review of teaching as a tool for the professional development of new academics. For this purpose, peer review of teaching schemes are generally carried out by professional development centres and experts provide valuable advice to new academic staff in order to improve their teaching practices. It was also found that the focus of the observation of teaching is purely developmental. There is also a concept of teaching partnerships in research-led universities. This process “involves forming partnership with one or more other teachers who will observe each other teaching, discuss the results and help each other learn from this experience” (University College Dublin, n.d.b). Likewise, a document from the University of British Columbia (UBC) states:

This program offers an opportunity for faculty new to UBC to network with other new faculty and the staff at the Centre for Teaching and Learning. The program includes opportunities to observe other faculty teaching in the Open Classroom program, participating in a mid-term online evaluation of your course, teaching portfolio development support and cohort meetings once a month. (UBC, 2007a)

The analysis revealed that about half the sample institutions pay particular attention to the provision of assistance, support, and training to course coordinators, academic heads,
deans, mentors, reviewers and the members of evaluation panels for their role in relation to the QA and QE of teaching. For instance, the University of Birmingham (2007d) also provides “training and guidance for Heads of Schools, line managers, mentors, staff development reviewers, promotions panel members etc on the role of learning and teaching in the contemporary academic career”. Likewise, the University of New South Wales (2005) provides “support for members of promotion and related panels in relation to evaluating merit or performance in teaching”. This point was also raised by Ramsden (2003) who emphasized that professionally trained and effective leadership at all levels of the institution is essential to improve the quality of teaching and learning.

Development and provision of resources to academic staff aimed at improving and enhancing their teaching practices was also identified as a feature of professional development processes in U21 institutions. For instance, the website of the Learning and Teaching Unit at the University of New South Wales (2007a) provides “many resources for staff seeking to improve their teaching. This includes opportunities for group workshops, one on one consultations and a wide range of print-based resources”.

Another important feature of professional development is the sharing of innovative teaching and learning practices among academics through workshops, conferences, seminars, symposia, colloquia and critical debates. Good teaching practices are also shared through the networks of peers established at department and at faculty level. Likewise, effective practices in most sample universities are documented and published in a systematic way for the purpose of sharing. For instance, the Compendium of Good Practice in Learning and Teaching at the University of New South Wales (2004) “documents and recognises examples of good educational practice at the University” and “consists of case studies and is published several times a year on the website of the Learning and Teaching Unit”.

The analysis also revealed the concept of developing and sustaining ‘communities of practice’ in learning and teaching for the professional development of academics. Some examples of communities of practice in the sample universities include: the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Community; Learning and Teaching Forum; Teaching Organisations; Assembly for Exchanging Experiences; Partners in Teaching and Scholarship; Teaching Circles and Squares. These communities of practice organize various activities on a regular basis on a wide range of topics about teaching and provide opportunities for academic staff to discuss their best practice among the university
community. For instance, Teaching Squares at the University of British Columbia (2007a) “celebrates teaching excellence, builds communities of practice, and aims to enhance teaching and learning through a structured process of classroom observation, reflection, discussion and plan for renewal”.

The analysis revealed that the participation of academics in professional development activities is generally recognized and rewarded in probation, tenure, promotion and in appraisal processes. Similarly, funding is provided to academics for the purpose of enhancing their professional qualifications. In a few sample universities, the participation of new academics in professional development activities is mandatory. For example, a document from the University of Queensland (2007d) explicitly states: “all appointees shall agree upon expectations of them and a staff development plan with the Head of School or Centre/Institute Director within the first three months of appointment”.

The final feature of professional development processes is the review and evaluation of professional development programmes, processes and courses on a regular basis for the purpose of improving their quality. The U21 institutions seek feedback from all concerned (as well as needs analyses). As a result of review and evaluation, revisions and changes are made in the programmes and processes. The University of New South Wales (2005), for example, ensures that “professional staff development programs are designed and implemented taking into account student and peer feedback on learning and teaching issues”.

It can be concluded that this category of QA processes for teaching is prevalent in all sample universities. Most aspects of professional development in U21 institutions are focused on enhancing the quality of teaching and learning. As a result, the focus of professional development activities is on the provision of support to academics for the purpose of enhancing their teaching practices. Professional development centres have been established at faculty and institutional level. Likewise, a number of networks have been established for sharing effective practice in teaching and learning. The analysis further revealed that most professional development activities are particularly focused on new academics.

5.5.6 Review and Evaluation of Teaching and Courses

One of the broad categories of QA processes for teaching to emerge from the template analysis is the review and evaluation of teaching and courses by students and peers. The
analysis revealed that this practice is prevalent in all the sample universities. In this practice, the universities usually seek feedback and input from students and peers on the quality of teaching and courses.

On the basis of two useful sources for feedback (from students and peers), the review and evaluation of teaching and courses was classified into two subcategories.

The first subcategory is related to the review and evaluation of teaching and courses by students. This is generally known as ‘student evaluation of teaching’ in most sample universities. For student evaluation of teaching, several different types of evaluation surveys are prevalent at department, faculty, institutional and national level. The second subcategory is related to review and evaluation of teaching and courses by peers. In this subcategory, an individual teacher provides feedback to another teacher on the quality of his/her teaching with the intention of enhancing the teaching practice of both. This is generally known as ‘peer observation of teaching’ or ‘peer review of teaching’ in most sample universities. The next two subsections focus on the significant features of both subcategories.

A. Student Evaluation of Teaching

The analysis revealed that student evaluations of teaching are generally conducted at department, faculty, institutional and at national level. It was, however, noted that the purposes of student evaluations of teaching conducted at each of these different levels are varied. The timing and the nature of student evaluation surveys at each of these levels is also varied. On the basis of levels, purposes, timing and the nature of surveys, three types of student evaluations of teaching emerged from the analysis.

I. Student Evaluation of Teaching at National Level

The first type is a national system of student evaluation of teaching and courses. In this type of student evaluation, feedback is sought from the students on the quality of provision in an institution through nationwide student surveys. These national surveys are typically conducted at the end of each semester, or end of a programme, within each tertiary institution and, therefore, are summative in nature. The aim of these national evaluation surveys is to measure/assure the quality of provision in an institution and is thus a judgemental one. In the same way, this type of student evaluation is motivated by
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external bodies and the results of evaluation are usually used as a basis for the allocation of funding to universities.

The analysis suggested that the focus of national student surveys is on QA of teaching and courses from the perspective of accountability. For instance, a number of national student surveys are conducted in Australian universities (e.g., the Course Experience Questionnaire) in conjunction with Graduate Careers Australia for the purpose of seeking feedback from students on the quality of courses and teaching experiences from the perspective of accountability (University of Melbourne, 2005; University of New South Wales, 2007a; University of Queensland, 2006d). This excerpt from the University of Queensland (2006d) indicates the nature of national surveys: “The data is used by UQ and government agencies to measure our performance against other Australian universities. In particular, results from the CEQ comprise one of the major indicators influencing the allocation of Learning and Teaching Performance Funds”. There is also evidence of publishing and dissemination of the results of student surveys.

II. Student Evaluation of Teaching at Faculty and Institutional Level

The second type of student evaluation of teaching is related to a summative process of seeking feedback from students on the quality of teaching and courses at faculty and institutional level. This type of evaluation is conducted using institutional surveys with a focus on both QA and QE. The analysis revealed that some aspects of this process have the characteristics of accountability whereas others are more concerned with improving the quality of teaching and courses. The nature of student evaluations is evident in this document from The University of Auckland (2006b) that states: “the University requires that teaching and courses be reviewed and evaluated on a regular basis to monitor and ensure quality, to identify areas for improvement, and to assist with professional development”.

Student evaluation at institutional level in U21 institutions is generally guided by three broad purposes. The first purpose is to improve the quality of teaching and courses. In this case, the focus of evaluation is on identifying areas for improvement followed by a provision of support to individual teachers. The results of evaluations are usually reported to individual teachers for their reflection. The second purpose of institutional evaluation is to recognize and reward quality teaching. In this case, the results of student evaluations are used as a performance indicator and are recognized in performance appraisal, teaching
excellence awards, and in tenure and promotions processes. For both purposes (i.e., for improvement; recognition and rewards), evaluation results are reported to supervisors, academic heads, deans, and to teaching and learning quality committees established at department and faculty level.

The third purpose of institutional student evaluation surveys is to monitor the quality of teaching and courses and is concerned with accountability. In this case, the results of evaluation are used for monitoring and thus are reported to academic heads, deans and other related committees established at faculty and institutional level for assuring the quality of teaching and courses. In a few sample universities, there is evidence of use of this type of student evaluation at the request of students to an academic head. In some instances, academic heads may commission student evaluations for monitoring purposes. As an illustration, the nature and purpose of student evaluations is evident in a document from The University of Auckland (2008) that states that student evaluation “ensure that feedback is gathered regularly from students through summative evaluations for use in monitoring and reporting on the quality of courses and teaching and in supporting quality enhancement”. Similarly, all three purposes of evaluation are evident from the following excerpt from the University of New South Wales [UNSW] (2004):

The new mandatory Course and Teaching Evaluation and Improvement Scheme (CATEI) is designed to allow staff to receive limited feedback on the effectiveness of their courses and individual teaching. It also allows heads of school to identify and acknowledge excellent teaching and also to identify where staff support should be provided. (UNSW, 2004)

III. Formative Student Evaluation of Teaching

The third type of student evaluation of teaching is related to a formative process of seeking feedback from students on the quality of teaching and courses at department level. This process is also referred to as self-evaluation and is initiated by individual teachers in order to diagnose areas for improvement or his/her professional development needs. This is a developmental process as it facilitates improvement in teaching and courses. The analysis also revealed the concept of staff-student consultative committees in a few sample universities for discussion of teaching-related matters. The purpose of such discussions is to improve the quality of teaching and courses. For instance, a document from the University of British Columbia (2007) states: “In addition to the
formal summative evaluations by students, faculty members are strongly encouraged to seek formative feedback during the course, using methods of their own choice”.

Key Features of Student Evaluation of Teaching

In addition to three types of student evaluation of teaching and courses, the analysis also revealed some general features of this process. The first is that research-led universities place an increasing emphasis on dissemination of policies related to student evaluation of teaching. For this purpose, guidelines are provided to students and academics to support them in understanding the benefits of the process. The next feature is that the reporting of the results of student evaluations to individual teachers is of significance in bringing about improvement. It is expected, however, that the teacher concerned would reflect upon his or her practice after receiving feedback from students. A related feature is that academic staff in U21 institutions are supported in responding to the feedback obtained from student evaluations, and by the provision of experts advice to them on their professional development needs.

Further features of the ‘student evaluation of teaching’ are its anonymous and confidential nature; the use of evaluative information to bring about change in teaching or teaching materials, and the importance of signalling these changes to students; and the adoption of a collaborative approach in student evaluation process. For example, a practice document from The University of Auckland (2002) states, “the responsibility for teaching quality is shared by individual staff members, teaching teams, Heads of Departments, Deans of Faculties and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor”. The anonymous nature of the process protects the students. The confidential nature of the evaluation process protects the academic staff although confidentiality is conditional because the evaluation outcomes are available to Head of Departments and Deans. The purpose of informing students about the results of the evaluation and the changes made in courses and teaching, as a result of their feedback, is that this creates a greater sense among students that their feedback is likely to affect change, with the resultant expectation that they will take the process seriously.

B. Peer Review of Teaching

The second subcategory of ‘review and evaluation of teaching’ is the process of seeking feedback and input from peers on quality of teaching. Three purposes of this process in research-led universities include: to enhance the quality of teaching, to recognize and
reward scholarly practice, and to identify and disseminate effective practice in teaching and learning. The strategies for peer review of teaching in U21 institution include: review of and collaboration in course design and delivery; departmental discussions and feedback sessions among colleagues; discussions with external examiners; and observation of teaching by peers and experts.

Two systems of peer review of teaching were found to be prevalent in U21 institutions. In the first system, an individual teacher generally initiates the process at any time with a focus on his/her own development. In the second, the formal systems of peer review of teaching exist and academics, particularly new ones, need to go through these systems. For example, a few sample universities have a systematic and regular system of peer observation of teaching that requires all academics to observe and be observed. The primary purpose of the practice is to enhance the teaching performance of an individual. The focus of the practice is on the identification of effective practices in teaching and the dissemination of those practices to the broader university community for sharing purposes.

The nature of peer review of teaching is evident from this excerpt from the University of Edinburgh (2007) that clearly states: “all members of the academic staff who do any teaching, including Head of School, should take part in the scheme. Teaching staff should act as both observer and observed at least once in every academic year”. The purpose of the peer review is also evident in a document from the University of Birmingham (2005a) that states: “the process should be such that the observer has an opportunity to identify good practice from the observee, and that particularly good practice can be disseminated in the Department or beyond”.

The analysis also revealed the concept of ‘teaching partnership programmes’ in a few sample universities for peer review of teaching. The purpose of the practice is to improve the quality of teaching and “involves forming partnership with one or more other teachers who will observe each other teach, discuss the results and help each other learn from this experience” (University College Dublin, n.d.b). In many instances this practice is supported by Professional Development Centres with a particular focus on reflection. One of prominent features of peer review of teaching in U21 institutions is that it is aimed at enhancing the teaching experiences of both the reviewee and the reviewer because the practice is designed in such a way that it is beneficial for both.
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The use of peer review of teaching for recognition and reward purposes in U21 institutions was also revealed by the analysis. Academics have to follow formal procedures. It is the responsibility of academic heads to arrange a peer review of their teaching and the process is generally carried out within the department. One of the sample universities, however, also incorporates ‘external peer review of teaching’, in addition to ‘internal peer review’, for promotion purposes. In this case, a team of external reviewers writes a summative report on the basis of first-order evidence of an academic’s teaching skills collected by a team of internal reviewers.

Reflection was revealed as a key element both in the processes of student evaluation of teaching and in peer review of teaching. The importance of reflection becomes even greater when the focus of review and evaluation processes is on improvement. In this case, reflection refers to the changes made in structure, design and delivery of courses as a result of review and evaluation. For this reason, support is provided to individual teachers by Professional Development Centres established at faculty and institutional level in U21 institutions. Reflection is also valued in recognition and rewards processes.

To conclude, the focus of student evaluation of teaching conducted at national level is on QA and most aspects of the process are judgemental. On the other hand, the focus of student evaluation of teaching conducted at faculty and institutional level is on both QA and QE and the process is characterized by both judgemental and developmental aspects. However, the formative student evaluation of teaching is generally conducted at the department level with a focus on enhancing quality of teaching. The analysis suggested that most aspects of peer review of teaching in U21 institutions are developmental. The focus of the process is on identification of effective practices and dissemination of those practices to the broader community with an aim to enhance the quality of teaching.

5.5.7 Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL)

One of the broad categories of QA processes for teaching to emerge from the template analysis is the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL). The analysis revealed that this practice is prevalent in 11 sample universities. It is a developmental process. Its developmental nature was evident from the fact that research-led universities place an increasing emphasis on developing, supporting, and strengthening SoTL as a tool for enhancing the quality of teaching. For example, the University of Queensland (2003) encourages its staff to “undertake and disseminate research into teaching and learning
practices to ensure that the most effective teaching practice is encouraged”. Furthermore, the analysis revealed the following key features of this process.

The first aspect of this process is the initiation of a system of teaching improvement grants for encouraging academics to enhance their teaching and learning skills by conducting research on a small scale. A few sample universities have also initiated pilot projects at department, faculty and institutional level. These projects provide funding to individuals, departments and schools for the purpose of conducting research into teaching-related practices in order to develop the teaching skills of staff. For instance, the ‘teaching enhancement grants’ at the National University of Singapore (2008) are aimed at “projects that can lead to the improvement of teaching skills” and are intended to “promote reflective and outcome-based teaching through active investigations into how to enhance the quality of teaching, the learning experience and learning outcomes at NUS”.

Another feature of this process, to emerge from the analysis, is the initiation of teaching fellowship schemes for academics to conduct research into teaching and learning. The fellowships are usually offered to academics by national funding bodies for the purpose of raising the profile of teaching and learning by conducting research into this at the institutional and national level. The fellowships are focused on enhancing the teaching and learning practices of staff by supporting innovation in course design and delivery at faculty and institutional level. As an illustration, a teaching fellowship scheme at the University of Edinburgh (2008b) is “intended to encourage and support activities that will make a significant contribution to the enhancement of learning and teaching at the university”.

One feature of this process is to award teaching fellowships to graduate students, particularly doctoral students, for the purpose of conducting research into teaching and learning. For instance, McGill University (2008a) awards such fellowships to students who are “interested in conducting research on university teaching and learning in any Faculty” to “recognize and promote the development of university teaching and learning expertise in various disciplines”. The analysis further revealed that academics who are awarded teaching fellowships, teaching improvement grants and pilot projects are obliged to work with professional development centres for the period of their project. For example, a policy document from the University of Edinburgh (2008) states that the “award holders will remain within their School but one member of the project team will
become a ‘TLA Associate’ for the time the Award is held. Associates will provide an important liaison function between the TLA Centre and their school”.

A further feature of this process is that it is mandatory for project holders (i.e., holders of teaching fellowships, teaching improvement grants, pilot projects) to publish the research findings of their projects and disseminate them to the broader university community. These findings are generally published on the universities’ websites. However, project holders are also encouraged to publish the findings of their projects in scholarly journals on teaching. Academics at the National University of Singapore (2008), for example, are invited to “share the educational outcomes with colleagues in CDTL workshops and/or publications. Where appropriate, they will be encouraged to publish their results in educational journals in association with CDTL”.

One of the prominent features of scholarship of teaching and learning is related to the teaching-research nexus. The U21 institutions have a strong belief in the significance of linkage between teaching and research. The teaching-research nexus is, therefore, encouraged in staff development programmes and in recognition and reward processes. Likewise, assistance is provided to staff for incorporating research-based approaches into course design and delivery. Academics are encouraged and supported to undertake and disseminate pedagogical research through the networks of SoTL.

The analysis revealed that research-based teaching and learning activities are largely supported, encouraged and emphasized at classroom level in U21 institutions. These activities include: raising awareness among students about the concept of teaching-research nexus and its benefits; development of research-based attributes in graduates; designing and teaching courses with emphasis on contemporary and personal research; inclusion of research methods in courses; involving postgraduate research students in high-level research activities and in departmental research projects; and the provision of opportunities for undergraduate students to participate in research activities.

It can be concluded that SoTL is a developmental process. The analysis revealed that the U21 institutions are placing an increasing emphasis on developing, supporting and strengthening SoTL as a tool for enhancing the quality of teaching and learning. Academics are thus encouraged and supported to undertake research into university teaching and learning through teaching fellowships and teaching improvement grants.
The findings of these ‘teaching projects’ are published and disseminated to the broader university community.

### 5.5.8 Recognition, Rewards and Incentives

One of the broad categories of QA processes for teaching to emerge from the template analysis is ‘recognition, rewards and incentives for scholarly teaching’. The analysis revealed that this process is prevalent in all sample universities and in most cases is strongly linked with the other seven categories of QA processes for teaching. In many instances this process acts as a bridge between various aspects of QA and QE embodied in other categories of QA processes. This process provides a linkage between the eight categories of QA processes for teaching. The template analysis revealed two subcategories of this process: an internal system of recognition, rewards and incentives, and an external system of recognition, rewards and incentives.

#### A. Internal Systems of Recognition and Rewards

In an internal system of recognition, rewards and incentives, the scholarly activities in teaching are generally recognized and rewarded at the institutional level and a system of recognition and rewards exists both for individuals and for departments, schools and faculties. Scholarly activities of departments and faculties and their performance in teaching and learning is generally recognized and rewarded through allocation of teaching and learning performance funds based on TLPIs.

In the case of individuals, many research-led universities have explicit policies for recognition of scholarly activities in teaching at faculty and institutional level and academics are generally rewarded in three prominent ways. First, scholarly activities of academics in teaching are recognized and rewarded in the processes of appointment, confirmation of probation and in tenure and promotions. Documentation from The University of Auckland (2004b) states, the “appointment, continuation and promotion policies place importance on the development and demonstration of teaching ability and excellence”. A few U21 institutions have introduced the idea of teaching-focused posts to raise the profile of teaching. For example, the University of Queensland (2007f) has introduced the concept of “teaching-focused academic appointments designed to strengthen the recognition and profile of teaching and associated scholarship”.

The analysis also revealed that sample universities confer an increased weighting on teaching in tenure and promotions processes. In the category of ‘teaching-focused staff’, the weighting range in processes of appointment, continuation, and tenure and promotion is from 70% to 90% for ‘teaching’ and ‘scholarship of teaching’ and the rest is for service. In the case of ‘teaching and research staff’, this weighting range is from 30% to 50% for teaching (and same for research) and the rest is for service. Furthermore, the focus of interviews in processes of appointment, continuation, and tenure and promotion is on quality of teaching. Likewise, careful consideration is given to the fact that at least two members of the judgement panel should have an expertise in reviewing and assessing contributions to teaching.

The second method used in recognizing the scholarly activities of academics in teaching is to reward them through teaching excellence awards, citations for enhancement of student learning and commendations at faculty and institutional level. Examples of these awards in sample universities include: sustained excellence in teaching; early career excellence in teaching; supervision excellence; collaboration in teaching; innovation in teaching; programme awards for enhancement of learning; and awards for mentor excellence. These awards are usually in the form of medals and monetary prizes. The award winners are required to use the money for improvement of their teaching. They are also obliged to share their ideas with the wider university community.

The third form of recognition of scholarly activities of academics in teaching in the U21 institutions is through awards, such as teaching fellowships and teaching improvement grants for conducting research into university teaching and learning. Academics are, as a result, engaged in research activities aimed at improving their teaching skills. Excellence in teaching is also rewarded through one-off payments, increments and enhancement in salaries. The following excerpt from a practice document of the University of New South Wales (2007a) illustrates the nature of rewards: “At UNSW many mechanisms exist, including awards for excellence in teaching, and grants and/or time allocations to support scholarship, innovation or development in teaching”.

**B. External Systems of Recognition and Rewards**

The template analysis suggested a second subcategory of recognition, rewards and incentives, that of an external system of recognition and rewards. In this system, scholarly activities in teaching are recognized and rewarded at national level and the system of
recognition and rewards exists both for individuals and for the institutions. Scholarly activities of institutions and their performance in teaching and learning is generally recognized and rewarded through allocation of teaching and learning performance funds on the basis of their performance in student surveys (on the quality of courses and teaching) conducted at national level.

In the case of individuals, scholarly activities of academics in teaching are generally recognized and rewarded through national teaching fellowships and national teaching excellence awards. As noted in the previous section, teaching excellence awards are offered to excellent teachers at all the U21 universities in the sample and include awards for programmes to enhance learning, awards for teaching excellence, and citations for outstanding contributions to student learning. In most cases, these national awards are linked with the institutional awards. The selection criteria for these awards are, therefore, the same as those for institutions. National teaching fellowships and projects are aimed at conducting research into teaching and learning for enhancing its quality at a national level.

The analysis revealed that external systems of recognition and rewards are generally initiated by national funding bodies and are aimed at enhancing the quality of teaching and learning. For instance, the National Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education in Australia has the “responsibility for allocation of additional funds to support teaching and learning improvement in the sector” and, for this, takes “institutional performance and feedback from students into account in allocation of such resources” (University of Melbourne, 2005). Similarly, at the University of Birmingham “HEFCE [Higher Education Funding Council for England] Teaching Quality Enhancement Fund monies are available to support the recognition and reward of staff who teach or otherwise support student learning” (2007c).

C. Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness – Teaching Portfolios

The process of recognition, rewards and incentives is strongly linked with teaching portfolios. This statement is strengthened by the fact that teaching portfolios provide support in evaluating the effectiveness of teaching in the processes of teaching excellence awards, probation, tenure, and promotions. Despite the fact that there is a slight variation in the criteria for the various processes, the following aspects are of particular importance for assessment of teaching portfolios in U21 institutions.
The first aspect is that teaching portfolios provide evidence of approaches to teaching that enhance student learning. These approaches include: efforts on the part of the teacher for engaging students in learning; stimulating and encouraging students in self-learning; engaging students in critical thinking and reflective practices; and provision of assistance and support to students to enhance their learning. They also provide evidence of approaches to assessment and their quality, consistency of assessment methods with learning outcomes and provision of meaningful and timely feedback to students.

Teaching portfolios also incorporate information about course design and delivery. This includes information about: alignment of courses with teaching and learning activities and assessment; course evaluations followed by reflection; development of inclusive curricula; the use of information and communication technologies; and evidence of research-led approaches to learning and teaching. Teaching portfolios also provide evidence of teaching effectiveness. This may include: data on student achievement; success rates of students taught by the teacher concerned; evidence of review and evaluation of teaching and courses followed by reflection; collaboration in course designs and in assessment practices; and recognition of teaching and learning activities by students, peers and community.

Teaching portfolios include material about scholarly activities that influence and enhance learning and teaching. These activities include: scholarship of teaching; professional development in teaching and learning; activities resulting in the award of grants and contracts associated with SoTL; and continual improvement of teaching and learning practices through feedback sought from students and peers followed by reflection. SoTL refers to pedagogical skills, research on teaching and learning, and research on advancement of the disciplines. Professional development refers to participation in teaching-related activities, consultation with teaching and learning support services to improve teaching, and completion of certificates in university teaching and learning.

The final feature of teaching portfolios is that they provide evidence of leadership in developing effective teaching and learning practices. The significant aspects in this regard include: evidence of improving teaching and learning standards at department, faculty and university level; leadership in student activities; participation in or development of teaching communities at university level or in the broader community; and supporting the learning of colleagues. The following excerpt from a document of the University of British Columbia [UBC] (2007a) indicates the nature of teaching portfolios:
The teaching evaluation committee recommends that UBC require faculty to create and keep up to date a teaching dossier/portfolio which outlines the instructor's teaching philosophy and methods, course outlines and innovations, participation in teaching workshops and team teaching, pedagogical publications or conference presentations, students’ achievements and their letters of appreciation, evidence of effective undergrad and grad research thesis supervision, etc. (UBC, 2007a)

To conclude, the analysis revealed that this category of QA processes for teaching (recognition and rewards) is strongly linked with the other seven categories. It is also linked with teaching portfolios. It appears that most aspects of this category are aimed at encouraging academics and institutions to be engaged in scholarly activities related to teaching. Similarly, the purpose of this QA process is to raise the profile of teaching. Most activities in this process are aimed at enhancing the quality of teaching and learning. However, it was evident that recognition and rewards are linked with the performance of individuals and of institutions.

5.6 General Features of Quality Assurance Processes

This section draws some conclusions on the basis of discussion around the various aspects of the eight categories of QA processes for teaching in research-led universities. This section will first examine general characteristics of QA processes in U21 institutions. It also elaborates on the nature of the relationship between various categories of QA processes for teaching. Finally, the results of the template analysis are used to highlight an overall approach adopted by U21 institutions towards QA of teaching to determine their focus on QA or on QE.

It is suggested, based on the analysis, that a collaborative approach to quality assurance of teaching is predominant in U21 institutions with an emphasis on enhancing students’ learning experiences. This approach is evident from an expert of the University of Hong Kong (n.d.d) who states: “the QA System has been formalized through wide consultation with colleagues and collaboration across all levels and teams of staff”. Likewise, a practice document from The University of Auckland (2007) states: “responsibility for teaching quality is shared by individual staff members, teaching teams, academic heads, Deans of Faculty and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)”.
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The analysis revealed that the eight broad categories of QA processes for teaching are integrated, linked and aligned with each other. The analysis also suggested that the strong relationship between QA processes for teaching makes it difficult to practise any part of the process independently. This strong relationship is not limited to the main categories of QA processes but also influences their subcategories.

The strong relationships between the various QA processes for teaching are evident from an excerpt from the University of Melbourne (2007a) that states: “nine guiding principles are interrelated and interdependent. Some relate to broad intellectual environment of the University while others describe specific components of the teaching and learning process”. Similarly, the QA system at the University of Birmingham (2007d) ensures that “teaching and learning enhancement and quality assurance processes interrelate and mutually support each other”. It was further revealed that, in most instances, the QA processes are linked through rewards.

