

UNIVERSITY OF JOHANNESBURG: QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Approved by Senate and Council: June 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

NUMBER	RECOMMENDATIONS	PAGE
	AND	
	UJ ACTION PLANS	
	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
	EXECUTIVE SUIVINARY	5
1.	DEVELOPMENT OF THE UJ QUALITY IMPROVEMENT	8
	PLAN	•
2.	PLANNING AND GOVERNANCE	14
2.1	RECOMMENDATION 1	15
	Action plan 1: The UJ vision and mission goals	17
	Action plan 2: Student experiences on all campuses	20
	Action plan 3: Unit for Institutional Research and Decision	23
	Support	•
	Action plan 4: Cultural Integration Project	24
	Action plan 5: Campus Directors	25
2.2	RECOMMENDATION 4	26
	Action Plan: Institutional Forum	26
2.3	RECOMMENDATION 6	27
	Action plan: Institutional surveys	28
3.	HUMAN RESOURCES	29
3.1	RECOMMENDATION 2	30
	Action plan 1: Functioning of the HR Division	31
	Action plan 2: Attraction, appointment, promotion and	32
	retention	
	Action plan 3: ADS staff matters	33
4.	TEACHING, LEARNING AND PROGRAMMES	34
4.1	RECOMMENDATION 7	35
	Action plan 1: Large classes and underprepared students	36
	Action plan 2: Teaching strategy and academic drift	38
	Action plan 3: Work integrated learning	39
	Action plan 4: Contact time	39
4.2	RECOMMENDATION 3	40
	Action plan 1: Integration of foreign African students	41
	Action plan 2: Racist, sexist and conservative attitudes	42
	among staff	

4.3	RECOMMENDATION 16	42
	Action plan 1: Assessment policy and rules	43
	Action plan 2: External moderation	43
	Action plan 3: Student grievances and RPL	44
4.4	RECOMMENDATION 8	44
	Action plan: Extended programmes	44
4.5	RECOMMENDATION 9	45
	Action plan: Evaluation of modules and lecturers by students	45
4.6	RECOMMENDATION 10	45
	Action plan: Academic planning	46
4 7	DECOMMENDATION 44	4-7
4.7	RECOMMENDATION 14	47
	Action plan: Non-subsidised programmes	47
5.	ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT	49
5.1	RECOMMENDATION 11	49 50
3.1	Action plan 1: Staff:student ratio (UJLIC)	50 50
	Action plan 2: Book titles per student	50 51
	Action plan 3: Library hours	52
	Action plan 4: Student:PC ratio	52 52
		52
5.2	RECOMMENDATION 12	53
	Action plan: ICT Strategy	53
5.3	RECOMMENDATION 15	55
	Action plan: Professional academic staff development	55
5.4	RECOMMENDATION 13	56
	Action plan: Certification	56
5.5	RECOMMENDATION 17	57
	Action plan: Security of student records and examination	57
	documentation	
•	RESEARCH AND SUPERVISION	50
6. 6.1	RECOMMENDATION 18	59
0.1		60 61
	Action plan 1: Young researchers	
	Action plan 2: Research foci	64 65
	Action plan 3: Financial support	65
6.2	RECOMMENDATION 19	65
0.2	Action plan 1: Postgraduate supervision	66
	Action plan 2: Postgraduate enrolment	66
	Action plan 3: Postgraduate throughput	69
	7. Total Plan 6. 1 Gotgiadato tinoagripat	

7.	QUALITY ASSURANCE	72
7.1	RECOMMENDATION 5	73
	Action plan: Quality management	73
8.	COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT	75
8.1	Concerns	76
	Action plan: Community engagement	76
9.	SUMMARY	78
10.	APPENDICES	85
10.1	UJ acronyms and abbreviations	86
10.2	The UJ Strategic Thrusts for the Next Decade	89

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Context and purpose

The HEQC Quality Audit of the UJ consisted of a visit to the campuses and a final site visit in August 2009. A draft Audit Report was submitted for comment to the University in March 2010. The University received the final Audit Report (AR) in July 2010.

The purpose of this document is to present the University's Quality Improvement Plan, consisting of various action plans, in response to the AR.

Development of the UJ Quality Improvement Plan

On receipt of the final AR, the University had to develop a Quality Improvement Plan (IP). The IP consists of a number of action plans that were developed, in response to the 19 recommendations (and related concerns), as contained in the AR. These were clustered to address recommendations according to broad themes, namely:

- Planning and governance
- Human resources
- Teaching, learning and programmes
- Academic administration and support
- Research and supervision
- Quality assurance.

