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Peer review of the faculties’ quality-assurance systems

Objectives and background:

- UCPH is responsible for assuring the quality of its study programmes.
- The faculty systems implement the procedures and document the outcomes.
- UCPH has indicated that it will apply for institution accreditation in January 2015.
- In October 2013, the Management Team (LT) decided on a framework consisting of six sub-projects:
  - Internal peer review of quality-assurance systems and practices
  - Programme evaluation
  - Contact with business, industry and graduates
  - Management information and key data
  - Prequalification and the development of new study programmes
  - Other strategic priorities
- KUUR reduced the faculties’ budget for internal peer reviews.
Peer review – purpose and framework

**Purpose:**
- Build on what exists – at faculties and UCPH
- Adjustment and revision where necessary – at faculties and UCPH
- Deadline: 24 June 2014
- Documentation of practice in autumn 2014
- Parallel processes at faculties and UCPH

**Framework:**
- Peer review panel: US and user-group for institutional accreditation
- Faculty representatives: associate dean, head of studies and quality-assurance staff
- Point of reference: Accreditation Institution’s guidelines and UCPH’s quality-assurance policy
- Preparation for US meetings, focusing on “points of special attention”
- After peer review: US recommendations for adaptation and revision of existing systems for use by the faculties
Overall impression

- All faculties are well on the way.

- Everybody (faculties/UCPH) will be over the finishing line by 24 June 2014

- All faculties to allocate time in the autumn for trial runs of their procedures
Key points

Structure and presentation

• Strengthening the link between quality-assurance policy, strategy and vision for the study programmes at faculties

• Improving links between UCPH and faculties

• Same position on websites

• Guidelines for content on website vs. KUnet
Key points

Responsibilities and follow-up

• Clarification of responsibilities and knowledge flow at faculty level. Where is the Dean?

• Clarification of the follow-up procedure and who is responsible for it.

• For example, if there is dialogue with employers and employer panels but there is no description of how the faculties ensure that the outcome of dialogue is used systematically.
Key points

New/stricter requirements: better management of programme quality

• Effective management information system: access to valid programme data

• Define quantifiable standards for quality at UCPH and faculties

• Programme evaluation, including system for dialogue with graduates and employers

• Development of new programmes, both bottom-up and top-down

• Closing study programmes
The process going forward

- Faculties and UCPH complete the quality-assurance policy and procedures by 24 June.

- Draft UCPH quality-assurance policy to be discussed at KUUR/SAK meeting on 4 June. The Management Team’s (LT’s) decision expected on 25 June.

- User group to draw up university guidelines for programme evaluations. To be discussed at KUUR/SAK on 4 June.

- Concept for graduate surveys to be discussed at KUUR/SAK on 4 June.

- Guidelines for student counselling and career guidance to be discussed at KUUR/SAK on 4 June.
Theme discussion about the quality of education

In the light of the peer review, the definition, clarification and vision for the following themes are central:

1. Research-based
2. Quality of education
3. Quality culture