The analysis also examined the nature of an overall approach to quality that the U21 institutions have adopted in their QA processes for teaching with a particular emphasis on whether these processes are more focused towards the QA or the QE end of the QA-QE continuum (see Chapter 2 and the overview of Section B of this chapter). The major subthemes of each process varied in their placement, dependant on purpose, along the continuum from accountability at the judgemental end of the scale to the purely developmental and enhancement-led end. On balance, however, the findings suggest that U21 institutions base their quality assurance processes for teaching more towards the QE end of the QA-QE continuum. The tendency of quality assurance processes towards QE is most evident in the summary data presented in Table 5.2. Of the 48 major aspects of quality assurance (and enhancement) processes, only 5 are classified as QA, while 20 are classified as predominantly QE. The features of quality teaching that emerged in the general category—through their emphasis on such elements as disciplinary expertise; pedagogical knowledge; scholarly engagement; focus on student learning outcomes; engaging students in learning and high-level activities; focus on self-learning; consistency of activities with learning outcomes; and provision of feedback and support to students—also suggest a QE orientation.
## Table 5.2: The nature of QA processes for teaching in U21 institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eight QA Processes</th>
<th>Major Aspects of QA Processes</th>
<th>Drivers Internal (I)</th>
<th>External (E)</th>
<th>Nature of Processes (QA &amp; QE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Learning (T/L) Plans, Policies and Processes</td>
<td>Externally motivated</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>QA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internally developed</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>QE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborative approach</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>QE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring and reporting</td>
<td>I&amp;E</td>
<td>QA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support departments/faculties</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>QE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish networks and committees</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>QE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emphasis on enhancing T/L</td>
<td>I&amp;E</td>
<td>QE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Update policies and processes</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>QE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disseminate plans and processes</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>QE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance-based funding</td>
<td>I&amp;E</td>
<td>QE&amp;QA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System of Audits and/or Reviews</td>
<td>Internal audits/reviews</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>QE&amp;QA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal in compliance with external</td>
<td>I&amp;E</td>
<td>QE&amp;QA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External audits/reviews</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>QE&amp;QA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public reporting</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>QA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Quality Appraisal (TQA)</td>
<td>TQA for schools/faculties through TLPIs</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>QA&amp;QE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance-based funding for T/L</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>QE&amp;QA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TQA for academics</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>QE&amp;QA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching specific targets</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>QE&amp;QA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional development needs</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>QE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Career aspiration needs</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>QE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reward performance in T/L</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R&amp;R/RQA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support for weaknesses</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>QE&amp;QA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Approval</td>
<td>New proposals within departments</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>QE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approval from faculty committees</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>QE&amp;QA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal/external validation</td>
<td>I&amp;E</td>
<td>QE&amp;QA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review courses</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>QE&amp;QA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development (PD)</td>
<td>PD activities for academics</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>QE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PD certificates in university T/L</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>QE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incentives for PD activities</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R&amp;R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus on teaching-related PD</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>QE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish PD centres</td>
<td>I&amp;E</td>
<td>QE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus on SoTL</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>QE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus on new academics</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>QE&amp;QA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sharing of innovative T/L practices</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>QE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communities of practices in T/L</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>QE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and Evaluation of Teaching and Courses</td>
<td>Student evaluation – national level</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>QA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student evaluation – faculty/institutional</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>QE&amp;QA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer review of teaching</td>
<td>I&amp;E</td>
<td>QE&amp;QA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formative feedback from students</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>QE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring and reporting</td>
<td>I&amp;E</td>
<td>QA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflection practices</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>QE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL)</td>
<td>SoTL (pedagogical research)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>QE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching fellowships and grants</td>
<td>I&amp;E</td>
<td>QE/R&amp;R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching-research nexus</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>QE&amp;QA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition, Rewards and Incentives</td>
<td>Internal rewards</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R&amp;R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External rewards</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>R&amp;R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rewards in tenure/promotions</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R&amp;R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching excellent awards (I&amp;E)</td>
<td>I&amp;E</td>
<td>R&amp;R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data in Table 5.2 have also been classified according to the driver associated with their implementation. So an aspect was classified Internal (I) where it was initiated by the department, faculty, or by the institution with a focus on improvement; or External (E) where it was initiated by the external funding bodies with a focus on accountability; or a combination of both. It is evident that most aspects of QA processes have been introduced internally in U21 institutions. Of the 48 major aspects of QA processes, the drivers behind 33 aspects are internal (I), the drivers behind 10 aspects are both internal and external (I&E), while the drivers behind 5 aspects of QA processes are external (E). This suggests that internal drivers on their own are largely sufficient in U21 institutions; but also that external drivers have a role to play in the overall quality assurance picture.

5.7 Conclusion

This chapter reported the analysis of 229 policy and practice documents in order to identify current practices for assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching in U21 institutions. These practices were further classified into eight broad categories of QA processes for teaching. The template analysis also revealed one general category. Further analysis of this category revealed key features of quality teaching in research-led universities. The role of teaching quality is important because it defined expectations and demonstrated how U21 institutions view quality teaching. The U21 institutions view quality teaching in terms of: disciplinary expertise; pedagogical knowledge; scholarly engagement; focus on student learning outcomes; engaging students in learning and high-level activities; focus on self-learning; consistency of activities with learning outcomes; and provision of feedback and support to students. The analysis suggested that the focus of quality teaching is on enhancing learning outcomes for students.

This chapter also examined the nature of eight broad categories of QA processes for teaching in U21 institutions along with the subcategories of each process. The common features of each QA process were discussed with a particular focus on determining the nature of approaches to quality assurance that U21 institutions have adopted. Various aspects of each process varied, depending on purpose, along the QA-QE continuum, from accountability at the judgemental end of the scale to the purely developmental and enhancement-led end. On balance, however, the findings suggest that U21 institutions base their QA processes for teaching more towards the QE end of the continuum. Finally,
both the developmental and judgemental aspects of the processes are linked with and
guide each other through systems of recognition and reward.
Chapter 6
Quality Assurance Processes for Teaching:
Perceptions of Higher Education Academics in
Pakistan
(Delphi Findings)

6.1 Overview

This chapter reports the results of Phase II of the study. This phase was concerned with seeking opinions from higher education leaders in Pakistan about the desirability and the likely acceptability of potential strategies aimed at assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching in Pakistan universities. This chapter examines the responses of academic leaders in Pakistan universities to the eight broad categories of QA processes derived from a prior template analysis of the U21 institutions’ policy and practice documents concerning QA of teaching (see Chapter 5). The Delphi technique was used to assess the desirability and likely acceptability of various aspects of QA processes in Pakistan universities.

6.2 Delphi Procedure

The Delphi exercise is an iterative process of data collection and analysis and usually comprises two to four rounds. It solicits, integrates and interprets collective wisdom generated by a panel of experts through a series of rigorous questionnaires interspersed with controlled feedback. For this study, 41 academic leaders in Pakistan universities were selected as the Delphi panel of experts. Eleven of these experts were the members of Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) and the remaining 30 were the Directors of Quality Enhancement Cells (QECs). The rationale behind using the Delphi technique, the background and the nature of experts, and the justification for the selection of experts, in the context of this study, are provided in Chapter 4 (see sections 4.4.2 and 4.4.3). For this study, the Delphi process comprised two rounds.

All of the experts were contacted via email and 31 agreed to participate in the study. The first round of the Delphi questionnaire resulted in responses from 21 experts and the number reduced to 16 in the second round. Table 6.1 presents the number of experts and their origin, along with their participation rate for both rounds of the Delphi. The Delphi Round I questionnaire (questionnaire I) was based on a prior template analysis of 229
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policy and practice documents concerning QA of teaching from 15 sample U21 institutions. The justification for developing questionnaire I on the basis of the findings of template analysis is provided in Chapter 4.

Table 6.1: List of the Delphi panel of experts participating in the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Origin and the Number of Delphi Experts</th>
<th>Experts Accepted Invitation</th>
<th>Experts Responded to Delphi Round I</th>
<th>Response Rate in Round I</th>
<th>Experts Responded to Delphi Round II</th>
<th>Response Rate in Round II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members of QAC (11)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors of QECs (30)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>73.08%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>53.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (41)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>67.74%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51.61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Delphi questionnaire I comprised 127 items that represented key aspects of 8 broad categories of QA processes for teaching in U21 institutions. The experts were asked to assess these aspects separately for their desirability and likely acceptability in Pakistan universities using the six-point Likert scale ranging from highly desirable (6) to not desirable at all (1) and from highly acceptable (6) to not acceptable at all (1). The Round I questionnaire is explained in Chapter 4 and appears in Appendix D.

In the first round of the Delphi, the data were analysed separately both for desirability and the likely acceptability of 127 aspects of eight broad categories of QA/QE processes for teaching in Pakistan universities. The Delphi technique attempts to develop a consensus among the experts. In this study, the four consensus criteria were applied for the analysis of responses in both rounds of the Delphi. The details of these consensus criteria and the rationale for using these criteria are provided in Chapter 4 and are explained in Appendix C. The consensus results for each round are shown in the Table 6.2.

Table 6.2: Items achieving higher or moderate consensus after Rounds I and II of the Delphi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delphi Round</th>
<th>Consensus Position on Desirability</th>
<th>Consensus Position on Acceptability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Not Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round I (127 Items)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round II (85 Items)</td>
<td>Not Included in Round II</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (127 Items)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2 shows that consensus was achieved on 125 aspects of QA processes, out of 127, for their desirability in Delphi Round I. Because of the high level of desirability and the consensus (98.42%) in Delphi Round I, no further survey about desirability was included in Round II. In contrast, only 42 items achieved consensus for their likely acceptability in Delphi Round I. Therefore, the remaining 85 items were included in the Delphi Round II (questionnaire II). In this round the participants were asked to assess the acceptability of
85 aspects of QA processes in Pakistan universities and rate them on the six-point Likert scale, ranging from highly acceptable (6) to not acceptable at all (1).

Questionnaire II also provided some additional information to the participants such as individual and group responses, the reasons for the low acceptability. The details of the information contained in Delphi questionnaire II along with the rationale behind them are provided in Chapter 4. Questionnaire II appears in Appendix E. Following this round, consensus was achieved on a further 72 items for likely acceptability of QA/QE processes. Considering that overall consensus by this point had reached 89.76% and given feedback from some respondents about survey fatigue, it was decided not to undertake any further rounds.

Table 6.2 also indicates the shift of consensus for likely acceptability of QA/QE processes between rounds 1 and 2. This shift of consensus is evidenced by the fact that because the number of items on which consensus was achieved in round 1 was increased from 42 items to 114 items in round 2. One of the potential reasons for the shift of consensus between rounds 1 and 2 is that respondents have reassessed their responses in the round 2 as a result of a more in-depth look at the items. Another potential reason for the shift of consensus might be that respondents have reconsidered their responses in round 2 in the light of group responses in round 1. A further potential reason for the shift of consensus might be the small number of respondents. The shift in the level of consensus is linked with the shift in opinions of the participants. Where there are few participants, the percentage of representation for each respondent increases and, therefore, any change in rating by one participant will have a relatively large impact on the overall rating. The shift of consensus in a positive direction (i.e. increase in the level of consensus), however, was not matched by an increase in the level of likely acceptability. As a result of the shift of consensus, the likely acceptability shifted in both positive and negative directions. In most cases, the level of likely acceptability was increased. However, a decrease in the level of likely acceptability was also noted in small number of cases.

6.3 Analysis and Interpretation of Responses

The Delphi responses were analyzed and interpreted in two stages. In the first stage, each item was considered to determine whether consensus had been achieved. The second stage determined the level of consensus, the level of desirability and the level of likely
acceptability for various aspects of QA/QE processes for teaching. The level of consensus was assessed in terms of high consensus, moderate consensus, and no consensus. For this purpose, the values of quartile deviation (QD) were used. High consensus was defined as a QD value of less than or equal to 0.60 ($QD \leq 0.60$). Moderate consensus was defined as a QD value of greater than 0.60 but equal to or less than 1.00 ($0.60 < QD \leq 1.00$). Finally, no consensus was defined as a QD value of greater than 1.00 ($QD > 1.00$). These criteria are shown in the Table 6.3.

Table 6.3: Criteria for determining the levels of consensus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Consensus</th>
<th>Quartile Deviation (QD) Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Consensus (HC)</td>
<td>$QD \leq 0.60$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Consensus (MC)</td>
<td>$0.60 &lt; QD \leq 1.00$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Consensus (NC)</td>
<td>$QD &gt; 1.00$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The level of desirability and/or the level of likely acceptability was interpreted in terms of highly desirable (or highly acceptable); likely desirable (or likely acceptable); and likely not desirable (or likely not acceptable). For this purpose, median values were used. The items with a median value of 5.00 or greater than 5.00 ($\text{Median} \geq 5.00$) were considered highly desirable (or highly acceptable). The items with a median value of less than 5.00 but equal to or greater than 3.50 ($5.00 > \text{Median} \geq 3.50$) were considered likely desirable (or likely acceptable). The items with a median value of less than 3.50 but equal to or greater than 2.00 were rated as likely not desirable (likely not acceptable). The items with a median value of less than 2.00 ($\text{Median} < 2.00$) were rated as not desirable at all (or not acceptable at all). The details of these criteria are shown in Table 6.4.

Table 6.4: Criteria for levels of desirability/likely acceptability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Desirability/Likely Acceptability</th>
<th>Median Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly Desirable (HD)/Highly Acceptable (HA)</td>
<td>$\text{Median} \geq 5.00$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely Desirable (LD)/Likely Acceptable (LA)</td>
<td>$5.00 &gt; \text{Median} \geq 3.50$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely not Desirable (LND)/Likely not Acceptable (LNA)</td>
<td>$3.50 &gt; \text{Median} \geq 2.00$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Desirable at All (NDA)/Not Acceptable at All (NAA)</td>
<td>$\text{Median} &lt; 2.00$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Delphi responses were analyzed and interpreted at item level and process level and the results have been reported accordingly. The intent of an item-level reporting of results is to understand the differences between the levels of desirability (or likely acceptability) of individual items depending on their nature and purpose. The item-level results have been reported separately for desirability (Section 6.4) and likely acceptability of various
aspects of QA processes in Pakistan universities (Section 6.5). In addition, the data were analyzed and interpreted, at item level for acceptability, applying the modified scree test to determine the level of consensus and to separate the highly acceptable items from the not acceptable items (see Section 6.5.3). The process-level results are also reported in order to assess the level of desirability (or likely acceptability) (see Section 6.6) for each of the eight broad categories of QA processes in Pakistan.

### 6.4 Desirability of QA/QE Processes – At Item Level

For the initial interpretation and reporting of the results for desirability, the Delphi Round I responses were used. To determine the level of consensus around desirability, quartile deviations (QD) of the ratings were used. The smaller the value of quartile deviation, the greater the level of consensus; and the higher the value of quartile deviation, the lower the level of consensus. The results for the level of consensus around desirability are shown in Table 6.5. It is evident that although the overall level of consensus for the desirability was 98.42% (125 items), the majority of the items (106) achieved moderate level of consensus (83.46%) followed by 19 high consensus items (14.96%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Measure of Consensus for the Desirability of QA Processes by Category</th>
<th>Number of Items Reached Consensus</th>
<th>Percentage of Items Reaching Consensus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HC</td>
<td>MC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans, Policies and Processes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System of Audits and Reviews</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Quality Appraisal</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Approval</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and Evaluation of Teaching</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition, Rewards and Incentives</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HC – high consensus; MC – moderate consensus; NC – no consensus; TC – total consensus (HC+MC)

Table 6.5 shows that the opinions of the experts diverged on two items and consensus was not achieved. These 2 items were related to ‘provision of the right of students to put their request to HoDs for the evaluation of any particular course or a teacher’ and the ‘peer review of teaching’. Paradoxically, these two items were rated as highly desirable. Table 6.5 also shows that the level of consensus is relatively higher for developmental processes.
than for judgemental processes. For instance, professional development and SoTL have a higher percentage of items than other categories in the high consensus column.

To assess the level of desirability for various aspects of QA/QE processes for teaching in Pakistan, the median was used based on Delphi Round I responses. The greater the value of the median, the higher the level of desirability; and the smaller the value of the median, the lower the level of desirability. The results for the level of desirability are presented in Table 6.6.

Table 6.6: Level of desirability for items based on data from Delphi Round I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Level of Desirability of QA Processes by Category</th>
<th>Total Items in each Category</th>
<th>The Level of Desirability for Items</th>
<th>Percentage of Desirable Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HD</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>LND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans, Policies and Processes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System of Audits and Reviews</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Quality Appraisal</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Approval</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and Evaluation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship of Teaching and Learning</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition, Rewards and Incentives</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HD –highly desirable; LD –likely desirable; LND –likely not desirable; NDA –not desirable at all

It is evident from Table 6.6 that all 127 aspects of QA processes for teaching were rated as highly desirable (HD) and not a single aspect was rated as likely desirable (LD), likely not desirable (LND), or not desirable at all (NDA). These results suggest a strong need for all proposed aspects of QA/QE processes in Pakistan universities as perceived by the selected experts. In order to investigate the nature of consensus around desirability, Table 6.7 compares the level of desirability against the level of consensus achieved on various aspects of QA processes.

Table 6.7: Level of desirability against level of consensus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Level of Desirability against the Level of Consensus for the Desirability</th>
<th>High Consensus (QD≤0.60)</th>
<th>M Consensus (0.60&lt;QD≤1.00)</th>
<th>No Consensus (QD&gt;1.00)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly Desirable (Median ≥5.00)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely Desirable (5.00&gt;Median ≥3.50)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely Not Desirable (3.50&gt;Median ≥2.00)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Desirable at All (Median&lt;2.00)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 6.6 and 6.7 indicate that all proposed aspects of QA/QE processes were commonly agreed for their desirability under the highly desirable column (or along a row). However, Table 6.7 shows that variation in the levels of consensus is not consistent with variation in
the levels of desirability and the level of consensus showed a wider distribution. The high level of desirability for various aspects of QA processes with reference to variation in the levels of consensus is further clarified in Appendix J which also presents an overview of the Delphi findings for desirability. The key aspects of each of the eight broad categories of QA processes are shown under each process by their level of desirability followed by the level of consensus achieved on each aspect.

The focus of various aspects of QA processes in the questionnaire is either on QA, on QE, or on both QA and QE (see Table 5.3). Table 6.7 clearly shows that all proposed aspects of QA processes were perceived to be highly desirable in Pakistan universities regardless of their nature and purpose, although with varied levels of consensus (also see Appendix J). This unanimity about high desirability of all aspects of QA/QE processes suggests that academic leaders in Pakistan place high importance on these processes. It is, therefore, argued that academic leaders perceived all QA/QE processes to be essential for assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching in Pakistan universities. The next section focuses on the likely acceptability of various aspects of QA/QE processes in Pakistan.

### 6.5 Acceptability of QA/QE Processes – At Item Level

For the initial interpretation and reporting of the results for the likely acceptability, both Round I and Round II responses were used depending upon the stage at which consensus was achieved on items. To determine the extent of consensus around likely acceptability, quartile deviations (QD) of the ratings were used. These results are shown in Table 6.8. It is evident that although the overall level of consensus for likely acceptability was 89.76% (114), most of the items (88) achieved moderate level of consensus (69.29%) followed by 26 items achieving high consensus (20.47%) and 13 no consensus items (10.23%).

Table 6.8 also indicates that the level of consensus, in the case of likely acceptability, was broadly distributed for the category ‘system of audits and reviews’ (57.89%), followed by ‘curriculum approval’ (66.67%). The table shows that the 12 items (out of 13) that did not achieve consensus belong to these two processes. A lack of consensus on these 12 items might be due to concerns about external involvement and perceptions of the complexity of procedures involved in these two processes. Given that ‘review and audit’ processes have not yet started in Pakistan universities, lack of consensus may relate to lack of
awareness. These ideas are explained more fully in Chapter 7 on the basis of interviews with those with experience in higher education in Pakistan.

Table 6.8: Items achieving consensus for likely acceptability based on data from Rounds I and II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Measure of Consensus for Likely Acceptability of QA Processes by Category</th>
<th>Total Items in each Category</th>
<th>Number of Items Achieved Consensus</th>
<th>Percentage of Items Achieving Consensus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plans, Policies, and Processes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>06 07 01 13</td>
<td>92.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System of Audits and Reviews</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>02 09 08 11</td>
<td>57.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Quality Appraisal</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>02 13 0 15</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>01 14 0 15</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Approval</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>01 07 04 08</td>
<td>66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and Evaluation of Teaching</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>09 11 0 20</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>03 14 0 17</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition, Rewards and Incentives</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>02 13 0 15</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>26 88 13 114</td>
<td>89.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HC – high consensus; MC – moderate consensus; NC – no consensus; TC – total consensus (HC+MC)

To assess the level of likely acceptability for various aspects of QA processes, the median was used based on Delphi Round I and Round II responses. The measure of acceptability was the same as the measure used for the analysis of the desirability, that is, the median value of the responses. The likely acceptability results of the Delphi are shown in Table 6.9 and a number of patterns are evident from it. Firstly, none of the items were rated as ‘not acceptable at all’ (NAA). This clearly shows that the experts did not express serious concerns about the acceptability of any aspect of QA processes in Pakistan universities.

Table 6.9: Level of acceptability for items, based on data from Rounds I and II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Level of acceptability of QA processes by Category</th>
<th>Items in each Category</th>
<th>The level of Acceptability for Items</th>
<th>Percentage of Acceptable Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plans, Policies and Processes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>HA 01 LA 13 LNA 0 NAA 0</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System of Audits and Reviews</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0 01 15 LNA 04 NAA 0</td>
<td>78.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Quality Appraisal</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>07 07 01 0</td>
<td>93.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>09 06 0 0</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Approval</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>04 08 0 0</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and Evaluation of Teaching</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0 11 09 0</td>
<td>55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship of Teaching and Learning</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15 02 0 0</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition, Rewards, and Incentives</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>04 11 0 0</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>40 73 14 0</td>
<td>88.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HA – highly acceptable; LA – likely acceptable; LNA – likely not acceptable; NAA – not acceptable at all

It is also evident from Table 6.9 that likely acceptability showed a wider distribution on the scale in contrast to the desirability responses (see Table 6.6 for desirability). For likely acceptability, the majority of responses (73) clustered around likely acceptable (57.48%) with 31.49% rated as highly acceptable (40 items) and 11.02% (14 items) as likely not
acceptable. Although 88.98% of the total items (113) were found to be either highly acceptable or likely acceptable, the variation in the levels of likely acceptability is clear. There is a considerable variation across the various categories of QA/QE processes with acceptability being much lower for ‘review and evaluation of teaching’ and ‘system of audits and reviews’. The nature of this lower level of likely acceptability is more clearly shown in Table 6.10, in which 14 likely not acceptable items are listed.

Table 6.10: List of 14 likely not acceptable (LNA) aspects of QA/QE processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Statements under their respective QA/QE Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Provide information to public, concerning university’ capacity for assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching and learning, as a requirement from external funding bodies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Establish a system of institutional reviews/audits of universities by the external review/audit panel for assuring, reviewing, and enhancing the quality of teaching-related activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Base the system of institutional reviews/audits on the submission of documentation concerning QA of teaching by the concerned university to the external audit/review panel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Implement quality enhancement plan and other follow-up activities in universities recommended by the external auditors reviewers in an audit visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Monitor the performance of all academics through annual performance reviews to be based at setting of teaching-related goals/targets for the following year and review of achievements against the targets for the preceding year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Provide the right to students for putting their request to Academic Heads for the evaluation of teaching and courses for any specific course or an individual teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Inform students on regular basis about the results of their evaluation of teaching and courses along with the action taken or proposed as a result of their evaluation (to engage students in the process).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Encourage a collegial system of peer review of teaching (formal &amp; informal) in universities aimed at enhancing the quality of teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Encourage a system of ‘peer review of teaching by a critical friend’ aimed at enhancing the quality of teaching in universities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Establish a ‘To observe and be observed’ system of “peer review of teaching” in universities on regular basis for all types of teaching staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Develop a process of peer review of teaching to identify good practices in teaching and learning and to disseminate those practices to the broader community of university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Develop a process of peer review of teaching aimed at enhancing the individual’s (reviewee) teaching performance/practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Recognition of the “review and evaluation of teaching by students and peers” practices in tenure and promotion processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Recognition of the “review and evaluation of teaching by students and peers” practices in teaching excellence awards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.10 shows that the most challenging processes in terms of likely acceptability are those related either to the involvement of external funding bodies in QA/QE processes or to the use of approaches for teaching evaluation purposes. It is interesting to note that the experts even expressed their concerns about the likely acceptability of those aspects of teaching evaluation processes that are focused on enhancing the quality of teaching or are related to rewards.

To further investigate the nature of likely acceptability and the level of consensus, Table 6.11 compares the level of likely acceptability against the level of consensus achieved on
various aspects of QA/QE processes. Table 6.11 indicates that there is a variation in the level of consensus at all levels of likely acceptability. Only 4 of the 127 items were rated as highly acceptable with a high level of consensus. At the other extreme, there was a high consensus that 5 of the items were likely not acceptable. These high consensus items are contrasted (in summary) in Table 6.12.

Table 6.11: Level of acceptability against the level of consensus for items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Level of Acceptability against the Level of Consensus for the Acceptability of Items</th>
<th>High Consensus (QD&gt;0.60)</th>
<th>M Consensus (0.60&lt;QD≤1.00)</th>
<th>No Consensus (QD&gt;1.00)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly Acceptable (Median≥5.00)</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely Acceptable (5.00&gt;Median≥3.50)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely Not Acceptable (3.50&gt;Median≥2.00)</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Acceptable at All (Median&lt;2.00)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.12: List of high consensus items rated as highly acceptable or likely not acceptable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>High Consensus – Highly Acceptable</th>
<th>High Consensus – Likely Not Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Establish supporting units, networks and centres for pedagogical development, research into T/L, and for professional development of academics.</td>
<td>Provide information to public on QA/QE measures by university as a requirement from external funding bodies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Development and provision of resources to academic staff, by T/L centres, for improving and enhancing the quality of their teaching.</td>
<td>Implement annual performance reviews to monitor the performance of academics against teaching-related goals/targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Initiate teaching fellowship schemes to conduct research into university T/L and for enhancing T/L practices in universities.</td>
<td>Provide right to students for putting their request to Academic Head for evaluation of teaching and courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Oblige teaching fellowship holders to work with T/L centres during the period of their project for the enhancement of T/L practices.</td>
<td>Collegial peer review of teaching (formal &amp; informal) for enhancing the quality of teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Peer review of teaching by critical friend for enhancing the quality of teaching.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.12 shows that the highly acceptable side includes mostly aspects of professional development and scholarship of teaching and learning. The intent of these aspects is to enhance the quality of teaching and learning. On the other hand, the likely not acceptable side includes mostly aspects of teaching evaluation approaches. This also reinforces the conclusion that likely acceptability is strongly related to a sense of surveillance that is perceived to accompany the quality processes, with developmental processes receiving strong support and evaluation processes perceived as very likely to raise greater concerns.

It is also interesting to note in Table 6.11 that the 14 likely not acceptable items listed in Table 6.10 do not all receive the same level of consensus, with less agreement in particular about the systems of internal audit/review at the department/faculty level based on submission of documentation about QA/QE of teaching to an internal audit panel. It is
further evident from Table 6.11 that the level of consensus showed a wider distribution for the likely acceptable items and it clustered into: 17 high consensus items, 45 moderate consensus items and 11 no consensus items. Paradoxically, the 11 of the 13 no consensus items were rated as likely acceptable in spite of divergence of opinion. Of the 13 no consensus items, 1 was about regular review of teaching and learning plans, policies, and processes; 8 items were about the internal/external systems of audits and reviews in compliance with institutions or external funding bodies; and 4 items were about internal and external validation of courses.

6.5.1 The Gap between Desirability and Acceptability

The Delphi results revealed a gap between desirability and acceptability. The analysis illustrates that where there was a strong endorsement for desirability of various aspects of QA processes, the respondents perceived that there would be less endorsement for likely acceptability. On the whole, the level of likely acceptability was significantly lower than the level of desirability. Table 6.13 shows the level of desirability against the level of likely acceptability based on median values. It is evident that all aspects of QA processes were rated as highly desirable (100%). In contrast, most aspects of QA processes were rated as likely acceptable (57.48%) followed by highly acceptable (31.50%) and likely not acceptable (11.02%).

Table 6.13: Level of desirability against the level of likely acceptability by median values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The level of desirability and likely acceptability</th>
<th>Level of Desirability (No. of Items)</th>
<th>Desirability Percentage</th>
<th>Level of Acceptability (No. of Items)</th>
<th>Acceptability Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly Desirable (Acceptable)</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely Desirable (Acceptable)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>57.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely Not Desirable (Acceptable)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Desirable (Acceptable) At all</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disjunction between the level of desirability and the level of likely acceptability can also be observed by comparing Table 6.6 with Table 6.9. In contrast to desirability in Table 6.6, Table 6.9 shows that various aspects of QA processes are non-aligned for their likely acceptability in Pakistan. In the case of desirability, all aspects of each QA process were commonly agreed under highly desirable column (see Table 6.6). In contrast, the Delphi findings revealed a lack of agreement for various aspects of QA processes for their likely acceptability and it varied from highly acceptable through likely acceptable to likely not acceptable. Table 6.9 clearly shows that, in most cases, some aspects of each QA process
were rated as highly acceptable while the other aspects of the same cluster were rated as likely acceptable or even likely not acceptable.

To clarify the nature of the gap between the desirability and the likely acceptability of QA processes, a further analysis was carried out comparing the mean scores on each item. A comparison of means was chosen because this most clearly shows the overall strength of endorsement of each item. The results are shown in Table 6.14 and the analysis confirms the gap between the level of desirability and the level of likely acceptability for various aspects of QA processes. Of the 127 items, only 20 items were rated as highly acceptable (15.75%) compared to 123 highly desirable items (96.85%).

Table 6.14 also shows that the majority of the items (94) were rated as likely acceptable (74.01%) compared with only 4 likely desirable items (3.15%) in this range. The 13 items, for their likely acceptability, were rated as likely not acceptable (10.24%) compared with none of the items in this range for desirability. The gap between the desirability and the likely acceptability of various aspects of QA processes in Pakistan was further confirmed because these 13 likely not acceptable items rated by their mean values were also rated as likely not acceptable by their median values, as listed in Table 6.10. The next subsection investigates the nature of this variation.