Community engagement (CE) was also identified as a broad theme, even though no specific recommendations on CE were made in the AR. However, some concerns were highlighted. Not all the concerns refer directly to a specific recommendation, but are still regarded as sufficiently important for inclusion in the IP. The concerns that focus on Community Engagement are dealt with separately under the heading Community Engagement. This theme is not based on a recommendation as such, but on CE-focused concerns only.

For each theme, a task team was appointed, each consisting of:

- A leader from the ranks of the MEC (Chairperson)
- UJ staff members, appointed in consultation with the Chairperson, who were knowledgeable in the field and/or could be expected to be leading the implementation of the relevant steps of the resultant IP
- Facilitator(s) from the staff of DIPQP.

Contents of the IP: An overview

The UJ responses include a contextualisation of the action plan (where necessary), an overview of the plan, structures and activities already in place or being undertaken, followed by further developments that are envisaged. The results of this process are reported in the Quality Improvement Plan for consideration by the relevant decision-making structures of the University (including MECA and MECO, the MEC, the SQC, Senate and the UJ Council).

The diagram below provides an overview of the contents of the IP w.r.t. the recommendations and the related concerns that are addressed in the action plans: It indicates broad themes, HEQC recommendations per theme and focus areas.

Annual progress reports to the HEQC

The MEC takes responsibility for the implementation of the improvements (i.e. action plans and steps). The action plans (implemented and envisaged) often cut across different DVC portfolios, and have the following implications for monitoring and developing annual progress reports:

- (a) Monitoring of the implementation is the responsibility of the relevant DVC.
- (b) Annual reports are submitted to the relevant DVC and the relevant Senate committees, MEC sub-committees, the MEC and Senate, for comment and approval. This is done annually, up to the finalisation of the plan. Ongoing matters will be included in the first annual report (i.e. beginning of 2012).
- (c) One consolidated institutional progress report to the HEQC will be compiled (by the Unit for Quality Promotion) and submitted to the SQC, the MEC, Senate and Council for approval.

The Summary provided at the end of the Quality Improvement Plan serves as a check-list for improvements to be addressed in the annual progress reports.

Planning and Governance

Recommendation 1

- UJ vision and mission statements
- Student experiences on all campuses and cultural integration
- A planning office
- Campus directors

Recommendation 4

Institutional Forum

Recommendation 6

Institutional surveys

Human Resources

Recommendation 2

- Functioning of the HR Division
- · Attraction, appointment, promotion and retention
- ADS staff matters

Teaching, learning and programmes

Recommendation 7

- Large classes and underprepared students
- Teaching strategy and academic drift
- Work Integrated Learning
- Contact time

Recommendation 3

- Xenophobia
- Racist, sexist and conservative attitudes among staff

Recommendation 16

- Assessment policy and rules
- External moderation
- Student grievances
- RPL

Recommendation 8

Extended programmes

Recommendation 9

 Evaluation of modules and lecturers by students

Recommendation 10

Academic planning

Recommendation 14

 Non-subsidised programmes

Academic Administration and Support

Recommendation 11

• UJLIC

Recommendation 12

Equivalence across campus'

Recommendation 15

Professional academic staff development

Recommendation 13

Certification

Recommendation 17

 Security of student records and examination documentation

Research and Quality Supervision Assurance

Recommendation 18

- Young researchers
- Research foci
- Financial support

Recommendation 5

Quality management

Community **Engagement**

Concerns

Community engagement

Recommendation 19

- Supervision
- Improving postgraduate enrolment
- Improving throughput of postgraduate students

1. DEVELOPMENT
OF THE UJ
QUALITY
IMPROVEMENT
PLAN

UNIVERSITY OF JOHANNESBURG: QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PLAN

1. DEVELOPMENT OF THE UJ QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PLAN

1.1 BACKGROUND

In June 2008 the University of Johannesburg (UJ) accepted a proposal of the Higher Education Quality Committee (HEQC) to conduct the first quality audit of the University during August 2009. The University established an internal structure to prepare for the audit, its main elements being the following:

- Appointment of an Audit Steering Committee, chaired by the Pro Vice-Chancellor, to steer the process.
- Establishment of a secretariat and the secondment of appropriate staff, including a Project Manager, for the duration of the preparation and execution of the audit.
- Allocation of the necessary infrastructure and financial support for the preparatory phase.
- Development of a communication strategy to ensure that internal stakeholders were kept informed of progress made and expectations regarding the role of various stakeholder bodies at all times.
- Soliciting the necessary support of the appropriate decision-making structures.
- Appointing a number of task teams to initiate the preparation of the self-evaluation of the University that preceded the audit.