Table 6.14: Level of desirability compared with the level of likely acceptability by mean values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The level of desirability and likely acceptability</th>
<th>Level of Desirability (No. of Items)</th>
<th>Desirability Percentage</th>
<th>Level of Acceptability (No. of Items)</th>
<th>Acceptability Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High (Mean≥5.00)</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>96.85</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely (5.00&gt;Mean ≥3.50)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>74.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely Not (3.50&gt;Mean ≥2.00)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not At all (Mean&lt;2.00)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.5.2 The Nature of the Variation in Levels of Acceptability

The variation in the likely acceptability of various aspects of QA processes was further investigated by searching for a relationship, if any, between the nature of items and their likely acceptability. The items in the questionnaire were classified into four categories by their orientation: developmental (D) or QE-oriented; judgemental (J) or QA-led; mixture of both developmental and judgemental (QE&QA); and motivated by recognition and rewards (R&R). This classification of items into four categories by their nature is shown in Table 6.15 against the percentage of their likely acceptability.
Table 6.15: Classification of items by nature and their likely acceptability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Nature of Items and Likely Acceptability</th>
<th>Percentage of HA Items</th>
<th>Percentage of LA Items</th>
<th>Percentage of LNA Items</th>
<th>Percentage of NAA Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developmental or QE-oriented (D)</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>23.29</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition and Rewards (R&amp;R)</td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental &amp; Judgemental (QE&amp;QA)</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>56.16</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgemental or QA-oriented (J)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.44</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HA – highly acceptable; LA – likely acceptable; LNA – likely not acceptable; NAA – not acceptable at all

The analysis of the Delphi items by their QE/QA orientation in Table 6.15 illustrates the differential nature of the likely acceptability rating. It is obvious from the Table that high acceptability is strongly related to those items that are defined as QE-oriented (70%) and none of the QA-oriented items was rated as highly acceptable. On the other extreme, only 14.28% of the QE-oriented items were rated as likely not acceptable. In contrast, 57.14% of the QA-oriented items were rated as likely not acceptable. In the middle, the majority of the likely acceptable items (56.16%) of processes are a mixture of both developmental and judgemental items by their orientation. Further details about the likely acceptability of QA/QE processes, in relation to the nature of items and their orientation, are provided in Appendix K.

In accordance with the variation in the likely acceptability of various aspects of QA/QE processes, a specific pattern emerged. In most instances, the acceptability of QE-focused items was highest, followed by R&R items, QE&QA items and QA-oriented items. Table 6.15 clearly indicates that the percentage of QE-oriented items is highest in the highly acceptable items column; the percentage of QE&QA-oriented items is highest in the likely acceptable items column; and the percentage of QA-oriented items is highest in the likely not acceptable column. These results are shown graphically in Figure 6.1.

Figure 6.1 clearly shows that the largest proportion in the highly acceptable (HA) column is occupied by QE-oriented items, followed by R&R-oriented items. Similarly, the largest proportion in the likely acceptable (LA) column is occupied by QE&QA-oriented items and the largest proportion in the likely not acceptable (LNA) column is occupied by QA-oriented items. The data presented in Table 6.15 and Figure 6.1 suggest that the differences between the highly acceptable (HA) side of QA processes and the likely not acceptable (LNA) side of QA/QE processes forms a continuum. This continuum is also confirmed by the application of a modified scree test to the Delphi data.
6.5.3 Acceptability of QA/QE Processes – Modified Scree Test

The likely acceptability of various aspects of QA processes by their QA/QE orientation was further analyzed using a modified scree test. This test is used to separate the highly acceptable items from the not acceptable ones. This test also determined the level of consensus and examined the relationship between the nature of items and their likely acceptability. The method for applying the scree test is outlined in Chapter 4 (see Section 4.4.4, Subsection E). The results of the analysis are shown in Figure 6.2.

By plotting the weighted mean values for all of the items along the y-axis and the items in descending order of mean values along the x-axis, a downward slope was produced. This downward slope is represented by orange dots in the Figure 6.2. A straight scree-line was drawn along the points with an angle of less than 40 degrees along the x-axis, represented by a blue line in the Figure 6.2. A cut-off point of 58 emerged, at which point the scree-line and a downward slope of orange dots intersected. This served as a reference point for the interpretation of the results. The procedure adopted for the interpretation of the scree test (and Figure 6.2) is further explained in Section 4.4.4 (Subsection D).

The level of consensus and the level of likely acceptability for various aspects of QA/QE processes are shown in Figure 6.2. The processes fall into three broad groups: the items

Figure 6.1: *Relationship between the nature of items and their likely acceptability by column graph*
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above the scree-line; the items along the scree-line; and the items below the scree-line. The test revealed that most of the items above the scree-line achieved consensus with a high level of acceptability. In most cases these items were of a developmental nature with an emphasis on ‘quality enhancement’ along with items about ‘recognition and rewards’.

Figure 6.2: Continuum of the modified scree test for likely acceptability of items

The items along the scree-line were further divided into two parts. The items to the left side of the scree-line achieved consensus and most of these items were a mixture of QA, QE and recognition and rewards. In most cases, the items to the right side of the scree-line were of a judgemental nature with an emphasis on QA. The items below the scree-line were also of judgemental nature. Figure 6.2 and Figure 6.3 show the scree-line as a continuum with eight broad categories of QA processes.

Figures 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3 (also see Appendix K) clearly show that most aspects of QA/QE processes in the highly acceptable (HA) column or on the left side of the continuum are qualitative measures, developmental, enhancement-led and motivated by rewards (R&R). The most prominent aspects are from the categories of SoTL (scholarship of teaching and learning), professional development, and recognition and rewards. It is, therefore, argued that high likely acceptability of these aspects of QA/QE processes might be due to their developmental nature. Similarly, high likely acceptability of these aspects indicates less
or no attention given to scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL), a historical lack of professional development, and a lack of recognition and rewards in Pakistan universities.

**Figure 6.3: Continuum of the Nature of Items and their Likely Acceptability**

It is also evident that most aspects of QA processes in the likely acceptable (LA) column in Figure 6.1 or at the middle-left side of the continuum in Figure 6.3 are a mixture of both qualitative and quantitative measures; developmental and judgemental; internal and external drivers; and enhancement-led (QE) and accountability-led aspects by their nature along with aspects of recognition and rewards. The prominent aspects in this range are from the categories of teaching and learning plans, policies and processes (D&J); audits and reviews (D&J); teaching quality appraisal (D&J); curriculum approval (D&J); student evaluations of teaching (D&J); and R&R (D&J). For the most part, these QA processes require committed effort from academic staff and leadership in their implementation.

With few exceptions, most aspects of QA processes in the likely not acceptable column in Figure 6.1 or at the middle-right side of the continuum in Figure 6.3 are the quantitative measures and are of a judgemental nature. The most prominent aspects in this part include: external system of audits and reviews and public reporting of performance; peer review of teaching; performance reviews of all academic staff; and involvement of students in the process of teaching evaluation. It was, however, evident that none of the items were in the column ‘not acceptable at all’ or to the far right of the continuum.

To sum up, the Delphi findings revealed that the likely acceptability of QA/QE processes for teaching in Pakistan universities falls across three levels: highly acceptable, likely
acceptable, and likely not acceptable. The Delphi findings further revealed that the gap between desirability and the likely acceptability of various aspects of QA/QE processes is wider at the likely not acceptable side than the highly acceptable side of QA processes. In other words, some of the aspects that the experts rated as most desirable were those that they considered were likely to be the most unacceptable. In order to develop a sustainable framework of QA/QE processes for teaching for Pakistan universities, it is essential to lessen the gap between desirability and likely acceptability.

The intended framework needs to be developed in such a way that facilitates an increase in the likely acceptability of QA/QE processes from low to high. The Delphi Round II questionnaire provided initial guidelines for this by asking experts to identify reasons for likely low acceptability. These results are shown in Table 6.16 and suggest that a lack of confidence in governance, staff resistance, and a lack of developmental resources are the major reasons for likely low acceptability of QA/QE processes in Pakistan.

Table 6.16: Level of desirability against level of likely acceptability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Reasons for Low Acceptability of QA Processes</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate Governance</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Resistance</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient Developmental Resources like Expertise, Infrastructure, Guidelines, etc.</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others if any</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.6 Desirability and Likely Acceptability of QA Processes at Category Level

This section reports the Delphi findings at the process level (by category) for each of the eight broad categories of QA processes for teaching with the purpose of assessing their level of desirability/acceptability in Pakistan universities. The findings suggested that all aspects of QA processes in each category are highly desirable in Pakistan. However, the situation for the likely acceptability of various aspects of QA processes was somewhat different. This section is thus particularly focused on discussion about the level of likely acceptability of QA processes in Pakistan. Discussion will move from highly acceptable categories to the likely not acceptable categories of QA processes in Pakistan universities. Appendix L presents an overview of the Delphi findings for the acceptability of various aspects of QA/QE processes.
6.6.1 Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL)

For this category, opinions were sought from the experts about 9 aspects of SoTL and 8 aspects of Teaching-Research Nexus. The experts agreed, either with a high or moderate consensus, on all items of this category both for their desirability and likely acceptability. All items of this category were rated as highly desirable. For the likely acceptability, the items in this category clustered into two groups: 15 items were rated as highly acceptable and 2 items were rated as likely acceptable. The nature of the 15 highly acceptable items indicates that their high acceptability might be due to three reasons.

First, the focus of the most of highly acceptable items is on strengthening the connection between teaching and research by developing, supporting and strengthening SoTL. This process is more likely to engage academics in research and teaching and to improve their skill in both. Second, these highly acceptable aspects are likely to encourage academics to be engaged in professional development activities because it appears that most academics in Pakistan have little experience of such activities and of SoTL. Third, high acceptability of these aspects also appears to be motivated by recognition and rewards. For example, most aspects in this category are focused on teaching fellowships and teaching improvement grants. These activities are not only focused on improving the teaching quality of academics but are also a source of recognizing and rewarding their scholarly activities in teaching.

The high acceptability of various aspects of this category indicates the strong desire of academic leaders to develop, support and strengthen SoTL in Pakistan. It is reasonable to assume that SoTL can provide an impetus to other QA processes for teaching in Pakistan. SoTL is an evidence-based reflective process for improving the quality of teaching and learning and will initiate debate about teaching and learning in Pakistan universities. The process of supporting SoTL in Pakistan is likely to initiate a thinking process about teaching and learning. This aspect of academic work appears to be missing in Pakistan and attention has seldom been paid to this practice.

An engagement of academics and institutions with SoTL encourages a scholarly approach to teaching and will help in understanding concepts such as problem identification as it relates to teaching, evidence collection, student understanding and engagement, and data analysis and evaluation. SoTL can help in informing decisions within institutions about development of policies and processes (D’Andrea & Gosling, 2005) for improving the
quality of teaching. SoTL is also likely to provide a guide at the initial stages of developing and implementing QA processes in Pakistan universities and thus can revive teaching. This might happen in Pakistan in a similar fashion to the way Boyer’s efforts (1990) at the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching helped to revive teaching in Western universities.

6.6.2 Professional Development (PD)

The Delphi findings revealed that experts agreed, either with a high or moderate level of consensus, on all items of this category both for their desirability and likely acceptability in Pakistan universities. All aspects of this category were rated as highly desirable. The likely acceptability of items, in most cases, was also high. The consistency of the level of acceptability with the level of desirability, for most items in this category, indicates the strong desire of experts for professional development activities in universities.

The key aspects of this category are shown in Appendix L along with an overview of the findings for likely acceptability. In this category the items clustered into two groups: most of these aspects (9) were rated as highly acceptable, and the next largest group of aspects (6) was those found to be likely acceptable. Most items of this category, as proposed in questionnaire, were linked with each other and a few aspects of PD activities were also linked with the developmental aspects of ‘teaching quality appraisal’ and ‘review and evaluation’. The high likely acceptability, for most of the aspects suggests that they may complement each other and also support aspects in the ‘teaching quality appraisal’ and ‘review and evaluation’ categories. In addition, all items in this category were at the developmental side of QA-QE continuum.

The 9 highly acceptable items are developmental in nature and are focused on developing either infrastructure for professional development of academic staff or on staff improving their own practices without the external surveillance of a colleague or a manager. The 6 likely acceptable items were related either to the developmental practices of ‘peer review’ and ‘peer mentoring’ in collaboration with teaching and learning centres or to evaluation of professional development activities for developmental purposes. All these aspects are developmental in nature and are more likely to increase acceptability of QA processes.

It is hypothesized that the strong desirability and likely acceptability for various aspects of this category is due to a historical lack of professional development and the resources allocated for the purpose in Pakistan universities. This hypothesis is strengthened by the
fact that a mere 23 percent of current faculty members in public sector universities of Pakistan hold PhD degrees (Hayward, 2009). Although the presence of PhD-qualified faculty members does not give a guarantee of quality teaching in universities, it increases the possibility, especially the integration of research into teaching. Implementation of professional development may be affected by resource availability but its provision is essential given that many academics are lacking in some basic skills, such as operating a computer, using web, accessing online databases. In most cases in Pakistan, no attention has been paid to establishing supporting units, networks and centres for teaching and learning in universities for professional development of academics and for conducting research into university teaching and learning.

6.6.3 Recognition, Rewards and Incentives

The experts agreed, either with a high or moderate level of consensus, on all aspects of this category both for their desirability and likely acceptability in Pakistan universities. All items of this category were rated as highly desirable. For likely acceptability the items in this category clustered into two groups: 4 items were rated as highly acceptable and the remaining 11 as likely acceptable. High desirability and a fair level of likely acceptability, for most of the items in this category, indicates the strong desire of academics that their scholarly activities in teaching and learning be recognized and rewarded at individual, faculty, institutional and national level in Pakistan universities.

The 4 highly acceptable items were about recognition and rewards of scholarly teaching (and related activities) of academic staff in tenure and promotion and through teaching excellence awards. These items were also of a developmental nature. For example, item ‘recognition of leadership in the development of good teaching and learning practices in tenure promotion and award processes’ is essentially focused on development as well as on rewards. One of the potential reasons for high likely acceptability of these items might be that the faculty of most public sector universities of Pakistan has been underpaid until recently (Hayward, 2009). There are also no procedures for recognizing and rewarding the efforts of those faculty members who put their efforts into improving the quality of teaching and learning at an individual level or at faculty/institutional level.

The 11 likely acceptable items in this category were about: performance-based external incentives for institutions; teaching-focused appointments; and development of teaching portfolios for documentation of evidence-based teaching effectiveness. It appears that the
lower level of acceptability for these items is related to their judgemental nature and due to the linkage of incentives with performance in teaching and learning. A possible reason for the variation in likely acceptability of “development of teaching portfolios” might be the lack of awareness about this among academics. These results also suggest that as we move from developmental aspects of QA processes to the judgemental aspects, the likely acceptability decreases.

A fair level of likely acceptability for various aspects of this category and the desire for recognition and rewards for scholarly activities in teaching might also be due to following two factors. First, in many universities in Pakistan, efforts for improving the quality of teaching and learning are not rewarded through tenure and promotion processes. Teaching quality is merely counted in number of years served, irrespective of its quality. Second, there is no concept of external incentives for institutions on the basis of their performance in teaching and learning (i.e., a lack of linkage of funding with performance). As a result, there is no distinction between those departments, faculties, and institutions who take measures to improve the quality of their teaching and learning and those who do not. There are likely to be issues of cost effectiveness in using a system of recognition and rewards but such a system, is likely to be appealing in the context of Pakistan given that the faculty of most public sector universities of Pakistan has been underpaid until recently (Hayward, 2009).

6.6.4 Curriculum Design, Development and Approval

The findings suggested that experts agreed, either with a high or moderate consensus, on all aspects of this category for their desirability in Pakistan. In contrast, consensus was achieved on only eight aspects of this category for their likely acceptability and it was not achieved on the remaining four. These four items were about involvement of experts from industry in the development and review of curricula and about the validation of courses by internal and external academics prior to their delivery.

All aspects of this category were rated as highly desirable for Pakistan universities. On the other hand, the likely acceptability of items in this category clustered into two groups: 4 aspects were rated as highly acceptable and the remaining 8 items were rated as likely acceptable. Consequently, a slight disjunction between the level of acceptability and the level of desirability was noted for most of the aspects. The 4 highly acceptable items were about development and review of courses within faculties and departments along with
provision of support and training to academic staff for this purpose. It is argued that high likely acceptability of these 4 aspects is because of their focus on assuring and enhancing the quality of courses through internal procedures without external surveillance of a body or a colleague.

The 8 likely acceptable items in this category were about involvement of external experts or academics in the development and review of courses and curricula. Likewise, the items with an emphasis on student-centred teaching and learning practices, encouragement of an inclusive learning and teaching experience for students and the establishment of staff-student consultative committees for the discussion of matters related to quality of courses and teaching were also rated as likely acceptable compared to high desirability rating. The potential reason for a lower acceptability rating may be that teachers in Pakistan perceive themselves as an authority and thus do not want to involve students in processes. This conclusion is supported by the general findings that external quality assurance processes tended to be rated at lower levels of acceptability than internal processes. It might also be due to the lack of professional development for academics in the area of course design and review. In most public sector universities of Pakistan prior to 2003-04, there has been an annual system of assessment, in which the same curricula has been taught for years. In such an environment curriculum development is not accorded a high priority.

6.6.5 Teaching and Learning Plans, Policies and Processes

The Delphi findings suggested that experts agreed, either with a high or moderate level of consensus, on all aspects of this category for their desirability. All aspects of this category were rated as highly desirable. However, experts agreed on 13 aspects of this category for their likely acceptability and consensus was not achieved on 1 aspect. This no consensus item was about the regular review and update of teaching and learning plans and policies. The level of likely acceptability for this category was also low. Only one item was rated as highly acceptable and the remaining 13 items were rated as likely acceptable. The only highly acceptable item was about provision of assistance and support to departments and faculties for development and implementation of teaching and learning plan, policies and processes.

The 13 likely acceptable items in this category are aimed at developing and implementing teaching and learning plans, policies and processes at department, faculty and institutional level for assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching and learning. In many instances,
these activities require qualified and professionally developed faculty members, staff and academic leadership along with a considerable amount of time and effort. It is assumed that these factors may be the potential reasons for the low likely acceptability of various aspects of this category because many Pakistan universities are struggling in these areas for resources. The assumption is strengthened by the fact that many academic leaders indicated a lack of expertise as one of the potential reasons for the low likely acceptability of QA processes, as is obvious in Table 6.16.

Although all aspects of this category are likely acceptable in Pakistan universities, a slight disjunction was noted between the level of acceptability and the level of desirability. It indicates that academics might have concerns about some aspects. It is hypothesized that the difference between the levels of likely acceptability and desirability may be due to the newness of the QA/QE concept and a lack of awareness and the understanding about the concept of QA/QE and their benefits in Pakistan.

The other potential reason for a mismatch between levels of acceptability and desirability for various aspects of this category is the lack of resources in universities. The planning processes (such as teaching and learning plans) and the developmental aspects of QA are generally linked with resources (Ramsden, 2003) and most universities in Pakistan are lacking in this respect. This fact was confirmed as many experts stated lack of resources as one of potential reasons for the low likely acceptability of QA processes in Pakistan (see Table 6.16).

Most items of this category are the basics of QA/QE and the role of academic leadership (i.e., the Directors of QECs, deans and academic heads in the case of Pakistan) cannot be denied in developing and implementing teaching and learning plans, policies, processes and guidelines. However, there is a lack of qualified academic leadership in Pakistan. For instance, only a few Directors of QECs hold advanced qualifications in higher education. The participants in the second round of the Delphi also indicated lack of expertise as one of the potential reasons for likely low acceptability of QA processes (see Table 6.16).

6.6.6 Teaching Quality Appraisal (TQA)

For this category, opinions were sought from the academic leaders about eight aspects of TQA processes for academic staff and seven aspects of TQA processes for departments and faculties. The experts agreed, either with a high or moderate consensus, on all aspects of this category for desirability. However, a slight disjunction was noted in the case of
likely acceptability of some aspects and the items clustered into two groups. Seven items of this category were rated as highly acceptable, with the same number of items rated as likely acceptable. However, the experts agreed with high consensus that one aspect of this category might not be acceptable in Pakistan. The likely acceptability for some aspects of this category was thus not consistent with their desirability.

The highly acceptable items of this category are related to aspects such as: taking account of professional development needs and career aspiration needs of academic staff while setting targets concerning teaching in annual performance reviews; provision of rewards to academic staff for their satisfactory ratings in performance reviews; and provision of support to academic staff who achieve below expectation teaching rating in performance reviews. These aspects are either about the developmental needs of academics or they are about recognition and rewards. These represent the ‘softer’ side of QA, and do not need much effort on the part of academics, and thus are rated as highly acceptable.

The likely acceptable aspects are related to the performance measurement of academics and of faculties either through performance reviews or teaching and learning performance indicators. These reflect the ‘harder’ side of QA processes. It is, therefore, hypothesized that the gap between desirability and likely acceptability for some of the aspects of this category might be due to a perceived reluctance by academics in Pakistan to have the quality of their teaching judged. This in spite of the need identified by the Boston Group (2001) for performance evaluation of academics in Pakistan and the linkage of promotions and increases in salaries with the performance of academic staff.

One aspect of this category was rated as likely not acceptable with a high consensus. This aspect was about monitoring the performance of academics through annual performance reviews. Paradoxically, such reviews were rated as likely acceptable for probationary and new academics but likely not acceptable for all of the academics. It appears that this gap might be due to staff resistance and inappropriate governance. It is also evident from Table 6.16 that these two reasons were strongly stated by the experts, in the second round of the Delphi, as potential reasons for the likely low acceptability of QA/QE processes in Pakistan universities.

One of the potential reasons for the difference between the level of desirability and the level of likely acceptability of performance reviews of academics, as noted by Jadoon and Jabeen (2006), is that these reviews have been used by academic heads as a controlling
tool for academic staff and not as a performance measure or for developmental purposes in Pakistan universities. While implementing annual performance reviews in Pakistan, it is likely that the process may not be implemented in a transparent way. Experts also indicated inappropriate governance as one of the potential reasons for the likely low acceptability of QA/QE processes in Pakistan.

6.6.7 Review and Evaluation of Teaching and Courses

The Delphi findings suggested that experts agreed, either with a high or moderate level of consensus, on all aspects of this category for their desirability. A disjunction was noted, however, in the likely acceptability of various aspects of this category compared with their desirability. The findings revealed that about half of the items in this category were rated as likely acceptable whereas the rest of the items were rated as likely not acceptable.

The critical analysis of the nature of likely acceptable items of this category indicates that they are focused on concepts such as: summative student evaluation surveys to monitor and improve the quality of teaching and courses; informing teachers about results of these surveys and to provide support to them in reflective practices; reporting results of surveys to all concerned for monitoring, improvement and recognition purposes; to seek formative feedback from students and peers. In most instances, these aspects have the characteristics of both developmental and judgemental approaches to quality by nature and a few aspects are motivated by rewards. It is argued, therefore, that the mixture of both developmental and judgemental approaches for various aspects of this category and their linkage with recognition and rewards has led to the rating of likely acceptable for these aspects.

Approximately half the aspects in this category were rated as likely not acceptable. These items were related to the concepts such as: to inform students about the results and action taken at their feedback; student evaluation at the request of students; and peer review of teaching for all purposes. Consequently, a wide gap was noted between desirability and likely acceptability of these aspects. A low likely acceptability of those aspects that were about the involvement of students in the teaching evaluation process may be due to a lack of awareness among students and also their political affiliations. In most public sector universities of Pakistan, students’ associations have been subjected to external political influences (Government of Pakistan, 2002). These student associations also influence the implementation of processes (Batool & Qureshi, 2007).
The item ‘collegial peer review of teaching for enhancing the quality of teaching and for identifying and disseminating good practices in teaching/learning’ was also rated as likely not acceptable. Similarly, peer review of teaching for all other purposes, including its use for recognitions and rewards, was also rated as likely not acceptable. This may reflect a misunderstanding of peer review with it being interpreted as a judgemental rather than developmental process. One of the potential reasons for this is that this practice, and similarly for annual performance reviews (Jadoon & Jabeen, 2006), might be used by academic heads as a control tool.

It is hypothesized that one of the potential reasons for the low likely acceptability of some aspects of this category is the partial implementation of the processes. For example, in case of ‘student evaluations’, attention is not given to the provision of feedback to individual teachers and consequent reflective practices. In the absence of feedback and reflective practices, true benefits of the process are not revealed and consequently its acceptability decreases. Another potential reason might be the lack of recognition and rewards associated with the practice. Kember et al. (2002) report that effective use of feedback data in teaching evaluation is related to the incentives for the purpose.

6.6.8 System of Audits and Reviews

The findings suggested that the experts agreed, either with a high or moderate consensus, on all aspects of this category for their desirability. Their opinions, however, diverged on some aspects of this category for the likely acceptability. Of the 19 items, high consensus was achieved on only 2. One of these aspects was rated as likely acceptable and the other as likely not acceptable. Moderate consensus was achieved on 9 aspects and all of these were rated as likely acceptable. Opinions of experts diverged on the remaining 8 aspects of this category and consensus was not achieved. Of the 8 no consensus items, the 5 were rated as likely acceptable and 3 were rated as likely not acceptable.

This is the highest number of items in any of the eight categories of QA/QE processes on which consensus was not achieved. It is assumed that the lack of consensus on these items might be due to the complexity of review and audit procedures. These processes have not yet started in Pakistan universities and many academics are not aware of them. Likewise, the lack of qualified academic leadership might be the potential reason. The overall level of likely acceptability in this category clustered into two groups: 15 items were rated as likely acceptable and 4 items were rated as likely not acceptable.
The 1 likely acceptable item, with a high level of consensus, was about the use of internal audits and reviews at department and faculty level for identifying good practices and emerging trends in teaching and learning’. This item is developmental in nature and lies at the ‘softer’ side of QA. In contrast, one likely not acceptable item, with a high level of consensus, was about the ‘provision of information to the public concerning universities’ capacity for assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching and learning, as a requirement from external bodies’. This item is more about accountability, is of quantitative nature, and lies at the ‘harder’ side of QA.

The 9 aspects in this category that were rated as likely acceptable with a moderate level of consensus are internal activities and are generally carried out by faculties and departments with a focus on development. It is, therefore, hypothesized that the developmental nature of these aspects attracts academic staff towards their acceptability. The five no consensus items that were rated as likely acceptable were about internal systems of audit and review at department and faculty level for assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching and learning. In most cases, these audits and/or reviews are based around the submission of documentation concerning QA/QE of teaching and learning by the department or faculty concerned. The focus of these audits/reviews is generally on monitoring, reviewing and enhancing the quality of teaching and learning in compliance with QA/QE mechanisms of the institution.

These audit and review activities are generally carried out internally by the department or faculty concerned and it is thus hypothesized that their ‘soft’ nature has led to their likely acceptable rating. The 3 no consensus items that were rated as likely not acceptable were about establishing a system of institutional audits and reviews for reviewing, assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching and learning. These audits and reviews are based on the submission of documentation, regarding QA/QE of teaching and learning, by universities to the external audit/review panel. Subsequently, universities are expected to implement quality improvement plans and related follow-up activities recommended by the external auditors following an audit visit.

The above analysis clearly shows that there is a slight or a wide gap between desirability and likely acceptability of all aspects of this category depending upon the nature of items. It is assumed that this difference might be due to monitoring and reviewing aspects of the process. One of the potential reasons for this gap, in the case of Pakistan, might be that audit activities are usually executed in compliance with external funding bodies and the
process requires a considerable amount of time, effort and documentation. These factors are also related to the lack of resources as was indicated by the experts (see Table 6.16). The other potential reasons for the gap between desirability and the likely acceptability of some aspects in this category might be: the newness of the concept of audits/reviews, lack of awareness, the lack of qualified leadership for implementing processes, involvement of external bodies, autonomy of the universities and the accountability aspects of the process.

One of the reasons for the low acceptability of various aspects of this category may be the lack of recognition and rewards in Pakistan universities. In 30 universities of Pakistan, the Self-Assessment has been initiated by departments under efforts of QECs as a measure of QA. The process is similar to an internal system of audits and reviews at department level. In a presentation about implementation of Self-Assessment, one of the Directors of a QEC revealed that many academic heads and faculty members feel Self-Assessment to be an additional and troublesome activity (Presentation at 14th Meeting of QEC Heads, 2010). Therefore, they do not take it seriously and, in some instances, an indirect demand for substantial rewards has been made.

The director of the QEC further revealed that currently there is no distinction between departments who are following Self-Assessment Procedures and those who are not. It was suggested that there is a need for recognition of the departments, faculties, and of faculty members who are following Self Assessment Procedures and cooperating with QECs. This also indicates that likely acceptability of various aspects of this category might be increased through the linkage of QA processes with recognition and rewards systems.

6.7 Conclusion

To summarize, this chapter has examined the responses of leaders in Pakistan universities to eight broad categories of QA processes for teaching. These categories were derived from a prior template analysis of 229 policy and practice documents concerning QA of teaching from Universitas 21 institutions. The Delphi technique was used to assess the desirability and likely acceptability of various aspects of QA processes for teaching in Pakistan universities. The findings suggested that all aspects of eight categories of QA processes are highly desirable in Pakistan universities.
However, the situation was somewhat different for the likely acceptability of various aspects of QA processes in Pakistan universities and it fell across three levels, namely: highly acceptable, likely acceptable, and likely not acceptable. In addition, a wide gap was observed between the level of desirability and the level of likely acceptability for various aspects of QA processes. The findings further revealed that the variation in the levels of acceptability was associated with the nature of items and a particular pattern emerged in the form of a continuum of three parts.

In most instances, the items to the left of the continuum were of a developmental nature and these aspects are likely highly acceptable in Pakistan. The items at the middle of the continuum were a mixture of both developmental and judgemental in nature and these aspects are likely acceptable in Pakistan. In most cases, the items to the right of the continuum were of a judgemental nature and these aspects are likely not acceptable in Pakistan. No items were rated as ‘not acceptable at all’.

The next chapter is particularly focused on the perceptions of higher education staff in Pakistan about the potential reasons that might explain the wide gap between desirability and likely acceptability of various aspects of QA processes in Pakistan universities.
Chapter 7
Academics’ Perceptions of the Low Likely Acceptability of QA/QE processes in Pakistan

7.1 Overview

The Delphi results revealed a gap between desirability and likely acceptability of various aspects of QA/QE processes for teaching in Pakistan universities (See Chapter 6). This chapter examines higher education academics’ perceptions about the low likely acceptability of QA processes for teaching in Pakistan universities.