The audit process progressed through various phases, consisting mainly of the following:

- Self-Evaluation Report (SER). Preparation of the first draft of the Self-Evaluation Report.
- Mock Audit. The University conducted a Mock Audit, in preparation of the HEQC Audit, in February 2009. An Audit Panel, consisting of knowledgeable persons, was invited by the University to conduct a Mock Audit that served as a full dress rehearsal for the HEQC Audit. The main purpose was to evaluate the appropriateness of the SER and to prepare University staff for the actual audit. In addition, the University benefited from the Audit Panel of experienced persons.
- Final SER. The SER was revised, based on the insights obtained during the Mock Audit, and the preparations were finalised.
- HEQC Audit. The Audit Panel composed the HEQC Audit Report (AR). A draft AR was submitted for comment to the University in March 2010. The final report was submitted in July 2010.

At the conclusion of the Audit, oral feedback was presented to the Management Executive Committee (MEC) of the University. Based on this preliminary feedback, the University launched a series of projects, called Initial Strategic Interventions (ISI), to address the concerns identified as part of the feedback. Its purpose was to initiate a response to the audit as soon as possible and not wait for the final AR before taking action.

On receipt of the final AR, the Quality Improvement Plan was prepared, incorporating the elements of the ISI, where appropriate. It is an action plan listing the actions the University proposes to take to address the various recommendations and concerns identified by the Audit Panel, as reflected in the AR.

1.2 PROCESS TO DEVELOP THE IP

Given the nature of a quality audit, the AR predominantly consists of concerns which typically culminate in a **recommendation**. Nineteen such recommendations were identified. Some positive findings of the panel were also listed, with the particularly outstanding ones labelled as **commendations**. There are six such commendations.

The Unit for Quality Promotion (UQP), which forms part of the Division for Institutional Planning and Quality Promotion (DIPQP), acted as Executive Secretariat in the preparation of this Quality Improvement Plan.

The HEQC recommendations serve as the point of departure for the UJ Quality Improvement Plan. These were clustered to address recommendations according to broad themes, namely:

- Planning and governance
- Human resources
- Teaching, learning and programmes
- Academic administration and support
- Research and supervision
- Quality assurance.

Community engagement (CE) was also identified as a broad theme, even though no specific recommendations on CE were made in the AR. However, some concerns were highlighted. The following theme-based clusters of recommendations were identified:

Cluster focus	HEQC Recommendations
Planning and governance	1, 4, 6
Human resources	2
Teaching, learning and programmes	7, 3, 16, 8, 9, 10, 14,
Academic support	11, 12, 15, 13, 17
Research and supervision	18, 19
Quality assurance	5
Community engagement	No recommendations, only concerns

The recommendations in each cluster are organised in terms of their relevance to the recommendation (not numerically).

For each recommendation, the concerns expressed in the AR, relevant to the particular recommendation listed. Not all the concerns refer directly to a specific recommendation, but are still regarded as sufficiently important for inclusion in the Quality Improvement Plan. This is especially relevant to some of the concerns on teaching and learning. These concerns have, however, been inserted under the recommendations on teaching, learning and programmes. The reader is alerted to the fact that some concerns are related more to the

theme than to the specific recommendation. The concerns that focus on Community Engagement are dealt with separately under the heading Community Engagement. This theme is therefore not based on a recommendation as such, but on CE-focused concerns only.

For each theme a task team was appointed, each consisting of:

- A leader from the ranks of the MEC (Chairperson)
- Members, appointed in consultation with the Chairperson, who were knowledgeable in the field and/or could be expected to be leading the implementation of the relevant steps of the resultant IP
- Facilitator(s) from the staff of DIPQP.

Each task team reported on progress since the HEQC site visit in 2009. They then developed responses to the recommendations and related concerns, from which action plans (and accompanying action steps) were developed. The UJ responses include a contextualisation of the action plan (where necessary), an overview of the plan, structures and activities already in place or being undertaken, followed by further developments that are envisaged. Evidence of improvements implemented thus far is available on request.

The results of the above process are reported in this Quality Improvement Plan for consideration by the relevant decision making structures of the University (including MECA and MECO, the MEC, the SQC, Senate and the UJ Council). The Quality Improvement Plan will subsequently be submitted to the HEQC.

1.3 INITIAL STRATEGIC INTERVENTIONS

As stated in section 1.1 above, the University launched a series of projects to address the major issues identified in the oral feedback given to the MEC by the Audit Panel at the conclusion of its site visit. The following six projects were identified:

- Academic staff
- Strategic and institutional planning and core functions
- The UJ teaching and learning strategy
- Curriculum reviews and academic standards
- Workload model for academic staff
- Supervision of postgraduate research.