Interviews were conducted with 6 Directors of QECs in Pakistan along with 22 lecturers and senior lecturers studying towards their PhDs at The University of Auckland following teaching experience in Pakistan universities. This chapter deals with the analysis of those interviews. The results from this phase of the study were used to illustrate, elaborate and enhance the Delphi findings, as part of the mixed method design. This chapter identifies the key factors that are likely to influence acceptability of QA processes in Pakistan. As such, these factors provide the basis for the development of a framework of QA processes for teaching for Pakistan universities.

7.2 Method

For this phase of the study, the data were collected in two stages. In the first stage, semi-structured interviews were conducted with six Directors of quality enhancement cells (QECs) in Pakistan. These QEC Directors had also participated in both rounds of the Delphi. As a result, the participants were aware of various aspects of the eight categories of QA processes and, therefore, were asked to state the potential reasons for low likely acceptability of each of the broad categories of QA processes in Pakistan universities.

In the second stage, 3 semi-structured focus group interviews were conducted with 22 lecturers and senior lecturers studying towards their PhDs at The University of Auckland. The participants in each group were informed briefly about each of the eight categories of QA/QE processes for teaching followed by the Delphi findings. They were then asked to state the potential reasons for low likely acceptability of each of the eight categories of QA processes, one by one, in the context of Pakistan universities. Chapter 4 provides the rationale for selecting the Directors of QECs and lecturers as a sample for the study. The
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analysis of interviews was carried out using the same template analysis technique as was used for the analysis of policy and practice documents (see Chapter 5).

7.3 Data Analysis

For this phase of the study, the template analysis started with four a priori themes: inappropriate governance; staff resistance; insufficient developmental resources; and cost. These themes were initially derived from the researcher’s personal experience of work in Pakistan higher education. These themes were also predominantly indicated by the experts, in the second round of the Delphi, as potential reasons for low acceptability of various aspects of QA processes in Pakistan universities (see Table 6.18). Further themes were allowed to emerge from within the dataset at the later stages of analysis. Using the qualitative data analysis software NVivo 8, a final template was developed. The final template revealed nine main themes and provided the basis for interpretation of the data.

7.4 Reasons for Low Acceptability of QA/QE Processes

The analysis of interviews revealed nine major factors that are likely to be responsible for the low likely acceptability of various aspects of QA processes for teaching in Pakistan universities. These factors, in a format of major themes and their subthemes, are shown in Table 7.1 and are summarized in the following subsections. The template analysis further suggested that most of these factors are linked with each other and apply to more than one QA/QE process. Understanding these factors will help to inform the nature of the framework of QA processes for teaching for Pakistan universities.

The following discussion illustrates the key findings with reference to interview excerpts validated by, where available, the findings of external reports on the situation in higher education in Pakistan.

7.4.1 Lack of Awareness

The first important factor that appears to be responsible for low likely acceptability of QA (and QE) processes in Pakistan universities is the lack of awareness about the concept of quality assurance among students, academic staff and leadership, and administrators. The participants suggested that the lack of awareness might be due to the newness of the concept of quality assurance in Pakistan universities. For instance, one QEC Director
stated: “You know, the concept is also new and it will take time ... and awareness among staff is more than necessary”.

Table 7.1: Factors likely responsible for low likely acceptability of QA processes in Pakistan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Awareness</td>
<td>Lack of awareness among staff and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newness of the concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difficulties in understanding the notion of quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Issues due to the lack of awareness among students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Qualified Human Resources</td>
<td>Lack of qualified faculty members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of qualified academic leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of expertise in the area of QA/QE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient Developmental Resources</td>
<td>Lack of financial resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Professional Development</td>
<td>Lack of professional development centres at universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need for capacity building in the area of QA/QE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate Governance and Administrative Structure</td>
<td>Consistency between role and responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need for change in management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Trust of Academics due to Inappropriate use of Processes</td>
<td>Inappropriate use of processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concerns about benefits of processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of fairness and transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bias in the use of processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of processes as a controlling tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of trust of academics in the processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of a Conducive Academic Environment</td>
<td>Staff resistance - against change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mindset of academic staff/negative attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absence of accountability culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative perception about the process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Interference</td>
<td>Political affiliations of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political affiliations of staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political interference in appointments and promotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political interests of governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative role of staff and students’ associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Recognition, Rewards, and Incentives</td>
<td>Lack of recognition and rewards in promotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of recognition and rewards for efforts in QA/QE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This resonates with the findings of a similar study in which Azam (2007) reports, in a survey of ten QEC Directors, that the initiative received a less enthusiastic response in the beginning due to lack of awareness, understanding and familiarity of academics with the concept of quality. The common perception of academics in Pakistan is that their job is to teach students, and learning is the job of students. Consequently, most of the teachers do little to improve the quality of their teaching. The shift in focus of university teaching towards learning may increase the probability that teachers will make the effort to improve the quality of their teaching.
The participants also identified that many QA/QE processes for teaching in Pakistan are likely to be influenced by a lack of awareness among students about QA/QE processes. For example, the participants commented that, in some instances, students are not fair in their evaluations due to a lack of awareness about the purpose behind the evaluation of teaching. One QEC Director revealed that, while evaluating teachers, students are concerned about their forthcoming grading and, therefore, rate influential teachers high irrespective of their teaching quality. Likewise, another QEC Director commented that the mindset of students is such that if they get low grades in the course of a particular teacher, they rate that teacher low in their evaluations irrespective of his/her teaching quality and vice versa. Students consider their grading rather than the quality of teaching.

Similarly, one QEC Director identified that good teachers demand quality work from students and students, therefore, are required to work hard. However, students do not necessarily like such teachers due to the associated work burden and hence rate those particular teachers low in their evaluations. As a result, sometimes it may happen that students do not essentially differentiate between the teachers who put effort into improving the quality of teaching and learning and those who do not. The poor differentiation in rating, on the part of students in Pakistan, between the teachers who put effort into teaching and those who do not is evident from the following interview excerpt from a senior lecturer:

The most important thing is to aware students, you need to inform students about the purpose of evaluation … I quote one example, I was conducting evaluation and one student was rating every aspect of teaching high … after evaluation, I asked student the reason and he replied “how can I assign a teacher less rating, he is a teacher and everything will be good” … You know, in Pakistan, someone is not taking a class [teaching], the other is teaching half an hour, and one is dedicated to teaching but everyone is getting high rating. We need to inform students.

It is suggested, therefore, that the lack of awareness among staff and students about QA processes may influence the implementation of processes in Pakistan and their likely acceptability might decrease as a consequence. It is argued, however, that if academics are aware of the benefits of QA processes, they might be more engaged in the processes and their acceptability might increase. Likewise, in the case of student evaluations, if the students knew the learning purpose behind evaluations then it is likely that some of the evaluation difficulties cited above could be decreased.
7.4.2 Lack of Qualified Human Resources

The analysis suggested three major elements in this category: a lack of qualified academic staff, a lack of qualified academic leadership, and a lack of expertise in the area of QA. It is estimated that only 23% of current faculty members in public sector universities in Pakistan hold PhD degrees (Hayward, 2009). The possession of a PhD degree, although not a guarantee of high quality teaching, means it is more likely those faculty members will also continue to conduct research in their disciplines and will consequently teach in a research-informed way.

The lack of qualified faculty members in Pakistan is evident in a comment from one lecturer who stated that “the majority of faculty members, you know, is not according to international standards”. The inability to attract and retain qualified faculty in sufficient numbers is one of the major issues that public sector universities in Pakistan are currently facing (Boston Group, 2001; Government of Pakistan, 2002).

It was also revealed that low likely acceptability of QA processes in Pakistan universities may be due to a lack of qualified academic leadership and a lack of expertise in the area of QA/QE. Ramsden (2003) argues that the quality of academic leadership is critical in improving the quality of teaching in universities. In Pakistan, many of the academic heads, deans, QEC Directors and the members of various committees are not professionally qualified and have a limited knowledge of QA processes. This fact was confirmed in 15th meeting of the Quality Assurance Committee of the HEC as it was revealed that academic heads and deans do not have sufficient knowledge to practice QA/QE processes in their departments and faculties (Minutes of the 15th Meeting of Quality Assurance Committee, 2009).

Likewise, most of the QEC Directors have neither professional qualifications in the area of QA/QE nor experience in conducting research work in this area or in higher education teaching and learning. Many such Directors have been transferred from other posts within universities in order to fill the position and little attention has been paid to appointment of qualified professionals. Some of the QEC Directors have dual roles: that of Director along with another position in a university. For instance, one QEC Director stated that he did not have a professional qualification related to the notion of quality and was appointed as a QEC Director to fill the position. In the same way, another QEC Director suggested a
change in academic leadership and administrative staff for implementing QA processes in order to increase their likely acceptability in Pakistan universities.

7.4.3 Insufficient Developmental Resources

This key factor relates to a lack of infrastructure, lack of financial resources and a lack of expertise and guidelines for the implementation of QA/QE processes. For instance, the establishment of QECs in some universities was significantly delayed due to a lack of staff and financial resources (Azam, 2007). Similarly, the Government of Pakistan (2002) established a Task Force on the improvement of higher education and it was reported that insufficient developmental resources was one of the factors contributing to the declining quality of higher education in Pakistan.

Likewise, one QEC Director commented that lack of financial resources is a barrier to the implementation of QA/QE processes. The lack of financial resources was also evident as the government reduced the budget of the HEC in 2009 (Hayward, 2009) and 2010. One of the lecturers stated: “definitely, infrastructure cost is also high if you want to establish QA system like overseas universities”. Many QA/QE processes, in fact, also require considerable amounts of time and effort on the part of academics. However, academics are already short in number and are facing an extra burden. The following excerpt from a focus group participant reflects the situation:

I think, the second most important problem in our education sector is that there is a big gap in the faculty … it is because there is a specific budget for each university and they try to hire faculty at low wages … therefore faculty will not accept these processes … the reason is simple, … when staff will receive low salary/pay, they will say … the amount of pay we will get we will work to that extent.

7.4.4 Lack of Professional Development

This factor relates to a historical lack of professional development of academic staff in Pakistan universities. For example, 3 QEC Directors indicated the absence of professional development centres at their universities as a potential reason for low likely acceptability of QA/QE processes. Academics are simply not aware of the benefits of the processes. Likewise, two QEC Directors advocated for capacity building in the area of QA/QE to raise the likely acceptability of QA processes.
There is no concept of teaching and learning centres for the professional development of academic staff at institutional level and the idea of a national body for this purpose has only recently been floated with the establishment of the National Academy of Higher Education (NAHE) in Pakistan. Consequently, the concepts of orientation programmes, training and refresher courses and workshops for the support of teaching and learning are largely unknown. Similarly, new academic staff are not required to attain any professional qualification, such as the postgraduate certificate programmes in university teaching and learning which are common in the UK, Australia and New Zealand universities. These types of activities are not in operation at the institutional or national level in Pakistan.

The lack of professional development hinders the implementation of QA/QE processes. As a result, the benefits of these processes are not revealed and thus contribute to the low levels of acceptability. Focus group participants were of the view that the provision of professional development might increase the likely acceptability of QA/QE processes in Pakistan. However, the focus of the participants was on the provision of professional development in accordance with international standards, as one of the lecturers stated: “Whenever professional development is in Pakistan … there is no vision or thought … then nothing is going to happen”.

7.4.5 Inappropriate Governance and Administrative Structure

This factor relates to inappropriate governance and administrative structure in Pakistan. For example, four of the QEC Directors commented that the management and administrative structure is not appropriate for the implementation of QA/QE processes in Pakistan. They were of the view that current management creates barriers to the implementation of QA processes and thus it needs to be changed. Likewise, the Boston Group (2001) through its contribution to the Task Force on the Improvement of Higher Education in Pakistan reports that many problems in public sector universities of Pakistan are due to some serious flaws in their governance and management structures.

One of the governance issues in Pakistan universities is the way academic leadership is appointed. The administrative structure of universities is such that the vice-chancellors, deans and the members of Syndicate are appointed by chancellors (governors). In the
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2The Syndicate is the supreme governing and legislative body of the university. The Chancellor appoints all of its members. The key powers of the Syndicate include: budget approval; curriculum approval; and promotions and salaries (Boston Group, 2001).
best cases, these appointments are not based on performance, and in the worst cases they are based on political patronage or nepotism (Boston Group, 2001). At the lowest levels, the registrar is directly involved in the hiring of faculty members and administrative staff (Boston Group, 2001). The focus group participants commented, however, that registrars are not academics and are generally politically influenced from within or from outside the university. Appointing academic leadership in this way inhibits likely acceptability of QA processes.

A related governance issue is that role, responsibility and authority are not always aligned with each other. In many instances, inappropriate responsibilities are assigned to position-holders with a limited authority and for which they are not accountable in a direct manner (Boston Group, 2001). Such mismatches at times can prevent position-holders fulfilling their responsibilities and result in inappropriate implementation of policies and processes. Consequently, policies and processes end in failure, further reducing acceptability. These types of issues are evident in the following excerpt from a focus group participant:

I think the hierarchy of the process is important … what should be there that they are not answerable … there should be check and balance for those who implement and are in authority … it can be HEC. Quality did not come in public sector but it comes in private sector [in Pakistan] … why, there is an owner in private … the VC should be owner and should be answerable to HEC.

Flaws have also been noted in the service structure (employment terms and conditions) of staff members, both academic and administrative. Most staff members are appointed on a permanent basis irrespective of their performance. They are not appointed for a specified period which might then be renewable on the basis of their performance. Likewise, no regular mechanism exists for evaluating the performance of staff members and merit plays a minimal role in their career advancement (Boston Group, 2001). One QEC Director commented that the service structure of universities is such that they are unable to take any action against staff members who are consistently performing unsatisfactorily. One lecturer indicated the nature of the service structure of universities: “You know if someone doesn’t want to work … what you can do, what university can do against him?” One Director QEC stated: “The structure is such that we cannot do anything with teachers if he does not wishes”.
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7.4.6 Inappropriate use of Processes and Lack of Trust

This factor mostly relates to the lack of trust on the part of academics in the processes as a result of their inappropriate use. The template analysis identified five major elements of this process as: inappropriate use of processes; concerns about the benefits of processes; lack of fairness and transparency in processes; biased use of processes; and the use of processes as a controlling tool. All these factors bring about mistrust on the part of academics in the processes and in their administration. As far as inappropriate use of processes is concerned, one lecturer commented that his university has implemented an annual system of examination in which external examiners assess the performance of students. In this situation, it is inappropriate to seek feedback from students on quality of assessment and to use this information to evaluate lecturers and their classroom teaching. In another instance, the Vice-Chancellor observed the teaching of a lecturer informally without any notice, creating some confusion for the lecturer about the purpose of the visit.

The second element relates to concerns about the benefits of the processes. In the case of student evaluations of teaching, the focus group participants revealed that in most cases the data are not interpreted appropriately nor are the lecturers informed about the results or areas for improvement. The participants revealed that teachers are only informed about their grading (i.e., A, B or C). The lecturers were of the view that the process is unhelpful in improving the quality of teaching.

The next element in this category is a perceived lack of fairness and transparency in the implementation of processes. For instance, most of the QEC Directors commented in their interviews that the processes are not implemented in a fair and transparent way due to the vested interests of those involved in their implementation. In relation to recognition and rewards, one QEC Director stated: “For best teaching awards, teachers influence students and ask for good comments”. Similarly, one QEC Director pointed out issues in student evaluations of teaching. He commented that both students and teachers are responsible for these issues, as well as there being some serious flaws in assessment system. The key issue is leniency in marking, on the part of teachers, with an intention of achieving good ratings from students. For instance, one QEC Director stated: “People who do not want to work … they do loose marking and give grades to students … and evaluation is good”. One of the lecturers stated the nature of the issue in this way:
When you talk about evaluation by students, the problem is, I know many teachers who say everyone is pass … second, when everyone is getting pass, they say, if you don’t want to come in class, no problem … third, course will be minimum …. Instead of teaching, they chat with students … when everyone is getting pass and getting good grades, how will they evaluate [the teaching]… they close their eyes and put a tick.

One of the important elements in this category is bias applied in the use of the processes. The participants identified these types of issues particularly in the case of ‘recognition and rewards’. It was revealed that faculty members who put their efforts into improving the quality of teaching and learning are not sure that their efforts will be recognized and rewarded in a transparent way. One lecturer commented that in the case of promotions, academic heads generally recommend their favourite faculty member irrespective of their performance in teaching and learning. The Boston Group (2001) also identify a lack of transparency and meritocracy, in promotion and other related processes in Pakistan universities. Likewise, one focus group participant stated:

The most important thing is the bias within Department … this is a big issue, that I worked hard but the review committee is biased to me … how best I do, they will not reward me … and if they will not reward me, what will happen next time, I will not work … when you will not give me incentives, these thing cannot be implemented … you need to implement review and reward system and that should be transparent … transparency is essential.

The final element in this cluster is the use of processes as a controlling tool by authorities. The focus group participants were particularly concerned with the performance appraisal processes. One participant quoted the example of an Annual Confidential Report (ACR) which is usually written at the end of a year by academic heads for the performance appraisal of faculty members. The lecturer reported that these reports are generally used by academic heads as a controlling tool. One focus group participant stated: “You know about ACRs, for favourites everything is good and … for others, it is a mixture”.

To summarize, the analysis suggested that inappropriate use of processes is a significant issue that might create barriers for the likely acceptability of QA processes for teaching in Pakistan universities. In this regard, the participants were particularly concerned with the lack of transparency and fairness in the use of processes in Pakistan. It is evident that the current environment within universities has resulted in a lack of trust on the part of
academics in the administration and in the use of QA processes and, therefore, there is concern about their likely acceptability in Pakistan universities.

7.4.7 Lack of a Conducive Academic Environment

This factor relates to the lack of a conducive academic environment which influences low acceptability of QA processes in Pakistan universities. The participants commented that, in some instances, the current environment makes it difficult for academics to practise QA processes. The significant subthemes within this main theme are: staff resistance to change, the mindset of academic staff, the absence of a culture of accountability and the negative perceptions of academics about QA/QE practices. One of the QEC Directors gave the following explanation of the nature of the academic environment in Pakistan universities:

They [academic staff and leadership] are just not ready, only you can implement by force, they are not ready by themselves … We need to punish them. HEC thinks that it will take time, you should only preach and it will happen but I think it will not happen by preach ... You know, culture is very reactive, they just react and do not want to work and especially old generation do not want it. Change may happen from younger ones. HEC should perform implementation by top-down approach.

A. Staff Resistance to Change

The first subtheme in this category is the resistance of academic staff to change and QA processes. One QEC Director stated: “Staff is not going to accept it, staff resistance is very high”. One lecturer commented: “Most important thing for not accepting processes is that we think ourselves distinguished, when I was there, I was thinking myself as a professor” [in a Pakistan university]. Azam (2007) reports, in the case of Pakistan, that the tendency towards resistance among academic staff may be due to the additional work burden, lack of manpower, lack of resources and also time constraints.

B. Mindset of Academic Staff

This subtheme relates to the mindset of academic staff and their negative attitude towards QA/QE processes in Pakistan universities. The academic environment and the mindset of academic staff in many Pakistan universities are such that even the effective practices in teaching and learning are not encouraged. One QEC Director stated that the identification
of effective practices and their dissemination to the broader university community are also sometimes opposed (or at least not encouraged). He further commented that this is due to professional jealousy among faculty members.

One reason for staff resistance to QA practices is the static mindset of academics. Many academics in Pakistan are clinging to the status quo and are not ready to accept change and QA practices. One QEC Director revealed that academics perceive practices such as QA, QE and professional development “exist only in ideology, taken from the internet, and have no ground [in] reality”. Likewise, the participants commented that many academics believe that they are already experts and there is, therefore no need for such things. One academic head’s perception of QA practices is evident, as he recorded his reaction to student evaluations of teaching to a QEC Director: “I am a PhD and students are not”.

The reactive culture in Pakistan universities was further revealed as one QEC Director emphasized: “Change the people, their mindsets, hard the rule and enforce them to work”. Two of the QEC Directors explained that academics have not given serious thought to teaching and learning and they perceive it to be a burden. It was further revealed that “faculty members are not motivated and committed towards their duties”. One of the lecturers, in response to the ‘peer review of teaching’, stated: “They don’t want it because one person knows that I have weaknesses … he will never want evaluation … he fears about his capability and thinks that reviewer is more capable than me and my weaknesses will be exposed”. Also in response to ‘peer review of teaching’, another focus group participant stated:

As far as peer review of teaching is concerned, it is simple … if I have identified the weaknesses of a teacher, he will become my greatest enemy … if someone is giving a presentation and I ask a question, he becomes the enemy of my life … whenever, the thinking of people is not changed, this will not happen, and it is very difficult task to change the mindset of people in Pakistan.

C. Absence of a Culture of Accountability

This subtheme affecting the academic environment is the absence of a culture of accountability in Pakistan universities. Four QEC Directors stated that many academics do not want to be held accountable for their responsibilities or be questioned about their performance. One QEC Director commented that the culture of universities is such that
academics welcome rewards, incentives and everything that personally benefits them. However, they resist (do not like) the activities that involve effort on the part of academics. Another QEC Director stated: “You know, it is common in Pakistan, staff welcome benefits and incentives but do not fulfil their duties … everyone talks about their rights but do not like to perform duties and same thing happens in universities”.

It was further suggested that academic staff often do not follow policies, processes and rules and regulations unless imposed upon them. For instance, one QEC Director stated: “Nobody wants accountability, they do not follow rules … they react and only make objections”. Likewise, the academic environment of universities is such that academics do not take responsibility and do not want to be accountable for their performance. For example, one QEC Director stated: “Academics are not interested and they just feel burden on them. No one takes it seriously and no serious thought is given”. Another QEC Director stated: “Teachers are not doing their duties properly. Teachers do not take responsibility. They do work for their own sake but not for the institution”.

**D. Negative Perceptions of QA Processes**

The final subtheme of this category relates to academics’ negative perceptions of QA/QE processes. For instance, one QEC Director identified faculty members’ perceptions of QA practices in this way: “They think that universities doubt their abilities and qualifications”. It was further revealed that academics fear that QA/QE practices might be used against them. One QEC Director commented that there is a misconception among academics that QA/QE practices will only be used for monitoring purposes and not for development. One lecturer stated: “They perceive that if evaluation is not good … they do not take it as an opportunity for improvement, they take it as a punishment … their understanding is that they might be punished upon these bases”. It appears that all of these aspects relating to the academic environment might create barriers to the acceptability of QA/QE processes in Pakistan universities.

**7.4.8 Political Interference**

Political interference, in the context of Pakistan universities, refers to aspects such as: the political affiliation of students, political affiliation of staff, negative roles of staff and students’ associations, and political interference in appointment and promotion processes. The analysis revealed that these issues largely relate to the public sector universities in
Pakistan and the sources of political interference are both internal (the academic staff associations and pressure groups) and external (the government). It was evident from the analysis that political pressure from government and from staff associations even affects the appointment and promotion of faculty members and administrative staff. One QEC Director revealed that the policy of his university (as instructed by the HEC) was that faculty members cannot be promoted to the post of associate professor without a PhD degree but nonetheless a faculty member has been promoted without this qualification.

The nature of political interference in Pakistan universities is also evident in one of the respondent’s comments: “Political interference is there, interference from the governments, hurdles by groups and political parties and even by students”. As far as staff associations are concerned, a QEC Director stated: “Teaching associations .... They just oppose everything”. Ameen (2007) also argues that the tradition of imposing political influence on universities is deep rooted in Pakistan. In most public sector Pakistan universities, the academics’ and the students’ associations have been subject to external political influences that have strongly sought the energy of youth and their role models for their own purposes (Government of Pakistan, 2002).

At the higher level, the deans and the vice-chancellors of universities are appointed by their respective chancellors. The chancellors are not academics and in many cases are affiliated with political parties in government. As a result, the political parties influence the deans and vice-chancellors for their own political interests. This fact was confirmed in the 4th meeting of Quality Assurance Committee as one Vice-Chancellor revealed that political pressures have negative effects on quality and create serious problems for implementation of policies and processes related to it (Minutes of 4th Meeting of Quality Assurance Committee, 2004). All of these issues on the part of students, academics and political parties influence fairness and transparency of processes and consequently might inhibit their likely acceptability.

7.4.9 Lack of Recognition, Rewards and Incentives

The final factor that may inhibit the likely acceptability of QA/QE processes in Pakistan universities is the lack of recognition, rewards and incentives. The experience of the QEC Directors in preliminary implementation of self-assessment practices aimed at assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching and learning at department level in universities also indicates that academics demand incentives for putting their efforts into QA/QE practices.
The lack of recognition, rewards and incentives for academic staff was also identified as one of the potential reasons for the decline of quality in the higher education sector of Pakistan by the Task Force (Government of Pakistan, 2002).

The quality of teaching in Pakistan universities has been influenced adversely by the poor salary and perverse incentives provided by a system of retention and promotion (Boston Group, 2001) until a recent increase in the pay scales for academics. However, these pay scales are fixed and not linked with performance. An optional tenure-track system has been introduced in universities to ensure accountability and to reward those academics who demonstrate excellence in teaching and research (Hayward, 2009). However, no measures have been taken to recognize and reward academics who are practising QA/QE processes and putting effort into improving the quality of their teaching and student learning. Likewise, mechanisms, such as teaching portfolios, have not been devised to assess the quality of teaching and learning. The absence of assessment mechanisms for teaching provides opportunities for bad practices such as lack of transparency and fairness and biased use of the processes.

In response to the low likely acceptability of QA/QE processes, one QEC Director stated: “Salaries are low”. One lecturer commented: “How can you reward teaching because ‘quality teaching’ is not included in any criteria, it is counted in number of years, the number of publication … focus is on quantity and not on quality”. One focus group participant stated: “When you talk about policies and processes … your staff is already not satisfied, whatever plan you give them, QA, quality monitoring, whatever, they will not act upon and this is particularly the case in public sector universities”. On the basis of these comments, it is argued that the lack of recognition and rewards for academics for putting their efforts into QA/QE practices might inhibit the likely acceptability of QA/QE processes in Pakistan universities.

7.5 Conclusion

The potential reasons for the low likely acceptability of QA processes in Pakistan include: lack of awareness; lack of qualified human resources; lack of professional development; lack of trust on the part of faculty members in administration and processes due to their inappropriate implementation or use; insufficient developmental resources; inappropriate governance and administrative structure; lack of a conducive academic environment;
political interference; and lack of recognition and rewards. These factors reflect social, cultural, economic, political and developmental aspects of Pakistan universities and, in turn, influence the implementation of QA processes. The next chapter is concerned with developing a framework of QA processes for teaching for Pakistan universities, taking into account these factors.
Chapter 8
The Framework of Quality Assurance Processes for Teaching for Pakistan Universities

8.1 Overview

This chapter proposes an Integrated Framework of Quality Assurance and Enhancement of Teaching (IFQAET) for Pakistan universities on the basis of the findings of the template analysis, Delphi technique, and the analysis of interviews. The proposed integrated framework comprises three key components: quality assurance, quality enhancement, and recognition and rewards. The components within the framework, along with the rationale for their inclusion and integration, are explained in relation to the findings of the study. This chapter provides the theoretical basis for the integrated framework and the final section focuses on the feasibility of implementing the IFQAET in Pakistan universities.

8.2 The Components of IFQAET and the Rationale

The IFQAET (Integrated Framework of Quality Assurance and Enhancement of Teaching) is based on a philosophy of quality improvement and comprises three key components: quality assurance, quality enhancement, and recognition and rewards (R&R). The first two components of the framework are the basic components, while the third is the supporting component. In broad terms, the main focus of the framework is on improving the quality of teaching in Pakistan universities by integrating developmental and the judgemental aspects of quality assurance processes through the bridge of recognition and rewards.

The IFQAET places a strong emphasis on the developmental aspects of QA processes by adopting the ‘whole institution’ and ‘transformative’ approach to the improvement of teaching in Pakistan universities. These developmental aspects would be complemented by the judgemental aspects to ensure that QA/QE processes operate appropriately. The purpose of the ‘recognition and rewards’ aspect is to integrate both the developmental and the judgemental aspects of the QA/QE processes in such a way that the processes attract academics, departments, faculties and institutions to the other two components. The IFQAET is graphically presented in Figure 8.1.
The IFQAET has its origin in the 229 policy and practice documents concerning quality assurance of teaching from research-led universities. It also takes into account the needs, demands and requirements of Pakistan universities in the area of quality assurance (QE) as identified by higher education academics in Pakistan. The significance of the three components of the framework in the context of Pakistan universities was evident from the findings of phases II and III of the study. The findings of the study also indicated that all three components of the framework should, of necessity, be integrated to serve the QA (QE) needs of Pakistan universities. The next three subsections are thus focused on each of the three components of the IFQAET, while the fourth provides the rationale for their integration in the context of Pakistan.

### 8.2.1 The Developmental Component of the IFQAET

The developmental component of the proposed integrated framework has its origin in the policy and practice documents of research-intensive universities. The significance of the developmental aspects of the QA processes was evident from the template analysis that suggested although U21 institutions have adopted both QA-oriented and QE-oriented approaches to quality for improving their teaching, these universities have a predominantly QE orientation in the processes of assuring and enhancing the quality of their teaching.