Project leaders were appointed, and work on the projects commenced. In May 2010, Senate approved the ISI Project Report. At this time, the initial draft of the AR was received by the University, and the attention shifted to addressing the final AR. The projects that formed the ISI were incorporated in the IP, as indicated below.

1.4 COMMENDATIONS

The University was pleased to note the list of commendations reflecting aspects in its functioning that the Audit Panel found particularly satisfactory. However, it is realised that this presents no reason for complacency. Hence, these commendations are listed below, in order for the reader of this Quality Improvement Plan to verify that there has been no regression regarding these aspects.

The commendations are:

- The HEQC commends the University of Johannesburg for its contribution to the social and economic development of the country through the work of its research centres and contributions in graduating a significant number of students in scarce skills areas.
- The HEQC commends the University of Johannesburg for its use of programme review as a mechanism to develop a programme qualification mix for the new institution.
- The HEQC commends the University of Johannesburg for the good practice shown by the Faculty of Education in having a systematic approach towards student learning and support.
- The HEQC commends the University of Johannesburg for the multi-pronged support that the Division of Academic Development and Support provides for teaching and learning.
- The HEQC commends the University of Johannesburg for its recent initiatives in supporting and strengthening the research core of the University.
- The HEQC commends the University of Johannesburg for its innovative projects in the field of alternative energy.

1.5 CONCLUDING PARAGRAPH OF AUDIT REPORT

The AR concludes with some remarks and admonitions that it behoves the University to take note of. The conclusion is quoted verbatim below, with no further comment:

University of Johannesburg is entering into a new phase in the consolidation of the merger, which created the institution in 2005. With its nearly 50,000 students, its four operating campuses, its designation as a comprehensive university, its increasing research and innovation profile, University of Johannesburg can make a valuable contribution to the goals of South African higher education and, particularly, to the socio-economic development of the Johannesburg Metropole. The institution can do this by providing affordable education to the city's population and by providing access with success to previously disadvantaged students; by giving effect to its specific identity as a comprehensive university; by forging research and training partnerships with a variety of stakeholders; and by contributing to social development through its community related initiatives.

While the University has taken many of the initial steps towards achieving its mission and vision, its main challenges are the following:

- The consistent provision of quality education across its programmes and campuses,
- The low teaching contact hours that characterise many of the undergraduate learning programmes,
- The lack of human and infrastructural resources to provide quality education to a growing student body,
- The development of clear forms of internal differentiation and articulation between technological and academic programmes,
- The implementation of its identity as a research-focused institution,

• The development of an appropriate and dynamic focus for its community engagement activities.

In order to make substantial progress in meeting these challenges the institution requires: sustained leadership; an uncompromising commitment to offering quality education across all programmes; and the ability to mobilise staff and students behind a common educational approach.

1.6 ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORTS TO THE HEQC

The MEC takes responsibility for the implementation of the improvements (i.e. action plans and steps). The action plans (implemented and envisaged) often cut across different DVC portfolios, and have the following implications for monitoring and developing annual progress reports:

- Monitoring of the implementation is the responsibility of the relevant DVC.
- Annual reports are submitted to the relevant DVC and the relevant Senate committees, MEC sub-committees, the MEC and Senate, for comments and approval. This is done annually, up to the finalisation of the plan. Ongoing matters will be included in the first annual report (i.e. beginning of 2012).
- One consolidated institutional progress report will be compiled (by the Unit for Quality Promotion) and submitted to the S Q C, the MEC and Senate for approval. This report will then be submitted to the HEQC towards the end of the first term of the ensuing year

The Summary provided at the end of the Quality Improvement Plan serves as a check-list for improvements to be addressed in the annual progress reports.

2. PLANNING AND GOVERNANCE

Recommendation 1

- The UJ vision and mission statements
- Student experiences on all campuses
- A planning office
- Cultural transformation
- Campus directors

Recommendation 4

Institutional forum

Recommendation 6

Institutional surveys

2. PLANNING AND GOVERNANCE

In the HEQC Audit Report to the UJ, the following recommendations, focusing on planning and governance matters, were made. These include planning matters, ranging from strategic and institutional planning to academic planning, governance, institutional research as support for planning and decision-making purposes and campus matters. Enrolment planning is addressed under teaching, learning and programmes.

2.1 RECOMMENDATION 1

The HEQC recommends that the University of Johannesburg conducts an institution-wide debate on the meaning and appropriateness of the vision and mission statements, and engages actively with staff on the practical implications of the statements, how they are translated into strategies and meaningful performance indicators.