This finding was reinforced by the Delphi results, which revealed strong support for the developmental approach from academic leaders in higher education in Pakistan. In the
Delphi, all the developmental aspects of QA processes were rated highly desirable. Similarly, most of the developmental aspects were rated as highly acceptable. A small number of the developmental aspects were rated as likely acceptable. It was also confirmed by the analysis that likely low acceptability of only a few developmental aspects was related to a lack of awareness, lack of professional development and lack of qualified human resources. These factors also reinforce the need for the developmental aspects of QA processes in Pakistan universities.

The significance of the developmental component of the IFQAET was also apparent from higher education academics’ perceptions of the likely low acceptability of QA processes in Pakistan universities. The five major reasons, in this regard, namely: lack of awareness; lack of qualified human resources; inappropriate use of processes; lack of professional development; and insufficient developmental resources, do not reflect resistance. These reasons, however, indicate insufficient recognition of the potential of QA/QE processes to enhance teaching and insufficient resources to implement them effectively. All these factors reflect the overall developmental needs of Pakistan universities.

The value of the developmental aspects of QA/QE is also clear from the literature, which demonstrates that implementation of QA processes is dependent upon such factors as: awareness about the concepts involved in QA/QE; presence of qualified academic staff; effective academic leadership; coherence, consistency and alignment of policies and processes; a collaborative approach to QA/QE; and the availability of sufficient physical and administrative support services (Attiyah & Khalifa, 2009; D’Andrea & Gosling; 2005; Lim, 2001; Ramsden, 2003; Robertson, 2002). Quality enhancement approaches have not only been advocated in the literature but their positive impact has been observed in improving the quality of teaching and learning in universities (Alean-Kirkpatrick, et al., 1997; Biggs, 2003; Gosling, 2004; Ramsden, 2003).

8.2.2 The Judgemental Component of the IFQAET

The judgemental component of the IFQAET also has its origin in the policy and practice documents of research-led universities. The judgemental aspects of QA were evident in six of the eight categories of the QA/QE processes that emerged from the template analysis, and this illustrates the significance of these aspects in assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching in U21 institutions. The importance of the judgemental aspects
was reinforced by the Delphi findings which suggested that all judgemental aspects of QA/QE processes are highly desirable for Pakistan universities.

The Delphi findings, however, revealed two important patterns for the acceptability of the judgemental aspects of QA processes and these have implications for the development of this framework. First, many of the judgemental aspects of QA/QE processes were rated as likely acceptable. Most of these judgemental aspects, rated as likely acceptable, belonged to the processes that had a related developmental function. Because the developmental aspects of such processes were strongly supported by academics in Pakistan, inclusion of their counterpart judgemental aspects in the IFQAET is justified because of their integrity and linkage with the developmental aspects of processes.

In the same way, the developmental aspects of teaching evaluation were rated as highly acceptable, whereas academics raised concerns about monitoring aspects of the practice. Likewise, various aspects of the category ‘recognition and rewards’ were rated as highly acceptable, whereas academics raised concerns about the use of teaching portfolios as a tool for the evaluation of evidence-based scholarly teaching. The strong linkage of both developmental and judgemental aspects of QA processes was evident from the template analysis and it indicated that the complete benefits of QA processes cannot be achieved without inclusion all of their constituents. It is, therefore, reasonable to include in the integrated framework for Pakistan the judgemental aspects of those QA/QE processes that had a related developmental function because the developmental functions were rated as highly acceptable.

The second pattern revealed in the results of the Delphi was related to a small set of judgemental aspects that were regarded as not likely to be acceptable. However, the low level of acceptability for the judgemental aspects (i.e., of likely not acceptable and likely acceptable items) was explained by academics in interviews and was due to two sets of factors. First, the low acceptability of the judgemental aspects was due to such factors as: the mindset of faculty members; absence of an accountability culture; staff resistance to change; the negative role of student and staff associations (and their resistance); and the need for change in management. Each of these factors reinforces the need to incorporate the judgemental component in the IFQAET for Pakistan. The low likely acceptability of QA/QE processes was also due to such factors as: political interference, inappropriate governance; lack of fairness and transparency in processes; and biased use of processes.
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This reinforces the need to clearly identify those judgemental aspects that are most likely to avoid these difficulties.

However, in their interviews academic leaders and lecturers explicitly emphasized the need for accountability-led approaches to improve the quality of teaching in Pakistan. The enhancement-led approaches to quality usually demand a willingness and commitment on the part of academics to do things on their own. Furthermore, these approaches require a collaborative and collegial environment in universities. The historical failure of Pakistan universities to improve the quality of teaching and research, however, shows that more direction is needed. The participants also revealed that the mindset of academics is such that they resist change and create barriers to implementation. The participants suggested that the only viable way to improve the quality of teaching in Pakistan universities is to legislate for the implementation of QA/QE processes for teaching. They also commented that the academic environment of Pakistan universities requires a top-down approach for the implementation of QA processes.

The significance of the judgemental aspects of QA/QE processes is also evident from the literature because several researchers argued that external QA processes have a potential to improve the quality of teaching in universities (Gift & Bell-Hutchinson, 2007; Harvey & Newton, 2004; Wahlén, 2004; Woodhouse, 2003). The scholars also acknowledge that external QA practices are of great importance in initiating an internal culture of quality in universities (Carr et al., 2005; Danø & Stensaker, 2007; Dill, 2000). In the context of Pakistan, the Task Force also reported absence of accountability as one of the key reasons for the decline in quality in universities (Government of Pakistan, 2002).

On the basis of these findings, it can be concluded that the judgemental aspects of QA/QE processes are central to improving the quality of teaching in Pakistan universities. The personal experiences of the researcher in higher education also suggest that the value of judgemental aspects cannot be ignored in the context of Pakistan universities. It is, therefore, argued that the judgemental component of the IFQAET will not only satisfy the accountability needs in Pakistan universities but it would more likely be used as a tool for improving the quality of teaching.

8.2.3 The Recognition and Rewards Component of the IFQAET

The recognition and rewards component of the IFQAET, like the other two components, also has its origin in the policy and practice documents of research-led universities. This
component serves as a bridge for the linkage and integration of the two basic components of the framework, developmental and judgemental. The template analysis suggested that most QA/QE processes are a mixture of developmental, judgemental, and recognition and rewards aspects, while the first two are strongly linked by the third.

The link between the developmental and judgemental aspects of QA/QE processes was also evident in U21 institutions in the form of teaching excellence awards. For the awards, teachers not only provide evidence of their past performance in teaching but they are also required to disseminate their innovative and effective teaching practices to the broader university community for developmental purposes. This connection of recognition and rewards with both the developmental and judgemental aspects was evident in many QA processes and indicates its significance in assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching in U21 institutions.

The Delphi findings showed that all aspects of QA processes associated with recognition and rewards were rated as highly desirable. The Delphi findings further revealed that all aspects of recognition and rewards were rated as highly acceptable or likely acceptable irrespective of their connection with developmental or judgemental aspects of processes. Considering the high desirability and high acceptability of all aspects of recognition and rewards, it is expected that this component of the IFQAET is more likely to raise the low acceptability of the judgemental aspects of QA processes.

The need for recognition and rewards in Pakistan universities was further identified in interviews with higher education academics. The participants explicitly commented that the lack of recognition, rewards and incentives is one of the potential reasons for the low likely acceptability of QA/QE processes in Pakistan universities. For instance, two QEC Directors, while describing their experiences of initial implementation of QA procedures in Pakistan, revealed that academics explicitly demand incentives for putting their time and effort into the implementation of QA/QE processes. One participant commented that universities did not differentiate, in terms of sanctions or incentives, between the faculties and departments who actively participate in QA activities and those who do not.

The significance of recognition and rewards in improving the quality of teaching is also clear from the literature (see Chapter 3). Several researchers argue that the commitment of faculty members to teaching is strongly linked with the status, recognition, and rewards associated with teaching (Gibbs, 2002; Hattie & Marsh, 2004; Lomas & Nicholls, 2005;
Moore & Kuol, 2005). The researchers have also noted a global shift in trend towards an emphasis on teaching in the processes of appointment, tenure and promotion (Gibbs, 2002; Lomas & Nicholls, 2005; Palmer & Collins, 2006; Parker, 2008). In the case of Pakistan, the lack of recognition and rewards for academics and institutions was identified as one of the potential reasons for the decline of quality in universities (Boston Group, 2001; Government of Pakistan, 2002; Hayward, 2009).

On the basis of these findings, it is argued that the role of recognition and rewards in the IFQAET is central and it will attract academics, departments and institutions towards QA processes in Pakistan universities. These findings tend to suggest that the inclusion of various aspects of recognition and rewards in the IFQAET would not only integrate both the quality assurance and quality enhancement functions, but is more likely to raise the acceptability of QA processes in Pakistan universities.

8.2.4 Rationale for the Integration of three Components of IFQAET and their Justification for Pakistan

This subsection provides the rationale behind the integration of the three components of IFQAET for Pakistan on the basis of the experiences of research-led universities. It also provides justification of these components in fulfilling the QA/QE needs of Pakistan universities. The integration of various aspects of QA processes in U21 institutions was evident from the template analysis. This suggested that all categories of QA processes were integrated and dependent upon each other, and due to this strong relationship, it was very difficult to practise any process independently of other processes. This relationship was also noted within various aspects of the same category to enable the achievement of complete benefits of any process. The template analysis also revealed that most QA/QE processes have dual characteristics of developmental and judgemental approaches and both aspects were linked through recognition and rewards.

The critical analysis of the Delphi findings revealed that highly acceptable aspects of QA processes were of a developmental nature and, therefore, were at the ‘softer’ side of QA (and QE) in terms of time and effort required by academics. On the basis of the findings of this study, it is argued that both characteristics (the developmental needs of universities and softness of processes) contribute towards high likely acceptability of these aspects of QA/QE processes. On the other hand, the aspects of QA processes viewed as being of low likely acceptability, in most instances, were of a judgemental nature and, therefore, were
at the ‘harder’ side of QA/QE in terms of the time and effort required by academics. It was evident from the template analysis and the literature, however, that these are the core aspects of QA processes and thus cannot be ignored in the context of Pakistan universities. The judgemental aspects are the political drivers and are essential for improving the quality of teaching in Pakistan.

The analysis of the interviews also reinforced the need for integration of the three components in the IFQAET (judgemental, developmental and recognition and rewards). The analysis revealed that the low acceptability of various aspects of QA/QE processes in Pakistan universities is due to nine factors, namely: a lack of awareness; lack of qualified human resources; insufficient developmental resources; lack of professional development; inappropriate governance and administrative structures; lack of trust due to inappropriate use of processes; lack of a supportive academic environment; political interference; and lack of recognition and rewards. The analysis of these themes, along with their subthemes, indicates that likely low acceptability is either due to the lack of developmental aspects; lack of judgemental aspects or the absence of a culture of accountability; or due to lack of recognition and rewards. All these factors strengthen the basis for integration of the three components in the proposed framework.

The need for integration of developmental, judgemental and recognition and rewards aspects of QA processes is also clear from the literature. The literature indicates that both approaches to quality (accountability and improvement) have strengths and weaknesses and there is no clear evidence that students’ learning outcomes could be reinforced by implementing either of these two quality models alone in universities. In order to achieve more effective results of processes, there is a need to maintain a balance between both approaches to quality by combining both collegial and managerial approaches and by integrating improvement and accountability aspects in policies (Bowden & Marton 1998; Danø & Stensaker, 2007; Filippakou & Tapper, 2008; Ramsden, 2003).

The linking of QA/QE policies and processes with recognition and rewards is emphasized by many academics. Ramsden (2003) suggests that QA/QE policies be supported through recognition and rewards. He further suggests linking resource allocation for departments and faculties with performance in teaching and learning. Kember et al. (2002) note that appraisal processes do not have much impact on the quality of teaching unless they are linked with rewards. In the same way, most QA processes in the IFQAET are also linked, integrated and consistent with each other.
The IFQAET is based on the assumption that the provisions to meet developmental needs in Pakistan universities will not necessarily bring about improvement in the quality of teaching. It is argued, however, on the basis of the findings of this study, and in particular the interviews, that improvement can happen in Pakistan universities through a focus on developmental needs in the presence of recognition and rewards and by applying a top-down approach. It was further emphasised that recognition and reward systems could also help in increasing the acceptability of accountability approaches in Pakistan.

The need for integration of both developmental and judgemental aspects in the proposed framework is also strengthened by the fact that most universities in Pakistan are going through a developmental phase. It is estimated that half of Pakistan universities (out of 73 public sector and 59 private sector) were established during the last decade and a mere 23 percent of current faculty members in the public sector universities hold PhD degrees. These facts not only highlight the developmental needs of universities but also the need for a more directed top-down approach due to the newness of the concept.

The need for and significance of the three components of the IFQAET, in the context of Pakistan universities, was also observed by the researcher during data collection for Phase II (Delphi technique) and Phase III (interviews) of the study and while attending the 2nd international conference on assessing quality in higher education (ICAQHE) in Pakistan. The meetings and discussions with 20 delegates from Pakistan during the conference and the meetings and discussions with the members of the Quality Assurance Committee and QEC Directors in Pakistan universities (during data collection and conference) suggested the need for all three components in any of the proposed framework for its sustainability and for enhancing the likely acceptability of various aspects of QA processes in Pakistan universities.

The IFQAET is also consistent with the academic culture of Pakistan universities. The real academic environment of most universities, and in particular developing countries, is generally characterized by a mixture of collegial and managerial; collaborative and bureaucratic; bottom-up and top-down; and responds to internal needs and external demands. On the basis of the findings of this study, it is argued that an enhancement-led approach is an ideal approach for enhancing the quality of teaching and learning. However, it works only in an ideal academic environment with bottom-up, collaborative, supportive and collegial characteristics. Such an environment is not the case in Pakistan.
It was clear from the interviews that most universities in Pakistan are facing unfavourable conditions and their academic environment thus might not allow them to practise purely enhancement-led approaches to quality. Conversely, accountability-led approaches alone contribute little to improvement in the quality of teaching and learning in universities. In fact, the real academic environment of Pakistan universities appears to be more suited to the implementation of the IFQAET because most of its QA/QE processes can be practised in an environment that is a mixture of both developmental and judgemental approaches. The integration of both QA and QE practices in the IFQAET is more likely to save time, money and effort for universities. As Gosling and D’Andrea (2001) have observed, the responsibilities for the functioning of QA and QE activities in many universities have been assigned to separate offices, such as quality offices and professional development centres. In such instances, it is quite likely that some QA/QE activities and efforts might be repeated over two offices due to the linkage of both QA and QE functions. In Pakistan, both of these responsibilities (QA and QE) have been assigned to QECs. This consistency of QA/QE processes in the IFQAET with the responsibilities of QECs is likely to increase their sustainability. Similarly, the amount of effort required to achieve the combined functions of QA and QE will be less than if that effort were applied to each function separately.

The IFQAET is especially appropriate for universities in the early stages of initiating a QA/QE system. It addresses the needs and demands of Pakistan universities in QA/QE. There is an adequate balance between the developmental and judgemental aspects of QA processes in the IFQAET. It fulfils both the internal need for quality enhancement and the external demands for accountability. It attempts to integrate both collegial and managerial aspects of QA processes. However, it is suggested that the HEC and Pakistan universities shift their focus from accountability-led approaches to enhancement-led over time.

To summarize, the proposed framework of processes attempts to integrate both QA and QE approaches through the support of recognition and rewards in Pakistan universities. The high desirability of these three components of the IFQAET was clearly shown in the Delphi findings. The likely acceptability of QE and of recognition and rewards aspects was strongly supported by academics. The acceptability of QA aspects was only partially supported. The analysis of interviews, however, provided clear evidence for the necessity of all components of the IFQAET (i.e., developmental, judgemental, and recognition and rewards) for Pakistan universities.
8.3 The IFQAET and Other Theoretical Frameworks

The IFQAET is aligned to the theoretical base of the Quality Development (QD) model proposed by D’Andrea and Gosling (2005). The focus of the QD model is on educational development and it attempts to integrate both QE and QA practices within institutions in order to bring about improvement in teaching and learning (D’Andrea & Gosling, 2005; Gosling & D’Andrea, 2001). The focus of the proposed framework of QA/QE processes is also on the developmental aspects of QA processes by integrating both improvement and accountability approaches with the support of recognition and rewards. In achieving the purpose of improvement in teaching and learning at institutional level, the QD model and the IFQAET have features in common. However, there are also some differences that reflect the culture of universities in developing countries, Pakistan in particular.

In both the QD model and the IFQAET, quality assurance and quality enhancement (QE) activities support each other to improve the quality of teaching and learning. Both models adopt the whole institution approach. The focus of both is on the development of internal quality assurance systems. However, both the QD model and the IFQAET also satisfy many external demands. Most activities in the QD model are of a qualitative nature and this data is used to satisfy external demands. However, the IFQAET adopts a mixture of both enhancement-led and accountability-led approaches in order to satisfy external demands, with the help of recognition and rewards.

The focus of the QD model is on improving the quality of teaching and learning and it requires a collegial environment for it to succeed. It requires commitment, willingness and involvement of the majority of faculty members in order to achieve its purposes. The focus of the IFQAET is the same as that of the QD model. However, QA processes in the proposed framework employ judgemental approaches to ensure that the developmental approaches function. To raise the acceptability of judgemental approaches for academic staff and universities, the IFQAET utilizes systems of recognition and rewards.

To practise the QD model in universities, Gosling and D’Andrea (2001) suggested three phases: development, implementation and evaluation. These phases are parallel to the phases of the quality improvement (QI) model implemented at Griffith University (Sachs, 1995). The focus of the QI model is on continuous improvement of quality and it is implemented in the cycle of ‘plan-do-check-act’. In most instances, QA/QE processes in the IFQAET could be implemented in the pattern of the QD and QI models. Like QD and
QI models, the starting point of the IFQAET is the development of policies and processes for assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching (paralleling development in the QD model and ‘plan’ in the QI model). Similarly, the second phase in the IFQAET would be the implementation of QA processes in universities (paralleling implementation in the QD model and ‘do’ in the QI model).

Most QA processes in the IFQAET would be required to be evaluated on a regular basis by feedback sought from all concerned about the effectiveness of the processes (parallel to evaluation in the QD and ‘check’ in the QI model). A quite similar pattern to these three phases of development (‘plan’ in QI), implementation (‘do’ in QI), and evaluation (‘check’ in the QI model) has also been tested in 30 universities of Pakistan in the initial implementation of Self-Assessment of academic programmes (Raouf, 2009). The practice is limited to some sort of internal and/or external reviews and there is some resemblance in the pattern. The implementation of QA processes of the IFQAET in the development, implementation and evaluation cycle would be facilitated because 30 Pakistan universities are already familiar with the pattern (See Chapter 2 for details of QI and QD models).

Table 8.1 presents an overview of the key characteristics of the Integrated Framework for Quality Assurance and Enhancement of Teaching in comparison with QA and QE models. The focus of the IFQAET is on developing and improving the quality of teaching. Table 8.1 demonstrates that the focus of the IFQAET is the same as an enhancement-led model. However, the IFQAET adopts some features of an accountability-led model to ensure that improvement is happening. The focus of the proposed framework is on internal processes with guidance and support from external bodies. The IFQAET also fulfils monitoring purposes. It fulfils internal needs for improvement through a developmental approach and it satisfies the external demands of accountability through a judgemental approach. In most instances, the IFQAET is likely to employ the same data for internal and external purposes and it would, therefore, lessen the amount of time and effort spent by academics and universities on quality assurance and enhancement activities.
Table 8.1: Overview of the IFQAET in comparison with QA and QE models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Features</th>
<th>QA Model</th>
<th>QE Model (QD&amp;QI)</th>
<th>IFQAET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Transformative</td>
<td>Mixture of both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Internally developed, external support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>Mixture of both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda</td>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Bureaucratic</td>
<td>Collaborative</td>
<td>Collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Mixture of both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Summative</td>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>Mixture of both</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.4 Feasibility of the IFQAET for Pakistan Universities in Contrast to Research-led Universities

The IFQAET comprises eight broad categories of QA processes. These categories have been developed in consultation with higher education academics in Pakistan, but they also have their origin in policy and practice documents of research-led universities. The origin of the QA processes for teaching (from U21 institutions) may raise questions about the feasibility of the IFQAET for Pakistan universities when compared to research-led universities. The critical question is whether the QA processes in the proposed framework can work in Pakistan universities, with a different academic culture and different working conditions.

The feasibility of the IFQAET for Pakistan universities in contrast with U21 institutions is illustrated in Figure 8.2 in three bands. These bands show variations in the levels of likely acceptability of QA/QE processes in the form of three continuums. At the left side of each continuum, the acceptability of QA/QE processes is low and, therefore, they only partially operate at this end. At the right side of each continuum, acceptability of QA/QE processes is high and are, therefore, more likely to operate effectively. The acceptability of various aspects of QA/QE processes is directly linked with the functioning of QA/QE processes in universities.

Because U21 institutions are already practising QA processes, they tend towards the right side of the continuum (as in Band 1 and Band 2). On the other hand, the Delphi findings suggested that Pakistan universities fall at the left side of the continuum due to a partial acceptability of QA/QE processes. One of the potential reasons for likely low acceptability of QA/QE processes in Pakistan universities is that they are in the early stages of QA/QE compared with U21 institutions. It is argued, therefore, that QA/QE processes may take time to become acceptable for academic staff and universities. As the likely acceptability
of QA/QE processes increases, Pakistan universities would also move towards the high-functioning end of the continuum.

Figure 8.2: Functioning of IFQAET in Pakistan universities and in U21 institutions

The interviews revealed that likely low acceptability of various aspects of QA processes in Pakistan is due to nine factors listed and discussed in Chapter 7. It is argued that these factors prevent appropriate functioning of QA processes in Pakistan universities. They create a difference in the functioning of QA processes and, therefore, U21 institutions are practising them, while their acceptability in Pakistan universities is low. It is thus argued that eight categories of QA/QE processes (in the IFQAET) that are being practised in U21 institutions can also operate in Pakistan universities provided certain conditions are met. These conditions are the measures to counter the key factors that are likely to prevent the functioning of QA/QE processes in Pakistan universities (Band 3, Figure 8.2). These conditions are also consistent with the literature.
Several scholars have argued that the following factors are prerequisites for the success of strategies aimed at improving the quality of teaching in universities: awareness about the concepts involved in QA/QE; the presence of qualified academic staff; effective academic leadership; a collaborative approach to QA/QE; coherence, consistency and alignment of policies and processes; simultaneous implementation of policies and process; availability of sufficient physical, electronic and administrative services; transparency in processes; a supportive academic environment; and evaluation of policies and processes (Attiyah & Khalifa, 2009; D’Andrea & Gosling, 2005; Lim, 2001; McKimm, 2009; Ramsden, 2003; Robertson, 2002).

The critical analysis of these factors from the literature and the factors derived from the analysis of interviews indicates that they relate to each other. They are likely responsible for a difference in the functioning of QA/QE processes in U21 institutions and in Pakistan universities. Various categories of QA/QE processes in the IFQAET are acceptable to academics of U21 institutions and they operate in these universities because most of the required conditions are met. As a result, U21 institutions are situated towards the right side of the continuum in Figure 8.1 (Band 2) where QA/QE processes are functioning. However, the absence of the required conditions in Pakistan universities leads them to be situated towards the left side of the continuum.

Appropriate attention to these factors can also push Pakistan universities towards the right side of the continuum (in Figure 8.1). Once these factors are addressed, it is likely that most QA processes will operate at the high-functioning end for Pakistan universities in a similar way to how they operate in U21 institutions. The IFQAET supports a number of recommendations. These recommendations are described in the next chapter. Some of the recommendations are linked with required conditions that may prevent the functionality of QA processes in Pakistan universities. The extent to which the required conditions are met will affect the probability of functioning of the processes. It is quite likely that the IFQAET also requires an appropriate timeframe in which to develop.

### 8.5 Conclusion

This chapter has proposed an Integrated Framework of Quality Assurance and Enhancement of Teaching (IFQAET) for Pakistan universities. The IFQAET is derived from the experiences of U21 institutions and comprises eight broad categories of QA/QE.
processes, with a number of sub-processes. It has been developed on the basis of the template analysis, Delphi findings and the perceptions of academic staff concerning the likely acceptability of processes in Pakistan. Considering the needs and demands of Pakistan universities, the proposed framework attempts to integrate both QA and QE approaches to quality with the support of recognition and rewards. The IFQAET is aligned to the theoretical base in the Quality Development model (D’Andrea & Gosling, 2005). The IFQAET is likely to operate effectively if a number of conditions are met.
Chapter 9
Conclusions and Recommendations

9.1 Overview

The final chapter of this thesis summarizes the research outcomes in two parts. In the first, conclusions are drawn with reference to the objectives of the study. The second part deals with practical implications of the study and recommendations are made in this regard.

9.2 Summary and Conclusions

This study focused on developing a framework of quality assurance processes for teaching for Pakistan universities. Many Pakistan universities are struggling to meet global standards in higher education and are seeking to improve their global standing. Quality of teaching is central to this. However, they do not have the necessary policies and processes, such as those used in other high-performance global universities, for assuring and enhancing the quality of their teaching. Considering the Universitas 21 (U21) institutions as a benchmark, eight categories of QA processes for teaching were derived from the policy and practice documents of these research-led universities. Based on these eight QA processes for teaching and consideration of the opinions of a sample of higher education experts and academics in Pakistan, a framework was developed for assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching in Pakistan universities.

Four main sets of conclusions emerge from this study. These conclusions contribute to scholarship in four significant ways. The first is the identification and classification of QA/QE processes for teaching in U21 institutions into eight broad categories. The second set of conclusions, or contribution, is the analysis of each of the eight broad categories of QA processes in order to understand their characteristics in the broader context of quality assurance or quality enhancement. The third set of conclusions or contribution is the development of an Integrated Framework of Quality Assurance and Enhancement of Teaching (IFQAET) for Pakistan universities. The fourth set of conclusions relates to the methodology that has been employed to conduct this piece of research. Each set of conclusions, or contribution, is summarized as follows.
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9.2.1 The Identification and Classification of QA Processes

This refers to the identification and classification of QA processes for teaching in U21 institutions into eight broad categories, namely – development and implementation of teaching and learning plans, policies and processes; systems of audit and review at department, faculty and at institutional level; teaching quality appraisal (TQA) for departments, faculties and for academic staff; review and evaluation of teaching and courses by peers and students; curriculum development and approval; professional development; scholarship of teaching and learning; and recognition and rewards for scholarly activities in teaching.

These eight broad categories of QA/QE processes for teaching can be broken down and viewed in terms of the following twelve features of quality teaching i.e., disciplinary expertise; pedagogical knowledge; engagement of academics in scholarly activities aimed at enhancing teaching and learning practices; focus on students’ learning outcomes; engaging students in learning; engaging students in high-level activities (i.e., reflection, critical thinking); inclusive experiences; focus on self-learning; alignment of activities with learning outcomes; provision of feedback; focus on the use of technology; and the provision of support to students (see Chapter 5 for details). These features are considered a standard for quality teaching and define the values and expectations that teaching and learning activities are intended to maintain in U21 institutions.

The identification and classification of QA processes for teaching with reference to the key features of quality teaching in research-led universities shows that these universities view quality teaching in terms of enhancing students’ learning outcomes. This is fairly consistent with the literature on quality teaching in higher education that emphasizes facilitating student learning and engagement (Biggs, 2003; Fry et al., 2009; Prosser & Trigwell, 1999; Ramsden, 2003). This also has consequences for the broader domain of developing policies and processes aimed at assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching and learning. The features of quality teaching in U21 institutions are closely associated with the feature of student-focused approaches to teaching and deep approaches to learning.

The strong emphasis of U21 institutions on enhancing learning experiences for students through encouraging student-focused approaches to teaching and deep approaches to learning has significant implications for the development of policies and processes for
assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching and learning. Because U21 institutions define ‘quality teaching’ in terms of student-focused approaches to teaching and deep approaches to learning, this study has addressed the need for universities to develop their QA and QE policies and processes aligned with these characteristics of quality teaching. Likewise, the emphasis of U21 institutions on enhancing learning outcomes for students through the adoption of student-focused approaches to teaching and deep approaches to learning can only be justified if their QA/QE policies and processes are consistent with these approaches. Although this study was not focused on this context, it has revealed opportunities for further research from this perspective.

9.2.2 The Nature of QA/QE Processes in U21 Institutions

This refers to the analysis of the eight categories of QA/QE processes for teaching in U21 institutions in order to understand their nature and characteristics in the broader context of QA or QE. Three points are significant in this regard. First, a collaborative approach was found to be predominant for assuring the quality of teaching in U21 institutions with an emphasis on enhancing students’ learning outcomes. Second, all eight QA/QE processes were integrated, linked and aligned with each other and the strong relationship between them made it difficult to practise any part of the process independently. Finally, various aspects of each QA process, depending upon the purpose, varied along the continuum, in terms of accountability, from the judgemental end of the scale to the pure developmental and enhancement-led end. On balance, however, U21 institutions base their QA processes more towards the enhancement-led end of the continuum.

These characteristics of QA processes indicate a difference in focus from QA towards QE in U21 institutions. On the basis of higher global standing of this network of research-led universities, it is implied that the focus on QE might help in improving the quality of teaching in universities. It is further implied that the acceptability of QA/QE processes could be increased through the adoption of a collaborative approach while developing and implementing processes. Another important conclusion drawn from these findings is that universities need to create an environment that supports appropriate implementation of strategies aimed at enhancing the quality of teaching.
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9.2.3 The Development of IFQAET for Pakistan Universities

This set of conclusions and the most significant contribution of this study is the development of an Integrated Framework of Quality Assurance and Enhancement of Teaching (IFQAET) for Pakistan universities on the basis of experiences of research-led universities. The IFQAET comprises three components, namely: quality assurance, quality enhancement, and recognition and rewards (R&R). In broad terms, the main focus of the proposed integrated framework is on improving the quality of teaching in Pakistan universities by integrating developmental and the judgemental aspects of QA processes through the bridge of recognition and rewards. On the basis of the findings of this study, it is argued that implementation of the IFQAET in Pakistan universities will not only improve the quality of their teaching but also raise their global standing. The support for this argument is drawn from a number of sources.

The IFQAET for Pakistan universities has been developed on the basis of experiences of research-led universities i.e., U21 institutions, a network of high-performance universities from 15 countries throughout the world with high global standings. The diverse nature of these universities in terms of their academic environment allowed this study to draw on diverse experiences in QA/QE. Most U21 institutions explicitly claim that their policy and practice documents on teaching are informed by research and international literature. The development of a framework with such a strong base is thus more likely to result in improvement in the quality of teaching in Pakistan universities.

One of the strengths of IFQAET is that, not only has it been developed on the basis of experiences of research-led universities, but it has also taken into account the opinions of higher education academics in Pakistan about these experiences at two stages. First, it has taken into account the opinions of academic leaders in Pakistan universities about the desirability and likely acceptability of various aspects of QA/QE processes in Pakistan universities using the Delphi technique. One quarter of these academics are engaged in devising policies and processes concerning QA/QE of higher education in Pakistan at a national level while the remainder are involved in implementing these QA/QE policies and processes at an institutional level. Second, this study considered the concerns of higher education academics, including academic leaders and lecturers, about various aspects of QA/QE processes for teaching while developing the integrated framework for Pakistan universities.
This study involved the representatives of higher education academics in Pakistan at three levels while developing the IFQAET for Pakistan universities i.e., academic leaders involved in developing QA/QE policies at national level; Directors of QECs involved in implementing these policies and processes at institutional level; and lecturers. It is argued, therefore, that the involvement of experts and lecturers will not only increase the ownership of the IFQAET but also enhance its sustainability in universities. As a result, various aspects of the IFQAET not only have their basis in research-led universities but also take into account the opinions of higher education academics in Pakistan.

With reference to the main objective of the study, it is significant that this is the first study aimed at developing potential strategies for assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching in Pakistan universities in accordance with global efforts. This thesis is evidence-based and thus contributes significantly in the context of Pakistan. This study also provides a theoretical framework for Pakistan universities to develop policies and processes aimed at improving the quality of their teaching and learning. Pakistan universities intend to enhance their capability and global standing. They are seeking to educate students for global purposes. Their goal is to close the teaching quality gap between them and high-performing international universities. This thesis provides the basis for achievement of these goals and intentions of Pakistan universities.

9.2.4 The Effectiveness of the Methodology

This set of conclusions or contribution refers to the methodology that has been used to conduct this piece of research. This study has added value in three aspects in terms of methodology. First, it used a hybrid mixed method design by merging the exploratory mixed method design and the explanatory mixed method design. Generally, one mixed method design is used in mixed methods studies. The results of the study confirm that the use of two mixed methods designs provided useful insights. On the basis of the findings, it is concluded that the methodology is transferable and can be replicated in developing policies in higher education and in evaluation.

One of the conclusions drawn from this study is that the Delphi technique proved to be a useful method for enabling precise and reliable judgements and decisions in higher education policy development. It allows a group of individuals to deal with complex issues such as those examined in this study. The technique can be used by government planners and policymakers. The first round of the Delphi is generally qualitative and
opinions are sought from experts in the area. However, the first qualitative round of the Delphi in this research was based instead on a different form of expertise, namely policy and practice documents. On the basis of the Delphi findings, it is argued that documentary evidence can operate as a proxy for an expert panel.

A further conclusion drawn from this study relates to the use of multiple consensus criteria while using the Delphi technique. The lack of a universally agreed consensus criterion is a common issue in Delphi studies and traditionally researchers define only one consensus criterion depending upon the nature of the study. However, this study used four consensus criteria to analyse responses in both rounds of the Delphi, as discussed in Chapters 4 and 6. While applying various consensus criteria at the initial stages of data analysis, it was confirmed that many of the consensus criteria in the literature are the subset of these four criteria. It was further confirmed by the Delphi findings that these four consensus criteria not only corroborate each other but also address each other’s weaknesses. On the basis of the Delphi findings, it is concluded that these four consensus criteria can add value to the Delphi technique and their combined use is recommended.

9.3 Practical Implications and Recommendations

This section considers the practical implications of the study in the context of Pakistan universities and recommendations are made with reference to an Integrated Framework of Quality Assurance and Enhancement of Teaching (IFQAET). These recommendations are drawn from the findings of the study and thus directly relate to the eight categories of QA processes (sub-processes). They also provide guidelines for the implementation of various categories of QA/QE processes for teaching in Pakistan universities. On the basis of the findings, the following eight sets of recommendations are being made for the HEC, QECs and for Pakistan universities.

9.3.1 Process Recommendations (about the Nature of Processes)

Recommendation 1: It is recommended that QA processes for Pakistan universities should contain both developmental and judgemental approaches to quality to enhance their likely acceptability and sustainability. The developmental approaches, in this context, refer to QE while judgemental approaches refer to accountability. It is further recommended that the focus of quality activities should be on QE. The accountability approaches need to ensure that developmental aspects of the processes are functioning appropriately. The
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tendency for quality assurance to be based on QE is confirmed by the findings of this study. The efforts of the HEC in Pakistan to improve the quality of higher education are also aligned with this recommendation, and the establishment of QECs at the institutional level, as their name implies, is indicative of its emphasis on quality enhancement.

**Recommendation 2:** This study noted a strong focus on defining teaching in terms of student learning and engagement in policies and processes aimed at improving the quality of teaching and learning. It is, therefore, recommended for the HEC and for Pakistan universities that they need to adopt such approaches to QA/QE of teaching that place an emphasis on the enhancement of students’ learning outcomes. As a result, universities will need to engage their students in teaching and learning activities. Likewise, they might need to encourage a dialogue between students and teachers.

**9.3.2 Policy and Planning Recommendations**

**Recommendation 3:** The starting point for a quality agenda for universities in Pakistan is the development of teaching and learning plans, policies and processes. These plans and processes need to state assessable objectives in teaching and learning along with strategies to achieve them. This will require the establishment of a regular system of reviewing, monitoring and reporting of the plans/processes. It is further suggested that universities develop and implement QA/QE policies and processes at both the faculty and institutional level with expertise and support provided to them by QECs and the HEC.

**Recommendation 4:** It is recommended that a university-wide collaborative approach is put in place for developing, implementing and evaluating teaching and learning plans, policies, and processes by engaging individuals, schools and faculties in the process. This is likely to increase the ownership and sustainability of policies and processes. In the case of Pakistan, the quality assurance committee (QAC) of the HEC is also operating on the same principle and they are developing QA/QE policies and processes in consultation with Pakistan universities (Batool & Qureshi, 2007). It is recommended that this principle be followed at institutional level through provision of support by QECs. For this purpose, universities need to establish necessary committees, centres and networks at faculty and institutional level. To develop research-informed policies and processes, pilot projects should be started at faculty and institutional level in the initial stages.

**Recommendation 5:** Pakistan universities need to place an emphasis on the consistency and coherence of QA/QE policies and processes at all levels by integrating and linking
their various aspects. Pakistan universities are in the initial stages of developing and implementing QA/QE policies and processes and the focus of the HEC and of universities is on both QA and QE activities. However, it appears that the linkage between these two approaches is missing. The coherence of QA/QE policies and processes is a critical factor in improving the quality of teaching (Ramsden, 2003).

**Recommendation 6:** It is recommended that Pakistan universities place a strong emphasis on the dissemination of QA/QE policies and processes among academic staff and students, thus raising awareness among them about their purposes and benefits. The QECs should work with those innovative individuals who have strong influence within the academic community. The role of academic leadership, such as Academic Heads and Deans, is important in this regard in the context of Pakistan. The QA/QE processes and practices need to be disseminated through orientation programmes, seminars, university websites and through the publication of booklets and brochures for academic leadership, faculty members, students and all concerned.

**9.3.3 Quality Appraisal Recommendations**

**Recommendation 7:** An internal system of audits and reviews should be established at department and faculty level in compliance with institutional procedures. These audits should be carried out by QECs in consultation with relevant departments and Faculties. Such audits would enable universities to assess the effectiveness of their QA mechanisms in enhancing the teaching quality of relevant departments and faculties. Such audits would also provide an opportunity for Faculties to reflect upon their QA mechanisms and whether the policies and processes are having the desired effects.

The procedural steps in the audit process need to include: submission of key documents to the audit panel by relevant departments and schools in support of their claim; review of documentation by the audit panel followed by a visit; and reflective practices and follow-up activities on the part of departments and schools with a focus on QE. These procedural steps are similar to the steps involved in the Self-Assessment procedure that has been initially implemented in 30 universities of Pakistan through QECs.

It is, however, recommended that the role of QECs in the audit process should be that of a supportive body and not a controlling body. Such audits should be limited not only to the pre-determined activities but should also include innovative practices. It is also suggested that the true benefits of audits can only be achieved by focusing on QE and through
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identification of effective practices and emerging trends in teaching and learning and the dissemination of those practices to the broader community of the university. Such audits should also identify areas for improvement with the provision of support to overcome them. All these responsibilities should be assigned to QECs. It is further recommended that audit activities should be linked with the provision of funding to the departments, schools and faculties.

Recommendation 8: It is recommended that Pakistan universities introduce an annual system of teaching quality appraisal for departments, schools and faculties as a measure of their performance in teaching and learning through teaching and learning performance indicators (TLPIs). It is recommended that this process is carried out by QECs. It is also suggested that a specific amount of funding be allocated to faculties and schools on the basis of measures taken by them for improving the quality of teaching and learning and assessed through key TLPIs that include: the development and implementation of teaching and learning plans by faculties; staff-student ratios; participation of new faculty members in a professional certificate in university learning and teaching and in other related developmental activities; implementation of teaching evaluation schemes; and the quality of course outlines.

Recommendation 9: It is recommended that Pakistan universities introduce an annual system of teaching quality appraisal for academics in order to monitor and enhance their performance in teaching and learning. In the context of Pakistan, it is suggested that appointments of academic staff are made on a contract basis for a specified period. These contracts should be renewable subject to the performance of academics in teaching and monitored through annual performance reviews. These reviews should be based on setting of teaching-related goals and targets for the following year and review of achievements against the targets set in the preceding year. Attention should be paid to the professional development needs and career aspirations of academics in setting of teaching-related goals and targets in reviews.

It is further recommended that new and probationary academics be specifically reviewed against the professional development they have received from mentors and other related resources. It is also recommended that the teaching quality appraisal processes be linked with rewards in Pakistan. It is suggested, therefore, that satisfactory ratings of new faculty members in performance reviews are rewarded in salary progression; confirmation of probation; and in tenure and promotions. However, support should be provided to those
staff who in reviews achieve ratings below expectation, through the implementation of performance improvement procedures and their weaknesses should be treated as areas for improvement. For transparent implementation of performance reviews in Pakistan, it is suggested that reviews should not be carried out exclusively by the academic head but by a committee, including the faculty member concerned.

9.3.4 Professional Development Recommendations

Recommendation 10: It is recommended that universities place a strong emphasis on the professional development of both academic staff and of leadership and initiatives should be taken at policy and practice level. The starting point for this may be the provision of infrastructure. It is, therefore, suggested that supporting units, networks and teaching and learning centres (TLCs) be established at faculty, institutional and at national level for the provision of professional development activities to academics. The establishment of the National Academy of Higher Education (NAHE) in Pakistan is a key initiative of HEC in this regard but no such support system exists at institutional level as recommended here. It is, therefore, suggested that attention be paid to the establishment of the TLCs at the institutional level under QECs and to the provision of finances, expertise and resources to universities. The collaboration between NAHE, QECs and TLCs is also significant.

Recommendation 11: It is recommended that Pakistan universities establish teaching development programmes; workshops; refresher courses and professional certificates in university teaching and learning for the professional development of all academics in general and for new academics in particular. These programmes and courses should be based on the principles that lead to effective learning and teaching practices. Such activities need to be encouraged and supported by academic heads, deans and by the institutions. It is further suggested that the NAHE, in consultation with QECs, develop a practice-based professional certificate in university learning and teaching and the participation of new academics in this certificate should be obligatory.

Recommendation 12: It is recommended that Pakistan universities initiate peer mentoring programmes at department, faculty and institutional level for professional development of new academics in teaching and learning. However, the assistance and training should be provided to academic heads, deans, mentors, reviewers and to the members of evaluation panels for their role in relation to quality of teaching and learning. It is also recommended that universities provide opportunities for sharing and adoption of effective practices in
teaching/learning. The critical debates, seminars, conferences, symposia and colloquia can play significant role in this regard.

### 9.3.5 Teaching Evaluation Recommendations

**Recommendation 13:** It is recommended that new courses be developed within schools or departments by those teaching the courses. These courses should, however, be approved by the committees established at department, faculty and institutional level prior to their delivery. Furthermore, they should be validated by internal and external academics in the disciplines. It is also recommended that experts from the industry and professional bodies be involved in the development and review of courses. The provision of support to faculty members is essential in all these aspects.

**Recommendation 14:** It is recommended that various systems of review and evaluation of teaching and courses be developed in Pakistan universities. Initially, systems should be established to encourage academic staff to seek formative feedback from students on the quality of teaching as well as feedback on the courses to facilitate improvement. For this purpose, it is suggested that universities establish staff-student consultative committees at department and faculty level for the discussion of matters concerning quality of teaching and courses. The support should be provided to academics by QECs in this regard since QEC personnel are expected to be trained by the HEC.

**Recommendation 15:** Pakistan universities should establish a regular system for student evaluation of teaching and courses at the faculty and institutional level. Although the practice is being used in 30 universities, it is suggested that it be used for the purposes of monitoring, improvement and recognition. The findings of this study further revealed that the real benefits of the practice can be achieved only if it is implemented with all of its constituents. For example, the rationale behind the practice should be to improve the quality of teaching and courses by identifying areas for improvement and followed by a supportive action. In Pakistan, teachers are generally not informed about areas for improvement. It is suggested, therefore, that greater attention be paid to the identification of areas for improvement and teachers should be supported in a collegial way in order for improvement to happen.

The monitoring aspects of student evaluations cannot be ignored in the case of Pakistan. It is thus recommended that evaluation results be reported to academic heads, deans and committees established at faculty and institutional level for monitoring, improvement and
recognition purposes. Similarly, an important element of student evaluations is to inform students about the results of the evaluation along with the action taken or proposed on the basis of their feedback. This will provide a greater sense of ownership and increases the likelihood that students will be more enthusiastic and responsible in providing feedback next time. Furthermore, QECs can take steps to raise awareness among students as to the purpose and benefits of the process by organizing seminars and by publishing booklets and brochures.

**Recommendation 16**: The universities should set up a cyclic system of seeking feedback from alumni and employers to improve quality, relevance and accessibility of courses. Likewise, it is suggested that QAA of the HEC establish a system of seeking feedback from students through nationwide surveys, in collaboration with QECs, to monitor the performance of universities in teaching and learning. It is further suggested that the HEC allocate a specific amount of funding to universities on the basis of the results of these surveys. However, particular attention should be paid to interpretation of the data and to consequent action taken in all forms of student evaluations of teaching and courses.

**Recommendation 17**: It is recommended that universities encourage academics to seek feedback and input from peers on the quality of teaching and courses for improvement purposes. This practice may face difficulties in Pakistan in the early stages. However, the following strategies are more likely to be helpful. First, the process should be initiated in a collegial way and teachers should be responsible for the review of their teaching with support of QECs. The concept of the ‘critical friend’ at departmental level might be also helpful in this regard. Second, the process should be initiated in a phased manner and the starting point for this should be departmental discussions; feedback sessions among colleagues; and collaboration in course design and course materials.

Another strategy to counter staff resistance against peer review of teaching is that the purpose of the process should be the identification of effective practices in teaching and learning and dissemination of those practices to the broader university community for sharing purposes. Similarly, the practice should be focused on the identification of areas for improvement and subsequent provision of professional development to academics. It is further recommended that feedback to individual academic staff must be confidential. Finally, such practices should be recognised in promotion and award processes.
Chapter 9: Conclusions and recommendations

To lessen staff resistance against peer review, it is also recommended that the practice be initiated by teaching and learning centres in a collegial way. Furthermore, this practice should be included as a contractual requirement during the probationary period of new academic staff. The universities should also start a ‘to observe and be observed’ system of peer review of teaching for all academic staff with teaching responsibilities. It is further recommended that a strong emphasis be placed on reflective practice because it is a key element in review and evaluation of teaching. It is also suggested that universities develop peer review processes in such a way that they provide an opportunity for academics to reflect upon the effectiveness of their teaching.

9.3.6 Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Recommendations

Recommendation 18: It is recommended for the HEC, QECs and for Pakistan universities that a strong emphasis be put on developing, supporting and strengthening the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) to improve teaching quality. It is also recommended that the assistance and support be provided to academics in order to engage them in the SoTL. The starting point for the SoTL in Pakistan universities should be the initiation of teaching improvement grants, fellowships and projects aimed at enhancement of teaching and learning. It is further suggested that the focus of such fellowships and projects be on encouraging innovation and on enhancing teaching and learning skills of faculty members. Because the HEC is already granting scholarships and fellowships to university teachers, it is, therefore, suggested that a specific proportion of these scholarships and fellowships be allocated to the projects aimed at enhancing teaching and learning.

It is further recommended that teaching fellowship award holders work with teaching and learning centres or with QECs during the period of their project. The fellowships should also be awarded to doctoral students for conducting research into university teaching and learning. The HEC is already awarding scholarships to doctoral students and a specific proportion of these scholarships, as an expansion, should be dedicated to this purpose. In the context of Pakistan, it is further suggested that small-scale pilot projects be initiated at faculty and institutional levels for conducting research into teaching and learning and thus enhancing the quality of teaching and learning in the initial stages of quality assurance.
9.3.7 Recognition and Rewards Recommendations

Recommendation 19: It is recommended that Pakistan universities establish a transparent system of recognition and rewards for scholarly activities in teaching. The system should include internal and external incentives for individuals, departments, faculties and institutions, to attract them towards QA/QE processes. The inclusion of various aspects of recognition and rewards in quality agenda of universities will not only integrate both QA and QE approaches to quality but will also raise the acceptability of processes in Pakistan.

Recommendation 20: It is suggested that a performance-based system for the allocation of funding to universities should be established at the national level. The HEC is responsible for the allocation of funding to universities. It is recommended that a specific proportion of funding be allocated to the universities on the basis of their performance in teaching and learning and the measures taken by them to improve the quality of their teaching. The TLPIs (Recommendation 8) should serve as a guideline in this regard. A similar process should be considered within institutions at department and faculty level to monitor and enhance the quality of their teaching and learning.

Recommendation 21: It is suggested that HEC develop, in collaboration with universities, a national system of awards for academics, such as teaching excellence awards, citations, and commendations, to raise the profile of teaching in Pakistan universities. It is further recommended that a similar system of awards be established at the department, faculty, and institutional level. However, all such award systems should be linked and aligned with each other. The role of the HEC, QECs and of institutions is very important in this regard. Furthermore, it is suggested that it should be obligatory on the part of award winners and teaching fellowship holders to share their innovative ideas and research findings about teaching excellence throughout the university.

Recommendation 22: It is recommended that teaching portfolios serve as a guideline for the assessment of evidence-based scholarly teaching while making decisions about tenure, promotion and awards in Pakistan universities. Universities should ask faculty members to forward their teaching profiles (portfolios) while applying for tenure, promotion and awards. These profiles need to contain an evidence-based record of scholarly activities of academic staff in teaching along with evidence of their teaching effectiveness. However, assistance, support and training should be provided to academic staff by universities or QECs in this regard.
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As suggested by the template analysis, the teaching portfolios should necessarily contain information on: teaching career to date; teaching and learning goals; teaching philosophy; teaching and learning practices; and intended learning outcomes, along with information on teaching effectiveness. These portfolios should also contain information on: course design and delivery; evidence of engaging students in learning; evidence of collaboration with colleagues in course design and delivery; evidence of consultation or collaboration with external peers; evidence of continuous efforts to improve the quality of teaching and learning; evidence of teaching effectiveness (data on student achievement); evidence of feedback sought from students and peers; evidence of recognition of teaching excellence by community, university, peers and students; evidence of contribution to SoTL; evidence of leadership in teaching and learning; evidence of knowledge transfer activities within the university and broader community; and evidence of critical reflection.

9.3.8 Implementation Recommendations

Recommendation 23: The final recommendation in this part is specifically related to the implementation of QA/QE processes for teaching in Pakistan universities. On the basis of personal experience of the researcher in this study, it is argued that the area of QA/QE in higher education is full of complexities and the implementation of processes in Pakistan universities may take some time. It is quite likely that Pakistan universities might face some difficulties in the initial stages of implementing proposed QA/QE processes, as is the experience of universities of other countries. In fact, the research-led universities have also invested a considerable amount of time and effort in achieving their QA/QE goals. It is expected, therefore, that continuous efforts will be needed on the part of academic staff, students and academic leadership for effective implementation of QA/QE processes in Pakistan universities. This recommendation consists of the following suggestions to assist in the implementation of processes.

First, it is strongly recommended that Pakistan universities adopt a collaborative approach in the implementation of QA/QE processes by engaging all concerned: students, teachers, administrators, academic leaders and policymakers. Second, it is recommended that both approaches to quality i.e., bottom-up and top-down should be used for the implementation of QA/QE processes. A bottom-up approach in this case refers to the implementation of processes at the local level through individual departments, schools and faculties. A top-down approach, in this context, refers to the provision of guidance from the QECs and the
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HEC for an adequate implementation of QA/QE processes. Capacity-building is also important in this regard.

The provision of expertise and finance is also important in the implementation of QA/QE processes in Pakistan universities. For expertise, it is suggested that a group of academics be professionally trained in the area of QA/QE. This group should comprise the Directors of QECs, Academic Heads, Deans, and a small sample of innovative teachers. It is further suggested that this group of academics act as a change agent while implementing QA/QE processes. Financial resources should be provided by the HEC for this purpose. It is also suggested that QA policies and processes should be well informed and both individual academics and higher education institutions be required to understand the nature of QA policies and processes in terms of their purpose/benefits. The universities should create a culture that supports the implementation of QA/QE processes. They should support the developmental aspects and should provide incentives to all concerned.

This research is the first of its kind aimed at developing potential strategies for assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching in Pakistan universities in accordance with QA/QE policies and practices of global universities. This study draws on evidence from top-performance, research-led universities. This study proposes QA processes for teaching for Pakistan universities in consultation with the key representatives from higher education in Pakistan in consideration of the ideas advanced here. It is thus argued that the proposed framework of QA processes is an ideal framework and it may lift Pakistan universities to a global level. However, this will require continuous effort at all levels.
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* indicates the sample Universitas 21 (U21) institutions.

**Australia**
1. University of Melbourne*
2. University of New South Wales*
3. University of Queensland*

**Canada**
4. University of British Columbia*
5. McGill University*

**China**
6. Fudan University
7. Shanghai Jiao Tong University

**Hong Kong**
8. University of Hong Kong*

**India**
9. University of Delhi

**Ireland**
10. University College Dublin*

**Japan**
11. Waseda University

**Mexico**
12. Tecnológico de Monterrey*
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**Netherlands**
13. University of Amsterdam

**New Zealand**
14. University of Auckland*

**Singapore**
15. National University of Singapore*

**South Korea**
16. Korea University

**Sweden**
17. Lund University

**United Kingdom**
18. University of Birmingham*
19. University of Edinburgh*
20. University of Glasgow*
21. University of Nottingham*

**United States of America**
22. University of Connecticut
23. University of Virginia*
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**Canada**

**McGill University (19)**
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Hong Kong

University of Hong Kong (8)


Ireland

University College Dublin (16)
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ward.html, http://www.ucd.ie/teaching/awards_grants_sub/grants.html and
http://www.ucd.ie/teaching/awards_grants_sub/apply.html


Mexico

Tecnológico de Monterrey (3)

Tecnológico de Monterrey. (n.d.a). Academic quality assurance and educational model (multiple sources). Retrieved September 25, 2008, from http://www.itesm.edu/wps/portal/english/kcxml/04_Sj9SPykssy0xPLMnMz0vM0Y_QizKLN443NASeSYGZpp76kRhiHgxxX4_83FT9IKBcpDIvNNcPyonNT0xuVI _WN9bP0C_IDc0tzb0REALCInKA!!/delta/base64xml/L0lDIU0IKQ1RPN29na2tBISEvboLvUUUFBSVFnakZJOQFraENFS VFqR0EhLzRKRmlDbzBlaDFpY29uUVZIaGolLzdRF8xQ!i!!?WCM_PORTLET=PC_7_1B2_WCM&WCM_GLOBAL_CONTEXT=/wps/wcm/connect/ITESM.en/Faculty/Educational+Model/Academic+quality+assurance/ and http://www.itesm.edu/wps/portal/english/kcxml/04_Sj9SPykssy0xPLMnMz0vM0Y_QizKLN443NASeSYGZpp76kRhiHgxxX4_83FT9IKBcpDIvNNcPyonNT0xuVI _WN9bP0C_IDc0tzb0REALCInKA!!/delta/base64xml/L0lDIU0IKQ1RPN29na2tBISEvboLvUUUFBSVFnakZJOQFraENFS VFqR0EhLzRKRmlDbzBlaDFpY29uUVZIaGolLzdRF8xQ!i!!?WCM_PORTLET=PC_7_1B4_WCM&WCM_GLOBAL_CONTEXT=/wps/wcm/connect/ITESM.en/Faculty/Educational+Model/Academic+quality+assurance/ and http://www.sacscoc.org/principles.asp, http://www.sacscoc.org/June2007AccreditationActionsandPublicDisclosureStatements.asp, http://cmpublish.itesm.mx/wps/wcm/connect/ITESM.en/Faculty/SACS+Reaffirmation/Process/

Tecnológico de Monterrey. (n.d.b). Accreditation of Tecnológico de Monterrey and quality enhancement plan (multiple sources). Retrieved August 31, 2007, from http://cmportal.itesm.mx/wps/portal/english/kcxml/04_Sj9SPykssy0xPLMnMz0vM0Y_QizKLN443NASeSYGZpp76kRhiHgxxX4_83FT9IKBcpDIvNNcPyonNT0xuVI _WN9bP0C_IDc0tzb0REALCInKA!!/delta/base64xml/L0lDIU0IKQ1RPN29na2tBISEvboLvUUUFBSVFnakZJOQFraENFS VFqR0EhLzRKRmlDbzBlaDFpY29uUVZIaGolLzdRF8xQ!i!!?WCM_PORTLET=PC_7_3_1_17_WCM&WCM_GLOBAL_CONTEXT=http://cmpublish.itesm.mx/wps/wcm/connect/ITESM.en/Faculty/SACS+Reaffirmation/Process/
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http://www.cem.itesm.mx/english/education/faculty.html

Tecnológico de Monterrey. (n.d.c). Teacher training and refresher courses (multiple sources). Retrieved August 23, 2008, from
http://cmportal.itesm.mx/wps/portal/english/kcxml/04_Sj9SPykkssy0xPLMpMz0vM0Y_QizKLN443NAesESYGZpp76kRhiHgexX4_83FT9IKBcpDIvNNcPyonNT0vxVI_WN9bP0C_IDc0otzb0REALClnKA!!/delta/base64xml/L0JJSk03dWJDU1EhIs9JRGpBQu15QUJFUKVSRUnLzRGR2dKWW5LSjBGUm9YZmcvN18zXzFJNw!!?WCM_PORTLET=PC_7_3_117_WCM&WCM_GLOBAL_CONTEXT=http://cmpubli sh.itesm.mx/wps/wcm/connect/ITESM.en/Faculty/Faculty/Teacher+training+and+refresher+courses/. http://cmportal.itesm.mx/wps/portal/english/kcxml/04_Sj9SPykkssy0xPLMnMz0vM0Y_QizKLN443NAesESYGZpp76kRhiHgexX4_83FT9IKBcpDIvNNcPyonNT0vxVI_WN9bP0C_IDc0otzb0REALClnKA!!/delta/base64xml/L0JJSk03dWID U1EhIs9JRGpBQu15QUJFUKVSRUnLzRGR2dKWW5LSjBGUm9YZmcvN18zXzFJNw!!?WCM_PORTLET=PC_7_3_117_WCM&WCM_GLOBAL_CONTEXT=http://cmpublis h.itesm.mx/wps/wcm/connect/ITESM.en/Faculty/Faculty/Teacher+training+and+refresher+courses/.