2.1.1 Related concerns

A number of related concerns were identified in the HEQC Audit Report and are listed below. These were clustered into a number of sub-themes:

The UJ vision and mission statements

- (i) The Panel heard of different interpretations among the stakeholders of what it means to be an "embracing African city university" (p.16).
- (ii) The Panel found varying levels of awareness and understanding of the vision and mission through the range of interviews it conducted with different levels of staff across the institution (p.16).
- (iii) There is little understanding of the UJ's identity in its designation as a comprehensive university (p.16).
- (iv) The majority of staff members interviewed during the site visit indicated that the UJ merger has been successful in that it has managed to produce a new institutional identity out of three distinct institutions, eliciting considerable loyalty among its staff and students. This was most marked by staff and students at the APK campus. The Panel proposes that the institution develop and implement measures to consolidate these gains, paying particular attention to its other campuses (p.17).
- (v) The UJ should consider conducting an intensive institution-wide debate on the meaning and appropriateness of the vision and mission statements, and engage actively with staff on the practical application of the statements (p.17).
- (vi) The Panel encountered scepticism about the managerial approach (via the Institutional Scorecard, Dashboard, and its various components) to deliver equivalent quality in the student learning experience on all campuses (p.17).
- (vii) The Panel proposes that the institution reconsider the manner in which it is attempting to give effect to its strategic objectives and develop systems that encourage participation of all stakeholders (p.18).
- (viii) The University may wish to consider how measurability of goals can be addressed, using available metrics (p.18).
- (ix) The Panel found that there was little awareness among staff of the Strategic Thrusts and lack of a clear sense of how annual thrusts were integrated and build on each other (p.18).
- (x) A separation between the strategy of Executive Management and active engagement

- with academic and intellectual choices for the institution was experienced (p.29).
- (xi) There was a strong perception that Senate was in danger of becoming a "rubber stamping body" (p.35).

Student experiences on all campuses and cultural integration

- (xii) The Panel noted the absence of a committee on Student Support and Services (p.27).
- (xiii) The Panel heard of the frustration of students on SWC, DFC and APB about the differences between the experiences of students at APK and their own. It would like to encourage the University to engage critically with various constituencies to understand how the quality of the student experience could be enhanced, especially on the Soweto campus, which needs urgent attention (p.24).
- (xiv) The Panel would also like to impress on the institution's senior leadership that equivalence of provision across campuses requires not only the development of campus infrastructure, but also the establishment of a substantive academic presence on each campus (p.24).
- (xv) The above might encourage diverse staff and students to move to these campuses and therefore support the institution in its goal of establishing non-racial environments on all its campuses and across various disciplinary fields. This requires a deliberate attempt at deepening cultural and demographic transformation on all UJ campuses and ensuring that the programmes and learning environment offered across campuses are of comparable quality (p.25).

A planning office

- (xvi) The demands of academic planning and implementation of strategy require much more sophisticated and ambitious organisation of the Planning Office (p.29).
- (xvii) Some concerns about the effectiveness of the Unit for Institutional and Strategic Planning (known, since mid-2010, as the Unit for Institutional Research and Decision Support), given its lack of sufficient staff, were expressed (p.18).
- (xviii) A need for an Institutional Research Unit was discerned (p.33).

Campus directors

(xix) Campus directors were of the opinion that their responsibilities and authority were limited, thereby inhibiting the impact they could have on service delivery, including the quality of the learning environment (p.29).

2.1.2 The UJ response and action plan

The concerns were clustered according to their focus. The recommendation is addressed by referring to specific clusters of concerns.

2.1.2.1 The UJ Vision and Mission Statements

Recommendation 1 of the HEQC Audit Report and the first eleven concerns designated here, address the perceived vagueness in respect of the UJ's institutional identity (as a comprehensive institution). The meaning and appropriateness of the UJ Vision and Mission Statements, the manner in which mission and strategic goal attainment are 'measured', as well as their practical implementation in various campus and committee/structural settings, have been a dedicated focus of the VC since the beginning of 2010. An in-depth review of the strategic goals and the institutional identity of the UJ resulted in a set of eight Strategic

Thrusts for the next decade, approved by the UJ Council in November 2010. Key indicators were identified for each of the eight Strategic Thrusts, and a Values Charter (based on the Strategic Thrusts) will be developed in 2011.

Various actions, involving all persons in senior and mid-level leadership positions in the institution, have already been taken, and many are still ongoing. These action steps will minimise and eventually eradicate the particular concerns, in striving for a shared future institutional identity and set of strategic thrusts and goals. A Vision and Mission Statement and a Values Charter for the UJ are the subject of ongoing institution-wide engagement.