New Zealand

University of Auckland (13)

http://www.auckland.ac.nz/uoa/fms/default/uoa/about/teaching/policiesprocedures/docs/reviewevaluation.pdf

http://www.auckland.ac.nz/uoa/fms/default/uoa/about/teaching/objectivesplans/docs/academic_plan_senate_1104.pdf

http://www.auckland.ac.nz/uoa/fms/default/uoa/about/teaching/policiesprocedures/docs/pd_acadstaff.pdf

http://www.auckland.ac.nz/uoa/fms/default/uoa/about/teaching/policiesprocedures/docs/effectiveteaching.pdf

http://www.arts.auckland.ac.nz/FileGet.cfm?ID=c5e548ee-cd5a-42b2-9810-fcdd6a99613e
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**Singapore**

**National University of Singapore (7)**
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United Kingdom

University of Birmingham (18)
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University of Birmingham. (n.d.g). Staff development and review scheme for academic teaching staff and research staff. Retrieved August 09, 2008, from http://www.hr.bham.ac.uk/development/sdr/details_academic_teaching_and_research_staff.shtml


University of Edinburgh (26)
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University of Glasgow (11)
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http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/learningteaching/awardsandfunds/teachingexcellenceawards/evidencestage/#d.en.10127


**University of Nottingham (26)**
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University of Nottingham. (n.d.o). Your employment with the university. Retrieved August 25, 2008 from http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/humanities/Information_for_Staff/Your_Employment_with_the_University.html

United States of America

University of Virginia (18)
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http://www.virginia.edu/planningdocuments/commission/2MRC/4b%20Appendix%20OK.pdf


University of Virginia. (n.d.c). *Faculty teaching awards: All-university teaching awards* (multiple sources). Retrieved on September 11, 2008, from http://trc.virginia.edu/Awards/Faculty/AUT.htm, http://trc.virginia.edu/Awards/Faculty/FMA.htm (Excellence in Faculty Mentoring Award), http://trc.virginia.edu/Awards/Faculty/SA.htm (Study Abroad Teaching Award), http://trc.virginia.edu/Awards/Faculty/AA.htm (Alumni Association Distinguished Professor Award), http://trc.virginia.edu/Awards/Faculty/ABT.htm (Alumni Board of Trustees Teaching Award), http://trc.virginia.edu/Awards/Faculty/CDT.htm (Cavaliers' Distinguished Teaching Professorship), http://trc.virginia.edu/Awards/Faculty/SCHEV.htm (State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV) Outstanding Faculty Award) and http://trc.virginia.edu/Awards/Faculty/NEH.htm (NEH Distinguished Teaching Professorship at the University of Virginia)
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Appendix C: Four Criteria for Consensus Development in the Delphi Technique

The literature indicates that there is no fixed procedure for consensus development in the Delphi. Researchers use a wide range of criteria depending upon the nature of the study and the type of the scale used in the questionnaire (i.e., three-point; four-point; five-point; six-point; seven-point; or nine-point scale). In this study, four consensus criteria were applied for the analysis of responses in both rounds of the Delphi. While applying these criteria for consensus development at various stages of data analysis, it was revealed that many criteria in the literature are the subset of these four criteria. These four consensus criteria use the values of mean, median, mode, interquartile range, and the percentages of responses at either side of the scale. These criteria are explained as follows:

Consensus Criterion 1 (Elwyn et al., 2006)

The first of the four consensus criteria states that an item achieves consensus provided 30% or more of the ratings do not fall in the lower-third and the upper-third of the scale simultaneously. Elwyn et al. (2006) defined this consensus criterion for the items on a nine-point scale in their study. They suggested that participants disagreed on an item provided 30% or more of the ratings fell in the lower third (ratings 1-3) as well as in the upper third (ratings 7-9) of the scale. For this study, it was defined that if 30% or more of the ratings fell in the lower third (rating 1-2) as well as in the upper third (rating 5-6) of the scale, that item was not agreed upon by the respondents and was sent back to them for re-rating in the following round of the Delphi.

Consensus Criterion 2 (Fitch et al., 2001)

This criterion defines consensus by the value of UCLA/RAND disagreement index (DI) and states that an item achieves consensus provided the value of DI for that specific item is less than one, i.e. DI<1 (Fitch et al., 2001). The disagreement index (DI) is defined as the value of IPR (Inter-Percentile Range) divided by the value of IPRAS (Inter-Percentile Range Adjusted for Symmetry). The IPR is the difference between the 30th and 70th percentile of respondents’ ratings. The value of IPRAS is calculated as 2.35 + (AI*1.5), where AI (Asymmetry Index) is “the distance between the central point of the IPR and the mid-point” of the rating scale (Fitch et al., 2001, p. 60). The central point of the IPR is
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the sum of 30\textsuperscript{th} and 70\textsuperscript{th} percentiles divided by 2. In this study, the DI was calculated as follows.

\begin{equation}
\text{Inter-Percentile Range (IPR) = 70\textsuperscript{th} Percentile – 30\textsuperscript{th} Percentile (difference b/w both)}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{Asymmetry Index (AI) = IPRCP – 3.5, where IPRCP is the central point of IPR [i.e., (70\textsuperscript{th} Percentile + 30\textsuperscript{th} Percentile)/2] and 3.5 is the central point of the rating scale.}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{Inter-Percentile Range Adjusted for Symmetry (IPRAS) = 2.35+ (1.5*AI), and}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{Finally, Disagreement index (DI) = IPR/IPRAS}
\end{equation}

**Consensus Criterion 3 (Kurth-Schai et al., 2000)**

This criterion states that an item achieves consensus if it fulfils the conditions of Interquartile Deviation\(\leq1.5\) and Mode-Median\(\leq1\) (Kurth-Schai et al., 2000). For this criterion, the values of mode, median, and interquartile range were calculated for each item and the items were tested against the aforementioned two conditions.

**Consensus Criterion 4 (Rayens & Hahn, 2000)**

This criterion states that the items with Interquartile Deviation values of zero (i.e., IQDs=0) achieve consensus along with the items that have Interquartile Deviation values of one (i.e., IQDs=1) and for them the percentage of generally positive or generally negative responses is more than 60\% (Rayens & Hahn, 2000). For this criterion, the values of IQDs were calculated along with the percentage of generally positive (ratings of 4/5/6) or generally negative (ratings of 1/2/3) responses. All the items were tested against both conditions and consensus was determined for them.
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Name (optional): __________________________________________ Qualifications: __________________________________________

Area of Specialization: ________________________________ Department/Organization/Institution: __________________________________

Instructions: Please assess both the Desirability and Likely Acceptability (to Academic Staff) of each aspect of quality assurance processes for assuring and/or enhancing the quality of teaching in Pakistan universities. Use the six-point scale ranging from Highly Desirable or Highly Acceptable (to Academic Staff) to Not Desirable or Not Acceptable (to Academic Staff). For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desirability</th>
<th>Likely Acceptability (to Academic Staff of Pakistan universities)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly Desirable</td>
<td>Highly Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please select the only one appropriate box in each of the “Desirability” and “Likely Acceptability” Columns by either putting a Tick (✓) [copy Tick (✓) symbol and paste it in the appropriate box] or by writing a “y” (“y” stands for “yes”) in the box of your choice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Desirability</th>
<th>Likely Acceptability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Development of teaching and learning plans at department, faculty, and institution level that involve setting of teaching and learning goals/targets at each specific level and strategies to achieve them.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reviewing, monitoring, and reporting progress against the targets identified in teaching and learning plans/strategies at department, faculty, and institution level on regular basis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Development of policies and processes at faculty and institution level specifically aimed at assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching and learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Development of guidelines for the implementation of teaching &amp; learning plans, policies, and processes for quality assurance of teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Review and update teaching and learning policies, processes, and guidelines on a regular basis according to the emerging needs of the universities in teaching and learning practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Desirability</th>
<th>Likely Acceptability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Adoption of a collaborative approach (involvement of and consultation with all concerned individuals, departments, faculties, etc.) by universities in the development, implementation, and evaluation of teaching and learning plans, policies, and guidelines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Establishment of Networks, Centres, Committees, and Bodies in universities for the development, implementation, and review of teaching and learning policies and guidelines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dissemination of teaching and learning plans, policies, and guidelines among the all concerned in universities to create awareness of benefits and to provide a way to act.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Development of teaching and learning policies, processes, and guidelines informed by research and international literature on good practices in teaching and learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Development of implementation procedures for teaching and learning policies, processes, and guidelines informed by research and international literature on good practices in teaching and learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Provision of assistance and support to departments and faculties for the development and implementation of teaching and learning plans, policies, processes, and guidelines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Consistency and alignment of teaching and learning plans and policies developed by departments, faculties, and universities with each other and with national policies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Development of an integrated system of quality assurance and quality enhancement based on monitoring, reviewing, and enhancing the quality of teaching and learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Development of an internal system of quality assurance in compliance with external bodies and based on activities that place emphasis on the enhancement of teaching and learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Development of an internal system of audits/reviews at department/school/faculty level with emphasis on quality enhancement of teaching activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Development of an internal system of audits/reviews at department/faculty level to assess the compliance of departmental/faculty quality assurance mechanisms with those of institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Development of an internal system of audits/reviews at department/faculty level with emphasis on supporting and improving internal quality assurance and quality enhancement processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Focus internal audits/reviews at department/faculty level on the quality of teaching and learning, courses, and assessment activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Base internal audit/review process, at departmental/faculty level, on the submission of documentation concerning quality assurance of teaching and learning by the concerned department/faculty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Base internal audit/review process, at departmental/faculty level, on the submission of documentation concerning quality enhancement of teaching and learning by the concerned department/faculty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Desirability</th>
<th>Likely Acceptability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Use of internal audits/reviews at department/faculty level to identify good practices and emerging trends in teaching and learning.</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Dissemination of good practices and emerging trends in teaching and learning identified in internal audits/reviews at departmental/faculty level, to the broader community of the university (other departments, schools, and faculties of the university).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Use of internal audits/reviews at department/faculty level to identify weaknesses or areas for improvement in teaching and learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Provision of support and guidance to the concerned departments/faculties for overcoming weaknesses or areas for improvement identified during the internal audit/review process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Provision of information to the public, concerning universities’ capacity for assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching and learning, as a requirement from external bodies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Initiation of a process of teaching programme reviews for departments/schools in universities comprising the review of course design, delivery, assessment, and other teaching-related activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Self-monitoring by department/school/faculty of the processes of quality assurance and quality enhancement for teaching-related activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Reporting of “self-monitored quality assurance and quality enhancement processes for teaching-related activities by department/faculty” to the various committees of the university established for the purpose.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Establish a regular system of institutional reviews/audits of universities by an external review/audit panel for assuring, reviewing, and enhancing the quality of teaching-related activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Base the system of institutional reviews/audits of universities on the submission of documentation, concerning quality assurance of teaching, by the concerned university to the external audit/review panel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Implementation of quality enhancement plan and other follow-up activities in universities recommended by the external auditors/reviewers in an audit visit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Monitor the performance of all academic staff through annual performance reviews to be based at setting of goals and targets concerning teaching for the following year and review of achievements against targets for the preceding year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Take account of the professional development needs of academic staff while setting the goals/targets concerning teaching in annual performance reviews of academic staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Take account of career aspirations of academic staff while setting the goals/targets concerning teaching in annual performance reviews of academic staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Review the teaching performance of probationary and new academic staff in annual performance review process on the basis of professional development they have received through mentors and other sources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Desirability</th>
<th>Likely Acceptability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Provision of rewards for probationary academic staff in confirmation of probation for satisfactory ratings in performance reviews.</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Provision of rewards for academics in salary progression for satisfactory ratings in performance reviews.</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Provision of rewards for academic staff in tenure and promotion processes for satisfactory ratings in performance reviews.</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Provision of support to academic staff, who achieve below teaching expectation rating in annual performance reviews, through the implementation of performance improvement procedures.</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Development of teaching quality appraisal processes for faculties and schools through the assessment of teaching and learning performance indicators.</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Allocation of specific amount of funding to faculties on the basis of measures taken for assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching and learning in faculties and assessed through teaching and learning performance indicators.</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Include “participation of new staff from the faculty in the professional certificate in university learning and teaching and other professional development activities” as one of the teaching and learning performance indicator in teaching quality appraisal process for faculties.</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Include “development and implementation of teaching and learning plans by faculties” as one of the teaching and learning performance indicator in teaching quality appraisal process for faculties.</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Include “implementation of student evaluation of teaching process in the faculties” as one of the teaching and learning performance indicator in teaching quality appraisal process for faculties.</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Take account of “the results of student’s evaluations of teaching at various tools implemented by faculties, university and at national level and comparison of those results within the faculties, across the faculties and with previous year’s results” as one of the teaching and learning performance indicator in teaching quality appraisal process for faculties.</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Take account of “reflection and action taken on the data of the teaching and learning performance indicators by the faculties” in the process of teaching quality appraisal of faculties.</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Emphasize the professional development of academic staff in policies and in the teaching and learning plans developed by faculties and universities.</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Development of a practice-based Professional Certificate in University Learning and Teaching for academic staff under the supervision of Teaching and Leaning Centres established at university level.</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Participation of probationary and new academic staff in practice-based Professional Certificate in University Learning and Teaching as a contractual requirement for appointment (necessary to attend).</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Desirability</th>
<th>Likely Acceptability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Provision of opportunities in universities for academic staff to share and adopt good T/L practices through critical debates, seminars, conferences, symposia, and colloquia (dissemination of good T/L practices).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Establish Supporting Units, Networks, and Centres at Faculty and university level for pedagogical development, research into teaching and learning (Scholarship of Teaching), and for the provision of professional development and other teaching skills to academic staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Initiation of various teaching professional development programmes by Teaching and Learning Centres which may include orientation programmes, certificates, training courses, refresher courses, and workshops for the support of teaching and learning practices depending upon the needs of academic staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Encouragement and support from Deans and Academic Heads for staff to dialogue and consultation with Teaching and Learning Centres and Networks established at Department, Faculty, institution, and national level for the development and enhancement of their teaching practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Initiation of peer mentoring programmes at Department, Faculty, and university level for the assistance of new academic staff to achieve excellence in teaching and learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Emphasize the development of IT literacy and library skills (use of information and communication technologies) in academic staff in professional development programmes provided by the universities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Provision of assistance, support, and training for Academic Heads, Mentors, Reviewers, Reviewees, and members of evaluation panels on their role in relation to quality of teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Development and provision of resources to academic staff, by Teaching and Learning Centres, for improving and enhancing the quality of their teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Provision of support by the universities for the development and sustaining the communities of practices in learning and teaching (e.g., Teaching Partnerships Program for peer review of teaching in a collegial way and consequent reflection practices; communities for designing and reviewing curricula; etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Initiation and organization of good practices in teaching and learning such as peer review of teaching in a collegial way for improvement to happen and to be organized by Teaching and Learning Centres.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Evaluation of professional development programmes, processes, and courses offered by universities and consequent revisions and changes to those programmes, processes, and courses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Seek feedback from the all concerned on the development (doing need analysis), review, and evaluation of professional development programmes and courses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Establish a process at Department and Faculty level to review courses on regular basis in order to maintain the currency in curricula.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Develop proposals for new courses within the Departments and subsequent approval from Faculty and university committees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. No.</td>
<td>Statements</td>
<td>Desirability</td>
<td>Likely Acceptability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Validation of courses by internal academics in the discipline prior to delivery.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Validation of courses by external academics in the discipline prior to delivery.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Involvement of experts from the industry and professional associations in the development and review of courses and curricula.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Encourage interdisciplinarity in the curriculum development.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Provision of support and training to academic staff for the development and review of courses.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Encouragement of an inclusive learning and teaching experiences for students through accommodation of diverse and flexible learning styles in curricula, teaching modes, and levels of support.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Emphasis on the consistency of teaching method, learning activities, and assessment practices with desired learning outcomes.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Encourage academic staff for the use of innovative, collaborative, interdisciplinary, and multiple methods of teaching and modes of instruction.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Emphasize student-centred teaching and learning practices/activities/processes that involve and engage students in learning.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Establishment of staff-student consultative committees in universities at department level for the discussion of matters concerning quality of teaching and courses.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Seek feedback from a range of stakeholders (past graduates, employers, etc.) on regular basis for improving the quality, relevance, and accessibility of courses.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Seek feedback from current/exiting students on the quality of courses through nation-wide surveys of all universities.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Seek feedback (summative and formative) from students on regular basis about the quality of teaching and courses at department and faculty level for monitoring, improvement, and recognition purposes.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Use of standardized items for student evaluation of teaching and courses in universities.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Provision of adding discipline specific supplementary questions in the standardized questionnaire used for student evaluation of teaching and courses at department/faculty level.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Provide the right to Academic Head at department level to commission student evaluation of teaching and courses for monitoring purpose.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Provide the right for students to put their request to Academic Head for the evaluation of teaching and courses for any specific course or an individual teacher.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Report the results of students’ evaluation of teaching to Academic Heads, Deans, and various committees established at faculty and university level for monitoring purposes.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Desirability</th>
<th>Likely Acceptability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Inform students on regular basis about the results of their evaluation of teaching and courses along with the action taken or proposed as a result of their evaluation (to increase involvement of students in process).</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Report the results of students’ evaluation of teaching and courses to the individual staff for improvement purposes and reflection practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Encourage academic staff for seeking formative feedback from students and peers on the quality of their teaching and courses for facilitating improvement in teaching and courses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Encourage a collegial system of peer review of teaching (formal &amp; informal) in universities for the enhancement of teaching quality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Encourage a system of “peer review of teaching by a critical friend” for enhancing the quality of teaching in universities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Establish a “To observe and be observed” system of “peer review of teaching” in universities on regular basis for all types of teaching staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Develop a peer review process of teaching to identify good practices in teaching and learning and to disseminate those practices to the broader community of university for sharing purposes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Develop a peer review process of teaching that enhances the individual's (reviewee) teaching performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Provision of support and advice to academic staff in reflection practices and in professional development needs to help them respond to feedback from peers and students on the quality of teaching and courses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Recognition of the “review and evaluation of teaching by students and peers” practices in tenure and promotion processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Recognition of the “review and evaluation of teaching by students and peers” practices in teaching excellence awards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Give due consideration to all relevant factors e.g., response rate and number of respondents while interpreting and reporting the results of student evaluation of teaching and courses for various purposes (awards, tenure and promotion).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Emphasis on strengthening the connection between teaching and research in universities by developing, supporting, and strengthening the scholarship of teaching and learning (the conduct and publishing research into teaching and learning by individual academies and by teaching and learning centres).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Build teaching-research nexus by encouraging and supporting academic staff for the incorporation of their personal research into course design and delivery.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Build teaching-research nexus by encouraging and supporting academic staff to incorporate the latest and contemporary disciplinary research into classroom teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Create awareness among the students about the concept of teaching-research nexus by teaching them research methods, techniques and skills (research skills) within subjects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Desirability</th>
<th>Likely Acceptability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Build teaching-research nexus by encouraging problem-based and enquiry-based approaches to teaching and learning.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Build teaching-research nexus by encouraging and involving postgraduate students in high level research activities e.g., departmental projects.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Build teaching-research nexus by providing opportunities for undergraduate students to participate in research projects e.g., small-scale research activities.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Recognition and rewards for academic staff who build the various forms of connections between teaching and research (staff who encourage and strengthen teaching-research nexus) in teaching excellent awards.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Recognition and rewards for academic staff who build the various forms of connections between teaching and research (who encourage and strengthen teaching-research nexus) in tenure and promotion processes.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Establish a system for the allocation of performance-based funding to universities, by external bodies, for the recognition of quality in teaching and learning.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Base the allocation of performance-based funding for teaching and learning to the universities, by external bodies, on the results of nation-wide surveys of student evaluation.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Introduce a system of teaching-focused appointments in universities with emphasis on teaching-related activities (e.g., Teaching-focused, Teaching and Research, and Research-focused appointments).</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Equal the status of teaching-focused appointment with those of research-focused and teaching-research focused appointment in universities.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Provide opportunities to academic staff to change their role from one category to other category depending upon their interest in each category (in Teaching-focused, Teaching and Research, and Research-focused).</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Recognition and rewards for evidence-based scholarly teaching in the processes of confirmation of probation, continuation, tenure, and promotions.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Recognition and rewards for excellence in teaching in the form of Teaching Excellence Awards at faculty, institution, and national level.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Obligation on the part of award winners to share their ideas on innovation and excellence in teaching throughout university.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Initiation of “Teaching Improvement Grants” scheme in universities for encouraging innovation and enhancing the teaching and learning skills of academic staff.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Initiation of “Teaching Fellowships” scheme in universities and by external bodies for conducting research into teaching and learning and for the enhancement of teaching and learning practices in universities.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Award fellowships to doctoral students for the purpose of conducting research into university teaching and learning (scholarship of teaching).</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Desirability</th>
<th>Likely Acceptability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Initiation of pilot projects at department, faculty, and institution level for promoting and enhancing teaching excellence.</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Emphasis on innovation and use of technology in teaching and learning in awarding teaching fellowships and teaching improvement projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Oblige teaching fellowship award holders to work with Teaching and Learning Centres during the period of project for the enhancement of teaching and learning practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Publication and dissemination of research findings and innovations, resulted from teaching improvement grants/projects, to the broader community of the university.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Encouragement of “publication and dissemination of research about teaching in scholarly journals”.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Development of teaching portfolios by academic staff for the documentation of evidence-based teaching effectiveness to be used in tenure and promotion processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Development of teaching portfolios by academic staff for the documentation of evidence-based teaching effectiveness to be used in teaching excellence award processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Include information on the teaching and learning goals, teaching philosophy, teaching and learning practices, and intended learning outcomes in addition to the information on teaching effectiveness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Recognition of contributions to scholarship of teaching and learning in tenure, promotion, and award processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Recognition of leadership in the development of good teaching and learning practices in tenure, promotion, and award processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Recognition of ongoing efforts to improve teaching and learning practices (continuous professional development) in tenure, promotion, and award processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Recognition of knowledge transfer activities, concerning teaching, within the university and broader community in tenure, promotion, and award processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Adoption of a collaborative and coordinated university-wide approach for enhancement-led quality assurance of teaching and learning in universities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Emphasis of enhancement-led quality assurance activities in universities is on the improvement of students’ learning experiences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Please add any statement about assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching in Pakistan universities that you consider is missing from the list above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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(Many thanks for your kind cooperation – Bashir Hussain).
## Appendix E: Delphi Round II Questionnaire

Name (optional): _____________________________________________

Qualifications: ____________________________________________

Area of Specialization: ____________________________

Department/Organization/Institution: ______________________

### Instructions
Please assess the *Likely Acceptability to Academics* in Pakistan universities of each of the following ways of assuring/enhancing the quality of teaching. Use the six-point scale ranging from *Highly Acceptable (to Academics in Pakistan Universities)* to *Not Acceptable At All (to Academics in Pakistan Universities)*. Please state the reason for low acceptability if you rated the item as “Not Acceptable” on the scale (i.e., if you rate 3 or below). For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely Acceptability (to Academics in Pakistan Universities)</th>
<th>Reasons for Low Acceptability (i.e., if you rate 3 or below)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly Acceptable ↔ Not Acceptable At All</td>
<td>Insufficient Developmental Resources like Expertise, Infrastructure, Guidelines, etc. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please select only one box in each of the “Likely Acceptability” Columns by putting a Symbol (X) in the box of your choice. This round of the Delphi questionnaire also indicates the group response to the first round of the Delphi (the numbers in each square represent the numbers who scored the item at that level in round 1). Your response for each specific item in the first round of the Delphi is also indicated by an asterisk (*) in the relevant column. In this round you can either confirm your original response or revise it in the light of group response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Likely Acceptability</th>
<th>Reasons for Low Acceptability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reviewing, monitoring, and reporting progress against the targets identified in teaching and learning (T/L) plans/strategies at department, faculty, and institution level on regular basis.</td>
<td>0 2 8 5 6* 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Development of policies and processes at faculty and institution level specifically aimed at assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching and learning (T/L).</td>
<td>0 5 10* 3 3 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Development of guidelines for the implementation of teaching &amp; learning (T/L) plans, policies, and processes for quality assurance (QA) of teaching.</td>
<td>0 4 7* 4 5 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Review and update teaching and learning policies, processes, and guidelines on a regular basis according to the emerging needs of the universities in teaching and learning (T/L) practices.</td>
<td>1 5 5 4* 4 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Adoption of a collaborative approach (involvement of and consultation with all concerned individuals, departments, faculties, etc.) by universities in the development, implementation, and evaluation of teaching and learning plans, policies, and guidelines.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Development of teaching and learning policies, processes, and guidelines informed by research and international literature on good practices in teaching and learning (T/L).</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Development of implementation procedures for teaching and learning policies, processes, and guidelines informed by research and international literature on good practices in teaching and learning.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Provision of assistance and support to departments and faculties for the development and implementation of teaching and learning plans, policies, processes, and guidelines.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Consistency and alignment of teaching and learning plans and policies developed by departments, faculties, and universities with each other and with national policies.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Development of an integrated system of quality assurance (QA) and quality enhancement (QE) based on monitoring, reviewing, and enhancing the quality of teaching and learning.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Development of an internal system of quality assurance in compliance with external bodies and based on activities that place emphasis on the enhancement of teaching and learning.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Development of an internal system of audits/reviews at department/school/faculty level with emphasis on quality enhancement of teaching activities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Development of an internal system of audits/reviews at department/faculty level to assess the compliance of departmental/faculty quality assurance (QA) mechanisms with those of institution.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Development of an internal system of audits/reviews at department/faculty level with emphasis on supporting and improving internal quality assurance (QA) and quality enhancement processes (QE).</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Focus internal audits/reviews at department/faculty level on the quality of teaching and learning, courses, and assessment activities.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Base internal audit/review process, at departmental/faculty level, on the submission of documentation concerning quality assurance of teaching and learning by the concerned department/faculty.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Base internal audit/review process, at departmental/faculty level, on the submission of documentation concerning quality enhancement of teaching and learning by the concerned department/faculty.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Use of internal audits/reviews at department/faculty level to identify good practices and emerging trends in teaching and learning.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Use of internal audits/reviews at department/faculty level to identify weaknesses or areas for improvement in teaching and learning.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Provision of support and guidance to the concerned departments/faculties for overcoming weaknesses or areas for improvement identified during the internal audit/review process.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Provision of information to the public, concerning universities’ capacity for assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching and learning, as a requirement from external bodies.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Self-monitoring by department/school/faculty of the processes of QA and QE for teaching-related activities.</td>
<td>1 5 6 5 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Reporting of “self-monitored QA and quality enhancement processes for teaching-related activities by department/faculty” to the various committees of the university established for the purpose.</td>
<td>1 2 7 5 3 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Establish a regular system of institutional reviews/audits of universities by an external review/audit panel for assuring, reviewing, and enhancing the quality of teaching-related activities.</td>
<td>0 3 6 5 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Base the system of institutional reviews/audits of universities on the submission of documentation, concerning QA of teaching, by the concerned university to the external audit/visit panel.</td>
<td>0 2 7 6 2 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Implementation of quality enhancement plan and other follow-up activities in universities as recommended by the external auditors/visitors in an audit visit.</td>
<td>0 3 5 6 3 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Monitor the performance of all academic staff through annual performance reviews to be based at setting of goals and targets concerning teaching for the following year and review of achievements against targets for the preceding year.</td>
<td>0 5 1 6 6 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Review the teaching performance of probationary and new academic staff in performance review process on the basis of professional development they have received through mentors &amp; other sources.</td>
<td>2 6 5 2 2 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Development of teaching quality appraisal processes for faculties and schools through the assessment of teaching and learning performance indicators.</td>
<td>3 4 4 5 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Include “implementation of student evaluation of teaching process in the faculties” as one of the teaching and learning (T/L) performance indicators.</td>
<td>2 1 9 2 5 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Take account of “the results of student’s evaluations of teaching at faculty, university, and at national level and comparison of those results within the faculties, across the faculties and with previous year’s results” as one of the T/L performance indicator in teaching quality appraisal process for faculties.</td>
<td>0 3 7 3 6 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Take account of “reflection and action taken on the data of the teaching and learning performance indicators by the faculties” in the process of teaching quality appraisal of faculties.</td>
<td>0 6 5 3 6 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Initiation of peer mentoring programmes at department, faculty, and university level for the assistance of new academic staff to achieve excellence in teaching and learning.</td>
<td>1 4 10 5 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Initiation and organization of good practices in teaching and learning such as peer review of teaching in a collegial way for improvement to happen and to be organized by Teaching and Learning Centres.</td>
<td>1 2 12 2 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Establish a process at department and faculty level to review courses on regular basis in order to maintain the currency in curricula.</td>
<td>4 7 3 4 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Develop proposals for new courses within the departments and subsequent approval from faculty and university committees.</td>
<td>7 3 5 3 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Validation of courses by internal academics in the discipline prior to delivery.</td>
<td>3 5 7 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Validation of courses by external academics in the discipline prior to delivery.</td>
<td>3 5 4 4 4 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Involvement of experts from the industry and professional associations in the development and review process.</td>
<td>5 7 1 3 5 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Encourage interdisciplinarity in the curriculum development.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Encouragement of an inclusive learning and teaching experiences for students through accommodation of diverse and flexible learning styles in curricula, teaching modes, and levels of support.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Establishment of staff-student consultative committees in universities at department level for the discussion of matters concerning quality of teaching and courses.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Seek feedback from a range of stakeholders (past graduates, employers, etc.) on regular basis for improving the quality, relevance, and accessibility of courses.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Seek feedback from current/exiting students on the quality of courses through nation-wide surveys of all universities.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Seek feedback (summative and formative) from students on regular basis about the quality of teaching and courses at department and faculty level for monitoring, improvement, and recognition purposes.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Use of standardised items for student evaluation of teaching and courses in universities.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Provision of adding discipline specific supplementary questions in the standardized questionnaire used for student evaluation of teaching and courses at department/faculty level.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Provide the right to Academic Head at department level to commission student evaluation of teaching and courses for monitoring purpose.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Provide the right for students to put their request to Academic Head for the evaluation of teaching and courses for any specific course or an individual teacher.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Report the results of students’ evaluation of teaching to Academic Heads, Deans, and various committees established at faculty and university level for monitoring purposes.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Inform students on regular basis about the results of their evaluation of teaching and courses along with the action taken or proposed as a result of their evaluation (to involve students in the process).</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Report the results of students’ evaluation of teaching and courses to the individual staff for improvement purposes and reflection practices.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Encourage academic staff for seeking formative feedback from students and peers on the quality of their teaching and courses for facilitating improvement in teaching and courses.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Encourage a collegial system of peer review of teaching (formal &amp; informal) in universities for the enhancement of teaching quality.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Encourage a system of “peer review of teaching by a critical friend” for enhancing the quality of teaching in universities.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Establish a “To observe and be observed” system of “peer review of teaching” in universities on regular basis for all types of teaching staff.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Develop a peer review process of teaching to identify good practices in teaching and learning and to disseminate those practices to the broader community of university for sharing purposes.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop a peer review process of teaching that enhances the individual's (reviewee) teaching performance/practices.</td>
<td>2 2 3 5 7 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of support and advice to academic staff in reflection practices and in professional development needs to help them respond to feedback from peers and students on the quality of teaching and courses.</td>
<td>3 3 5 4 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of the “review and evaluation of teaching by students and peers” practices in tenure and promotion processes.</td>
<td>2 3 2 4 6 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of the “review and evaluation of teaching by students and peers” practices in teaching excellence awards.</td>
<td>4 2 4 3 4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give due consideration to all relevant factors e.g., response rate and number of respondents while interpreting and reporting the results of student evaluation of teaching and courses for various purposes (awards, tenure and promotion).</td>
<td>4 4 4 2 4 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build teaching-research nexus by encouraging and supporting academic staff to incorporate the latest and contemporary disciplinary research into classroom teaching.</td>
<td>4 3 6 3 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create awareness among the students about the concept of teaching-research nexus by teaching them research methods, techniques and skills (research skills) within subjects.</td>
<td>8 3 4 0 3 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build teaching-research nexus by encouraging problem-based and enquiry-based approaches to teaching and learning.</td>
<td>4 6 4 2 3 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build teaching-research nexus by encouraging and involving postgraduate students in high level research activities e.g., departmental projects.</td>
<td>9 3 3 3 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build teaching-research nexus by providing opportunities for undergraduate students to participate in research projects e.g., small-scale research activities.</td>
<td>7 2 5 1 4 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition and rewards for academic staff who build the various forms of connections between teaching and research (staff who encourage and strengthen T-R nexus) in teaching excellent awards.</td>
<td>11 2 3 2 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition and rewards for academic staff who build the various forms of connections between teaching and research (who encourage and strengthen T-R nexus) in tenure and promotion processes.</td>
<td>9 2 1 5 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base the allocation of performance-based funding for teaching and learning to the universities, by external bodies, on the results of nation-wide surveys of student evaluation.</td>
<td>2 2 6 4 4 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal the status of teaching-focused appointment with those of research-focused and teaching-research focused appointment in universities.</td>
<td>2 4 5 6 3 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunities to academic staff to change their role from one category to other category depending upon their interest in each category (in Teaching-focused, Teaching &amp; Research, and Research-focused).</td>
<td>7 5 5 3 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition and rewards for evidence-based scholarly teaching in the processes of confirmation of probation, continuation, tenure, and promotions.</td>
<td>5 3 5 4 3 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Initiation of pilot projects at department, faculty, and institution level for promoting and enhancing teaching excellence.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Emphasis on innovation and use of technology in teaching and learning in awarding teaching fellowships and teaching improvement projects.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Oblige teaching fellowship award holders to work with Teaching and Learning Centres during the period of project for the enhancement of teaching and learning practices.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Publication and dissemination of research findings and innovations, resulted from teaching improvement grants/projects, to the broader community of the university.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Development of teaching portfolios by academic staff for the documentation of evidence-based teaching effectiveness to be used in tenure and promotion processes.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Development of teaching portfolios by academic staff for the documentation of evidence-based teaching effectiveness to be used in teaching excellence award processes.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Include information on the teaching and learning goals, teaching philosophy, teaching and learning practices, and intended learning outcomes in addition to the information on teaching effectiveness.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Recognition of contributions to scholarship of teaching and learning in tenure, promotion, and award processes.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Recognition of leadership in the development of good teaching and learning practices in tenure, promotion, and award processes.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Recognition of knowledge transfer activities, concerning teaching, within the university and broader community in tenure, promotion, and award processes.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Adoption of a collaborative and coordinated university-wide approach for enhancement-led quality assurance of teaching and learning in universities.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Emphasis of enhancement-led quality assurance activities in universities is on the improvement of students’ learning experiences.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