The intention is to employ a participative approach, which would purposefully encourage more frequent and open discussion and debate by executive, academic and service and support staff, as well as student leaders on all formal University structures and committees, including Senate. The strategic performance steering and monitoring mechanisms, including an Institutional Scorecard and an evolving institution-wide, differentiated performance management system, will continue to be implemented, as will a strategic dashboard. This will happen in a participative manner. Action Plan 1 below (and its various actions steps) addresses the main recommendation and the above concerns in particular.

Action Plan 1: The UJ Vision, Mission and Goals

The UJ's *Strategic Thrusts for the Next Decade*, including a preamble that incorporates an evolving Vision and Mission Statement and Institutional Values, as well as key indicators for each of the eight Strategic Thrusts were approved by the UJ Council in November 2010. The Strategic Thrusts for the Next Decade resulted from the following action steps:

- (a) ELG and MEC breakaways (February 2010): The ELG and Management Executive Committee (MEC) were involved in two separate three-day strategic breakaways, and the key results of the two breakaways were captured in a PowerPoint presentation by the VC, entitled "UJ: The next decade". The latter presentation was soundboarded with the general leadership corps on 18 March 2010.
- (b) Workshop and debate (March 2010): Staff in senior and mid-level leadership positions in academic, service and support domains (the Senior Leadership Group) participated in a three-hour workshop (facilitated by the Vice-Chancellor) on the mission and proposed Strategic Thrusts. The outcomes of the workshop (a consolidated document which summarises the UJ's future identity and strategic thrust domains, entitled "The next decade: Setting the scene"), was enhanced by individual personal feedback (via e-mail), served as input to the next action step (see (f) below) in May/June 2010.

(c) Institutionalisation of the Senior Executive Leadership Groups:

The following important strategic and planning decisions were taken in 2010:

- (i) A Charter for the Executive Leadership Group (ELG) was approved, which provides for its composition, strategic and advisory role and functions.
- (ii) An annual strategic planning schedule, with specified purposes and desired outcomes for each strategy planning session, and identified role players, was formalised.
- (iii) Bi-annual (March and September) strategic meetings between the VC and the Senior Leadership Group (comprising the ELG, vice-deans, heads of academic

- schools, heads of academic departments, directors of support and service divisions and selected senior managers) have been incorporated into the strategic planning schedule, to enhance internal institutional communication and stimulate debate on matters of strategic importance.
- (iv) The support role and function of the UIRDS ("the Planning Office") in particular its role in the provision of management information has been articulated clearly.

The establishment of a Senior Leadership Group is one of the UJ's concrete responses to the concerns.

- (d) Series of workshops on the UJ's Strategic Thrusts (May/June 2010): A series of six workshops, in which almost 130 leaders and other invited senior colleagues participated, were facilitated by the DVC: HR and Institutional Planning, and staff from the Division for Institutional Planning and Quality Promotion (DIPQP). These workshops acted as sounding board opportunities for leaders to interrogate the proposed Strategic Thrusts critically, and in so doing, to provide advice to the VC on the relevance and most appropriate formulation of each Strategic Thrust, on action steps for each thrust and on how best these Strategic Thrusts can be translated into achievable action plans for the next decade. The outcomes of these workshops were consolidated in a document entitled: "Proposed strategic thrusts for the University of Johannesburg for the next decade. Results of the May/June 2010 workshops". After approval by the MEC, the latter document served as input to the next action step (see (e) below).
- (e) Unpacking and formulating the UJ Strategic Thrusts (July to mid-October 2010): The content of the document, stemming from action step (d) above, was analysed, interpreted, compared and consolidated by dedicated MEC members and their respective teams. A separate ELG breakaway in August 2010, was also partially dedicated to this task, and eventually resulted in a more refined document, entitled "UJ's strategic thrusts for the next decade". The latter document served as input to the next action step (f) below.
- (f) Workshop for leaders (29th of October 2010): Once again, the Senior Leadership Group participated in a three-hour workshop (facilitated by the VC) on the UJ's Vision, Mission and possible Strategic Thrusts. The outcomes of the workshop (a consolidated document which summarises the UJ's future identity and Strategic Thrusts (with accompanying key indicators), entitled "The next decade: Setting the scene", enhanced by individual personal feedback (via e-mail), served as input to the next action step (see (g) below).
- (g) Council monitoring workshop: At a workshop on 18 November 2010, Council was presented with a proposal on the UJ's Strategic Thrusts for the Next Decade, the result of the strategic planning sessions outlined above. After an intensive day-long deliberation, Council approved the proposed eight strategic thrusts for the next decade, as well as a preamble to the strategic thrusts (encapsulating a Vision, Mission and Values Statement) and key indicators used for monitoring purposes in respect of each of the eight Strategic Thrusts.

- (h) ELG and MEC breakaways: The ELG, and thereafter the MEC, met at two separate breakaways in early February 2011. The primary purpose of these breakaways was to fine-tune the Strategic Thrusts and their accompanying key indicators, and to determine an implementation strategy.
- (i) Senior Leadership Group meeting: The document, entitled "UJ's Strategic Thrusts for the Next Decade" was presented to the Senior Leadership Group at its first strategic planning session for 2011, on 9 March. General initial institutional buy-in has now been achieved in respect of the UJ's vision, mission and strategic thrusts. Communication of the key messages derived from the abovementioned) with selected stakeholders staff and students is the next challenge of the UJ's implementation strategy of its second Strategic Plan for 2011-2020.
- (j) Strategic plan formulation and buy-in: The UJ's second Strategic Plan needs to be shaped and formulated by means of an interactive strategy of staff and student engagement. Except for the already approved Vision Statement, Mission Statement, Strategic Thrusts and their accompanying key indicators, buy-in into a UJ Values Charter and appropriately formulated Strategic Goals (and their related KPIs, enabling measures and metrics) also needs to be obtained.
- (k) Strategic plan implementation and monitoring: The VC, assisted by the DVC: HR and Institutional Planning and the Planning Office, identifies, develops, recommends and implements (having secured broad institutional 'buy-in') appropriate and negotiated mechanisms (e.g. balanced scorecards and/or strategic dashboards and/or an institutional scorecard) to monitor progress or the lack thereof, in terms of the implementation of the UJ's Mission and Strategic Plan. Monitoring is an ongoing biannual process, which takes place over a number of years. The ideal is to implement appropriate and approved monitoring mechanisms, for the first time in 2012, and thereafter, on a bi-annual basis until 2020.
- (I) Revised charter of Senate: The concern that Senate was in danger of becoming a "rubber stamping body" was addressed by a review of the composition and functioning of Senate in 2010,the most important revisions being the following:
 - (i) Council approved an amendment to the UJ Statute (to be proposed to the Minister of Higher Education and Training in 2011) to allow for broader representation in Senate, thereby making Senate more demographically representative.
 - (ii) A theme-based approach to each Senate meeting was adopted, in terms of which Senate devotes part of the meeting to debate and discussion on pre-selected themes of academic policy and principle.
 - (iii) The Senate agenda was revised, to enable it to spend less time on formal approvals of amendments to academic rules and regulations and more time on discussions of academic principle and policy (standard rule amendments are circulated electronically via a VC circular to Senate members, who are invited to comment on the amendments via e-mail).
 - (iv) A Senate Academic Freedom Committee was established, its function being to advise Senate on matters related to academic freedom and institutional autonomy.

(v) An annual year-end performance review by Senate members, of the functionality of Senate, takes place, both in terms of the governance of Senate and of its effectiveness in conducting its core business substantively.

2.1.2.2 Student experiences on all campuses

Here, the focus is on the equivalence of the student experience on all campuses. The raison d'être of any university is its students. The UJ is no exception, and does not wish to be different. Student life and experience per se is not captured explicitly in any HEQC Audit Criterion.

It is, however, captured in one of the ten goals of the UJ's first Strategic Plan (2005 - 2010), i.e. Goal 9: The preferred student experience. The Goal is described as follows: *To promote the holistic development of the student in preparation for the world of work and responsible citizenship.* It is also captured in the eight thrusts that guide the UJ's second Strategic Plan (2011-2020). It is specifically evident in Thrust 3, which reads as follows: *A unique programme profile for each UJ campus, equivalence of resource provision and stature, with a dedicated focus on the Soweto Campus (SWC) and the Doornfontein Campus (DFC) for the next three years.*

The concern to deliver equivalent quality in the student learning experience on all campuses, especially the Soweto Campus (SWC) and the Doornfontein Campus (DFC), as well as the newly established Student Services Council, are being addressed in Action Plan 2 below.