86. If you want to comment at any of the above aspects for assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching in Pakistan universities, please, add here. Furthermore, if you want state reasons for low acceptability (other than above) of any aspect of quality assurance processes for teaching in Pakistan universities, please state here. You expert opinion will be appreciated in this regard.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------- (Many thanks for your expert opinion and kind cooperation – Bashir Hussain, The University of Auckland).
Appendix F: Participant Information Sheet I

Participant Information Sheet I (Phase II)

Title: Quality assurance processes for teaching in research-led universities: Implications for Pakistan.

Dear Participant,

I am Bashir Hussain. I am PhD student at the School of Critical Studies in Education (CRSTIE), Faculty of Education, The University of Auckland, New Zealand. I am doing research for my thesis titled “Quality assurance processes for teaching in research-led universities: Implications for Pakistan”. In phase I of this study, I have analyzed policy and practice documents concerning quality assurance processes for teaching from 15 member universities of Universitas 21 (U21) network. Out of these 15 universities, three universities are from Australia, two from Canada, four from UK, and one each from Hong Kong, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Singapore, and USA. On the basis of the findings from phase I of the study, I have developed a questionnaire. The ultimate aim of the study is to develop a model of quality assurance processes for teaching for Pakistan universities. This model will be based on the findings of phase I of the study. The model will be validated, in the context of Pakistan universities, by seeking expert opinion from scholarly persons like you on the desirability and likely acceptability of various aspects of QA processes for teaching in Pakistan universities.

You have been selected as part of a sample of higher education academics from Pakistan (Members of Quality Assurance Committee [QAC] of the HEC and Directors of Quality Enhancement Cells [QECs] established at Pakistan universities). The purpose of selecting this group as a sample is to seek their opinions on various aspects of quality assurance processes for teaching in the context of Pakistan universities. These academics (sample group) are dealing with the matters concerning quality assurance in higher education and are well aware of the context of quality assurance in Pakistan universities.

In this regard I would like to invite you to participate in this research titled “quality assurance processes for teaching in research-led universities: Implications for Pakistan” as a part of doctoral thesis at the School of Critical Studies in Education (CRSTIE), Faculty of Education, The University of Auckland, New Zealand.
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If you are willing to participate in this study, I will send you a questionnaire via email or mail (as feasible for you) seeking your opinion on the desirability and likely acceptability of various aspects of quality assurance processes for teaching in the context of Pakistan universities. Once you have completed the questionnaire, it will be collected via mail or email. It will take about 30-40 minutes to complete the questionnaire. In order to clarify the original data, parts of the questionnaire may be sent back to you once or twice (round 2 and round 3). The amount of time needed (if needed) at these occasions will be even less depending upon the results of analysis in the preceding rounds of the study.

The data will be stored for a maximum of one year after the completion of PhD (3-4 years in all) on the departmental computer and/or personal laptop, both of which are password protected. Any print outs of the data will also be stored in locked cabinets which are provided to the researcher in S-Block (S202) by School of Critical Studies in Education, Faculty of Education, The University of Auckland.

As a participant, you will have the right to withdraw from this study at any time. Furthermore, you can withdraw your data from the study at any time up to two months after the questionnaire has been returned.

Your opinions will be analyzed and studied by me as a part of my research and reviewed from time to time by my thesis supervisors as a part of study. The data will be aggregated and no individual responses will be reported on in the thesis or any of the publications. Personal confidentiality of individuals is guaranteed in this regard and your responses will be anonymized in the data. However, the group name as a sample will be mentioned in the thesis or might be in any of the publications. For example, it may be reported likely in this way: “the expert opinion on the desirability and likely acceptability of various aspects of quality assurance processes was sought in the context of Pakistan universities from the members of Quality Assurance Agency (QAC) and the Directors of Quality Enhancement Cells (QECs) established at Pakistan universities”. Similarly, it may be reported likely in this way: “opinion was sought from higher education academics of Pakistan”.

Should you wish to contact me during the period of data collection, you may do so at: Bashir Hussain, PhD student, Building S202, School of Critical Studies in Education, Faculty of Education (Epsom Campus), The University of Auckland, New Zealand. Cell: 00 64 21 063 6756. Email: b.hussain@auckland.ac.nz.
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**Contact Details in Pakistan:** Bashir Hussain, Pak Street, Near Northern Bypass Bosan Road, Shalimar Colony, Multan, Pakistan. Ph: + 92 61 6220447; Cell: + 92 300 637 8454.

**Supervisor’s contact details:** Associate Professor Graeme Aitken, Dean at the Faculty of Education, The University of Auckland, New Zealand. Email: g.aitken@auckland.ac.nz.

**Head of Department’s contact details:** Dr Airini, Head of School, School of Critical Studies in Education, Faculty of Education, The University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand. Email: airini@auckland.ac.nz.

If you have an ethical query about this project, you can contact the Chair of the University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee (UAHPEC) at:

Chairperson
University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee
Office of the Vice Chancellor
Alfred Nathan House
24 Princess Street
Tel: 09 373 7599 ext 87830

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE ON 3 December 2008 for 3 years, Reference Number 2008/487.
Appendix G: Consent Form I

This consent form will be retained for six years by the School of Critical Studies in Education (CRSTIE), Faculty of Education, The University of Auckland.

Researcher: Bashir Hussain

Research Project: Quality assurance processes for teaching in research-led universities: Implications for Pakistan.

I have read the Participant Information Sheet and have had the opportunity to ask questions and have them answered. I understand that;

- I have been selected as part of a sample of “Higher Education Academics from Pakistan (Members of Quality Assurance Committee of the HEC and Directors of Quality Enhancement Cells established at Pakistan universities)”. This group has been selected for study in order to develop a model of quality assurance processes for teaching for Pakistan universities.
- I have voluntarily given my consent to participate in this study.
- I may withdraw from this study at any time.
- I may withdraw my data gathered for this study at any time up to two months after the data has been collected.
- Any of the publications that result from the research will not identify me as an individual participant. However, the group name as a sample of the study might be mentioned in the thesis or might be in any of the publications.
- The data will be stored in the researcher’s password protected departmental computer and/or laptop and will be retained and used by the researcher for his PhD thesis/publications and possibly after his PhD is complete.

I agree to participate in the research project “Quality assurance processes for teaching in research-led universities: Implications for Pakistan”.

Name of participant: ___________________________________________________

Signature: ____________________________ Date ____________________

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE ON 3 December 2008 for 3 years, Reference Number 2008/487.
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Participant Information Sheet II (Phase III)

Title: Quality assurance processes for teaching in research-led universities: Implications for Pakistan.

Dear Participant,

I am Bashir Hussain. I am PhD student at the School of Critical Studies in Education (CRSTIE), Faculty of Education, The University of Auckland, New Zealand. I am doing research for my PhD thesis on “Quality assurance processes for teaching in research-led universities: Implications for Pakistan”. In phase I of the study, I have analyzed policy and practice documents concerning quality assurance processes for teaching from 15 member universities of Universitas 21 (U21) network. In phase II of the study, the Delphi questionnaire was developed on the basis of the findings from phase I and opinion was sought from Directors of Quality Enhancement Cells (QECs) on the desirability and the likely acceptability of various aspects of quality assurance (QA) processes for teaching in Pakistan universities. The ultimate aim of the study is to develop a model of quality assurance processes for teaching for Pakistan Universities. This model will be based on the findings of Phase I and Phase II of the study. The findings will be discussed with PhD students (originally Lecturers/Assistant Professors in Pakistan universities) studying at The University of Auckland and their opinion will be sought on the desirability and likely acceptability of various aspects of QA processes for teaching in Pakistan universities.

You have been selected as part of a sample of “PhD students studying at The University of Auckland and originally employed as Lecturers and/or Assistant Professors in Pakistan universities”. The purpose of selecting this group as a sample of the study is to discuss the Delphi finding with them and seek their opinion on the various aspects of QA processes for teaching in the context of Pakistan universities. These PhD students were teaching in Pakistan universities and, therefore, they can provide a good insight about the desirability and likely acceptability of various aspects of QA processes in Pakistan universities. This will also help me to further clarify and interpret my Delphi findings.

In this regard I would like to invite you to participate in this research titled “Quality assurance processes for teaching in research-led universities: Implications for Pakistan”
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as a part of PhD thesis at the School of Critical Studies in Education (CRSTIE), Faculty of Education, The University of Auckland, New Zealand.

If you are willing to participate in this study, I will invite you for a focus group interview (group of 4-5 students). In the focus group interviews, Delphi findings will be discussed and your opinion will be sought about the desirability and likely acceptability of various aspects of quality assurance processes for teaching in Pakistan universities. Participants will be anonymous and their views will be generalized in my final thesis alongside the responses from the Directors of QECs. I am not going to consult the participants about their own data but about what I have found in my Delphi analysis and their views about the desirability and likely acceptability of various aspects of QA processes for teaching in Pakistan universities. This will help me to further clarify and interpret my Delphi findings and to understand the data as a whole. The key prompt questions I will be asking are:

1. What do you think about the desirability and the likely acceptability (to the academic staff) of various quality assurance processes for teaching in Pakistan universities?
2. What possible reasons might be (if any) for the low likely acceptability of various quality assurance processes for teaching in Pakistan universities.
3. What hurdles might Pakistan universities face in the implementation of these quality assurance processes for teaching and how can we counter these hurdles?

The data will be stored for a maximum of one year after the completion of PhD on the departmental computer and/or personal laptop, both of which are password protected. Any print outs of the data will also be stored in locked cabinets which are provided to the researcher in S-Block (S202) by the School of Critical Studies in Education, Faculty of Education, The University of Auckland.

As a participant, you will have the right to withdraw from this study at any time. Furthermore, you can withdraw your data from the study at any time up to two months after the focus group interviews have been conducted.

Your opinions will be analyzed and studied by me as a part of my research. The data will be aggregated and no individual responses will be reported on in the thesis or any of the publications. Personal confidentiality of individuals is guaranteed in this regard and your responses will be anonymized in the data.
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Should you wish to contact me, you may do so at: Bashir Hussain, PhD student, Building S202, School of Critical Studies in Education, Faculty of Education, The University of Auckland, New Zealand. Cell: 00 64 21 063 6756. Email: b.hussain@auckland.ac.nz.

**Supervisor’s contact details:** Associate Professor Graeme Aitken, Dean at Faculty of Education, The University of Auckland, New Zealand. Email: g.aitken@auckland.ac.nz.

**Head of Department’s contact details:** Dr Airini, Head of School, School of Critical Studies in Education, Faculty of Education, The University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand. Email: airini@auckland.ac.nz.

If you have an ethical query about this project, you can contact the Chair of the University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee (UAHPEC) at:

Chairperson
University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee
Office of the Vice Chancellor
Alfred Nathan House
24 Princess Street
Tel: 09 373 7599 ext 87830

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE ON 14 April 2010 for 2 years on, Reference Number 2008/487.
Appendix I: Consent Form II

This consent form will be retained for six years by the School of Critical Studies in Education (CRSTIE), Faculty of Education, The University of Auckland.

Researcher: Bashir Hussain

Research Project: Quality assurance processes for teaching in research-led universities: Implications for Pakistan.

I have read the Participant Information Sheet (PSI) and have had the opportunity to ask questions and have them answered. I understand that:

- I have been selected as part of a sample of “PhD students studying at The University of Auckland and originally employed Lecturers/Assistant Professors in Pakistan universities”. This group has been selected for study in order to discuss the Delphi findings with them and to seek their opinion on the various aspects of quality assurance processes for teaching in the context of Pakistan universities.
- I have voluntarily given my consent to participate in this study.
- I may withdraw from this study at any time.
- I may withdraw my data gathered for this study at any time up to two months after the focus group interview has been conducted.
- Any of the publications that result from the research will not identify me as an individual participant. However, the group views might be generalized in the thesis or might be in any of the publications.
- The data will be stored in the researcher’s password protected departmental computer and/or laptop and will be retained and used by the researcher for his PhD thesis/publications and possibly after his PhD is complete.

I agree to participate in the research project titled “Quality assurance processes for teaching in research-led universities: Implications for Pakistan”.

Name of participant: ___________________________________________________

Signature: __________________________ Date ____________________

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE ON 14 April 2010 for 2 years on, Reference Number 2008/487.
### Appendix J: Overview of the Delphi Findings for the Desirability of Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Desirable (HD)</th>
<th>LD</th>
<th>LND</th>
<th>NDA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consistency of plans &amp; policies [High Consensus]</strong>; Develop T/L plans, policies, processes &amp; guidelines for QA/QE of teaching at D/F/I level; Review &amp; monitor the progress of plans; Collaborative approach in developing &amp; implementing above; Establish networks to develop, implement &amp; review T/L plans &amp; policies etc; Disseminate T/L plans, policies &amp; guidelines; Research-informed plans, policies &amp; processes; Support Faculties &amp; Schools in developing &amp; implementing T/L plans, processes, etc. [Moderate Consensus]; No Items [No Consensus].</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td>No Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>System of Audits and Reviews</strong></td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td>No Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Items [High Consensus]; Internal system of audits/reviews at D/F level with emphasis on QE by identifying good practices &amp; dissemination; Internal system of reviews in compliance with external bodies; External system of audits to monitor QA/QE system &amp; activities within institutions; Performance-based funding for institutions by external funding bodies; Public reporting on QA/QE measures [Moderate Consensus], No Items [No Consensus].</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td>No Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Quality Appraisal (TQA)</strong></td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td>No Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Items [High Consensus]; TQA processes for D/S/F through T/L PIs; Allocate funding on the basis of performance in T/L through T/L PIs such as implementation of T/L plans and SET; Results of SET, Participation of staff in PD; Reflection practices; Annual performance reviews and PD reviews; Consideration of career &amp; PD needs in both reviews; Recognition &amp; rewards in both types of reviews [Moderate Consensus], No Items [No Consensus].</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td>No Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Development</strong></td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td>No Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD opportunities for all academics; Establish networks &amp; centres for initiation of PD training programmes; Support academics encourage staff for PD [High Consensus]; Mandatory PD of academics through certificates &amp; training programmes; Initiation of good practices in T/L by TLCs like PR &amp; Mentoring; Sharing of good practices; PD of HoDs &amp; Deans; Evaluation of PD programs by seeking feedback; [Moderate Consensus], No Items [No Consensus].</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td>No Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum Design, Development and Approval</strong></td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td>No Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and review courses within departments; Internal &amp; external validation of courses; Support in design &amp; delivery of courses; Engage students [High Consensus]; No Items [Moderate Consensus]; No Items [No Consensus].</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td>No Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review and Evaluation of Teaching and Courses</strong></td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td>No Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback from all stakeholders to improve the quality of teaching &amp; courses at F/N level [High Consensus]; Student evaluation of teaching &amp; courses (SET) at F/I/N level; Reporting of SET results to all for monitoring, improvement and recognition purposes; Careful use of SET for all purposes; Inform teacher about the results; Provision of support in reflection practices; Give right to HODs to conduct SET for monitoring; Inform students about the results &amp; action taken at SET; Formative feedback from students; Peer review of teaching for PD &amp; to identify good practices; Recognise &amp; reward PET practices [Moderate Consensus]; SET at the request of students; One aspects of peer review of teaching [No Consensus].</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td>No Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL)</strong></td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td>No Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop, support &amp; strengthen Scholarship of Teaching &amp; Learning (SoTL); Fellowships for SoTL [High Consensus]; Fellowships, 'Pilot projects' and 'Teaching Improvement Grants' at D/F/I level for staff &amp; students to conduct research in T/L; Oblige project holders to work with T/L centres; Publication and dissemination of research about teaching; Build T-R nexus; Recognise &amp; reward SoTL [Moderate Consensus], No Items [No Consensus].</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td>No Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recognition, Rewards, and Incentives</strong></td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td>No Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Items [High Consensus]; Recognise and reward scholarly teaching at F/I/N level with an obligation to share; Teaching-focused appointments; performance-based funding for faculties institutions; Rewards in appointments, probation, tenure and promotions; Teaching awards at I/N level; Use teaching portfolios to evaluate teaching effectiveness [Moderate Consensus]; No Items [No Consensus].</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td>No Item</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HD –highly desirable; LD –likely desirable; LND –likely not desirable; NDA –not desirable at all
## Appendix K: Likely Acceptability of Processes in Relation to the Nature of Items

### Plans, Policies and Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HA</th>
<th>Likely Acceptable</th>
<th>LNA</th>
<th>NAA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop plans, policies and processes for QA/QE of teaching at D/F/I level [D]; Review and monitor progress of above [J]; Collaborative approach in developing &amp; implementing above [D]; Establish networks to develop, implement &amp; review policies [D&amp;J]; Disseminate plans &amp; policies [D]; Research-informed policies &amp; processes [D]; Consistency of plans and policies [D]; Enhancement-led activities [D&amp;J].</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### System of Audits and Reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HA</th>
<th>Likely Acceptable</th>
<th>Likely not Acceptable</th>
<th>NAA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Item</td>
<td>Internal audits/reviews at D/F level to identify good practices [D]; Dissemination of these practices [D]; Provision of support to D/F to overcome weaknesses [D]; Internal reviews to identify weaknesses [D&amp;J]; Internal reviews at D/F level in compliance with institution [J]; Internal reviews in compliance with external bodies [J].</td>
<td>Report QA/QE measures to public [J]; External audits to monitor QA/QE activities and system within institutions [J].</td>
<td>No Item</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Teaching Quality Appraisal (TQA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Acceptable</th>
<th>Likely Acceptable</th>
<th>LNA</th>
<th>NAA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement SET as a PI at D/F/I level [D&amp;J]; TQA processes for D/S/F through TLPIs that include: implementation of T/L plans, results of SET [D&amp;J]; participation of staff in PD &amp; reflective practices [D&amp;J]; PD reviews &amp; PR for new staff [D&amp;J].</td>
<td>Performance reviews of all academic staff on annual basis [D&amp;J].</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Professional Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Acceptable</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>LNA</th>
<th>NAA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish centres/networks for initiation of PD activities [D]; Provide resources [D]; PD opportunities for all academics [D]; Encourage &amp; support academics for PD [D]; Mandatory PD of new academics through training programs &amp; certificates [D]; Share good practices [D]; PD of HoDs &amp; Deans [D]; Review &amp; evaluate PD activities [D].</td>
<td>Initiation of mentoring and PoT by TLCs [D].</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Curriculum Design, Development and Approval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HA</th>
<th>Likely Acceptable</th>
<th>LNA</th>
<th>NAA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop &amp; review courses internally at F/S/department level [D].</td>
<td>Support in design &amp; delivery of courses [D]; Engage students in matters related to quality of teaching/courses [D]; Consistency of teaching methods, learning activities &amp; assessment practices [D]; Internal &amp; external validation of courses [D&amp;J].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Review and Evaluation of Teaching and Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HA</th>
<th>Likely Acceptable</th>
<th>Likely not Acceptable</th>
<th>NAA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feedback from all stakeholders to improve the quality of teaching &amp; courses at F/I/N level [D]; SE of teaching and courses at F/I/N level[J]; Inform teachers about results [D]; Report results to all for monitoring, improvement and recognition purposes [D&amp;J]; Seek formative feedback [D]; Careful use of SET for all purposes [D&amp;J]; Provide support in reflection practices [D]; Give right to HODs to conduct SET for monitoring [D].</td>
<td>SET at the students’ request [J]; Inform students about results &amp; action taken at SET [D&amp;J]; Peer review of teaching to identify good practices &amp; for PD [D]; Collegial PRT [D]; Recognise &amp; reward PRT - 2 items [R&amp;R].</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Acceptable</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>LNA</th>
<th>NAA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fellowships for SoTL &amp; for enhance T/L practices [D]; Oblige fellowship holders to work with T/L centres [D]; Develop, support &amp; strengthen SoTL [D]; Pilot projects &amp; Teaching Improvement Grants and at D/F/I/national level for staff &amp; students to conduct research into T/L [D]; Publication &amp; dissemination of research in teaching [D]; Build T-R nexus [D]; Recognize and reward SoTL [R&amp;R].</td>
<td>Research in teaching and initiate pilot projects [D].</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recognition, Rewards, and Incentives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Acceptable</th>
<th>Likely Acceptable</th>
<th>LNA</th>
<th>NAA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognise and reward scholarly teaching at all level with obligation to share [R&amp;R]; Rewards in appointments/probation/tenure/promotions [D]; Teaching awards at all level [D; R&amp;R].</td>
<td>Raise profile of teaching in tenure/promotions [D; R&amp;R]; Teaching-only posts [R&amp;R]; Performance-based funding for institutions [J]; Use of teaching portfolios to evaluate teaching effectiveness [D&amp;J].</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td>No Item</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix L: Overview of the Delphi Findings for Likely Acceptability of Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plans, Policies and Processes</th>
<th>HA</th>
<th>Likely Acceptable</th>
<th>LNA</th>
<th>NAA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support S/F in developing &amp; implementing plans/policies [HC; No Item [MC; NC].</td>
<td>Develop T/L plans, policies and processes for QA/QE of teaching at D/F/I level; Review and monitor the progress of above; Collaborative approach in developing &amp; implementing above [HC]; Establish networks to develop, implement &amp; review policies; Disseminate plans &amp; policies; Research-informed policies and processes; Consistency of plans and policies; Enhancement-led QA activities [MC]; Review and update above [NC].</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System of Audits and Reviews</th>
<th>HA</th>
<th>Likely Acceptable</th>
<th>Likely not Acceptable</th>
<th>NAA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Item</td>
<td>Internal audits/reviews at D/F level to identify good practices [HC]; Disseminate good practices identified in internal reviews; Provision of support to D/F to overcome weaknesses; [MC]; Internal reviews to identify weaknesses; Internal reviews at D/F level in compliance with institution; Internal reviews in compliance with external bodies [NC].</td>
<td>Report QA/QE measures to public [HC]; No Item [MC]; 3 aspects of external audits to monitor QA/QE activities/system of institutions [NC].</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Quality Appraisal (TQA)</th>
<th>Highly Acceptable</th>
<th>Likely Acceptable</th>
<th>LNA</th>
<th>NAA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Take account of career &amp; PD needs in annual performance reviews and PD reviews[HC]; Allocate funding on the basis of performance in T/L through PIs; Support academics who achieve low rating in reviews; Recognition &amp; rewards for reviews [MC]; No Item [NC].</td>
<td>Implement SET as a PI at D/F level [HC]; TQA processes for D/S/F through T/L PIs that include: implementation of TL plans, results of SET; participation of academics in PD &amp; reflection practices; Performance review of new staff [MC]; No Item [NC].</td>
<td>Performance reviews of all staff on yearly basis [HC]; 0 Item [MC; NC].</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Development</th>
<th>Highly Acceptable</th>
<th>Likely Acceptable</th>
<th>LNA</th>
<th>NAA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish centres and networks for initiation of PD activities; Provide resources [HC]; PD opportunities for all academics; Encourage and support academics for PD; Mandatory PD of new academics through training programmes and certificates; Sharing of good practices; PD of HoDs &amp; Deans; Seek feedback to evaluate PD activities [MC]; 0 Item [NC].</td>
<td>Initiation of good practices by TLCs such as mentoring &amp; PoT [HC]; No Item [MC; NC].</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum Design, Development and Approval</th>
<th>HA</th>
<th>Likely Acceptable</th>
<th>LNA</th>
<th>NAA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop and review courses within F/S &amp; departments [HC]; 0 Item [MC; NC].</td>
<td>No Item [HC]; Support in design &amp; delivery of courses; Engage students in matters concerning quality of teaching and courses; Consistency of teaching methods, learning activities and assessment practices [MC]; Internal and external validation of courses [NC].</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review and Evaluation of Teaching and Courses</th>
<th>HA</th>
<th>Likely Acceptable</th>
<th>Likely not Acceptable</th>
<th>NAA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Item</td>
<td>Feedback from all stakeholders to improve the quality of teaching &amp; courses at F/I/N level; SE of teaching and courses at F/I/N level; Inform teachers about results; Report results to all for monitoring, improvement and recognition purposes [HC]; Seek formative feedback; Careful use of SET for all purposes; Provide support in reflective practices; Give right to HODs to conduct SET for monitoring [MC]; 0 Item [NC].</td>
<td>2 aspects of collegial peer review of teaching; SET at students’ request [HC]; 3 items about PRT to identify good practices &amp; for PD; Recognise and reward PoT – 2 items; Inform students about the results &amp; action taken at SET [MC]; No Item [NC].</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL)</th>
<th>Highly Acceptable</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>NNA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fellowships for SoTL &amp; to enhance T/L practices; Oblige fellowship holders to work with T/L centres [HC]; ‘Teaching Improvement Grants’ at D/F/I &amp; national level for staff &amp; students to conduct research into T/L; Develop, support &amp; strengthen SoTL; Publication &amp; dissemination of research about teaching; Build T-R nexus; Recognize &amp; reward SoTL [MC]; No Items [NC].</td>
<td>Research in teaching and initiate pilot projects [MC].</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td>No Item</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognition, Rewards, and Incentives</th>
<th>Highly Acceptable</th>
<th>Likely Acceptable</th>
<th>LNA</th>
<th>NAA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 Item [HC]; Recognise/reward scholarly teaching at F/I/N level with an obligation to share; Rewards in appointments, probation, tenure &amp; promotions; Teaching excellence awards at I/N level [MC]; No Item [NC].</td>
<td>Raise profile of teaching in tenure/promotions [HC]; Teaching-focused posts; Performance-based funding for institutions; Use teaching portfolios to evaluate teaching effectiveness [MC]; No Item [NC].</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td>No Item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HA – highly acceptable; LA – likely acceptable; LNA – likely not acceptable; NAA – not acceptable at all
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