Action Plan 2: Student experiences on all campuses

This Action Plan consists of the following action steps:

- (a) The UJ Student profile and related analyses: Having been in existence for more than six (6) years, it is possible and appropriate for the UJ to create and interrogate a profile of its undergraduate students, in respect of several variables and characteristics. For the past two years, the profile has formed part of the brief of the UJ First-Year Experience (FYE) Committee, in conjunction with the work being conducted by the Academic Development and Support Division and the UIRDS. The profile aims to analyse (and compare, where appropriate) students from different cohorts, campuses and faculties, and will also include a holistic (institutional) perspective. The profile serves as invaluable background information firstly, for the DVC (HR and Institutional Planning) and his Strategic Planning support team (when formulating KPIs, enabling measures and metrics); secondly, for the UJ's First-Year Experience and Teaching and Learning Committees in their efforts to ascertain where students are (in terms of various variables at entry level), so that they can teach and support accordingly; and thirdly, for the DVC: Academic and the various faculties and academic development and support units, to assist in the realistic development of their own strategic plans for the next decade.
- **(b) Student Services Council**: This Council was established in 2010. It meets four times per year and comprises senior representatives of the faculties and of the service and support divisions, as well as elected student representatives (SRC, House Committees of residences, student organisations, etc.). Its purpose is to discuss operational

concerns raised by students, that impact negatively on their learning experience and on the holistic student experience the UJ wishes to provide for its students. It is co-chaired by the DVC (HR and Institutional Planning) and the President of the UJSRC, and reports to the VC.

- (c) Equivalent student learning experience on all campuses, especially the Soweto Campus (SWC). The following envisaged actions that have been, or will be taken:
 - (i) A Campus Master Plan for **all campuses**, aimed at a quality environment, comparable facilities and future-orientated technological infrastructure (refer to Recommendation 12, and more specifically Action Plan 1 in 5.2.2), was initiated in 2008 and incorporates planning until 2014.
 - (ii) The radical reconstruction of the **Soweto Campus** (an investment of approximately R500 million, incorporating significant DHET support) is almost complete (as at February 2011). SWC, an attractive, modern campus with highly sophisticated, wireless technological connections and facilities, is set to become a hub for academic, sporting and cultural activities. Since January 2011, the Dean of the Faculty of Education is based on the SWC. The development included lecture venues, offices, state-of-the-art sport facilities which have a sports centre with an indoor sports hall, fully equipped gym, a spinning room and an aerobics class, 3 soccer fields, cricket oval, athletics tracks, netball courts, pavilion, grade-R school, sports clubhouse and law clinic. A new residence with 312 single rooms was completed in December 2010 and ready for occupation in 2011. The Campus will also boast a modern Student Centre and a brand-new student residence.
 - (iii) For the UJ, a key strategy in growing student enrolments in SET fields, is to extend the physical capacity of the University, the Doornfontein Campus in particular. For this reason, the University decided to purchase the Perskor Building, adjacent to the DFC, to secure additional capacity for future growth in Health Sciences and Engineering. The enlarged campus will then serve to consolidate the Faculties of Engineering and Health Sciences from the beginning of 2013. The Perskor Building will in particular provide space for laboratories for Engineering. One of these will be set up as a Training Workshop, in order to provide Work Integrated Learning opportunities to students in Engineering programmes. A Design Centre will also be provided on the campus to create a space for students, lecturers and researchers to work on projects across disciplinary and even faculty boundaries. Industry linkages will also be fostered via the Design Centre, with many opportunities for problembased contract research. The University has already secured funding from the DHET for the upgrading and extension of the Campus with regard to the under-supply of laboratories and computer workstations, and the condition of the existing laboratories. A total of 1 000 computer workstations is planned for this Campus, which will bring the ratio of students per workstation down to 1:12. The total cost for the redevelopment of the academic space currently in use on the DFC campus, including the purchase and refurbishment of the Perskor Building, however, is calculated to be R408 million. The University will approach the Minister, as well as the National Skills Fund for further financial support to complete this project. At the

- completion of the project, the Campus will be able to accommodate 9 117 FTE students within buildings, comprising 92 738 ASM of space for academic purposes.
- (iv) Except for the recent modernisation and upgrading of the **Auckland Park Bunting Road** (APB) campus, in line with the other three campuses, the presence of the Faculty of Art, Design and Architecture (FADA) and the Faculty of Management's School of Tourism and Hospitality (STH), serves to attract many students (and external visitors) to this show-case campus. The campus accommodates several research units, which are situated in the research village. The structures in the research village date back as far as 1940, and have been restored. As the campus was originally built in 1961, as the erstwhile Goudstad Teachers Training College, large numbers of ex-students, visit the campus to reminisce about their student days. Old auditoriums and lecture venues have been refurbished to boast the most modern of audio visual and other equipment.
- (v) The **Auckland Park Kingsway** (APK) campus is generally well equipped, and a new residence complex (across the road) houses students in the SAICA-supported Thuthuka Accounting programme, as well as postgraduate students.
- (vi) **ICT in large classes**: This matter is addressed in Action Plan 2 in 5.2.2.In summary: The UJ recently launched a large class project, with the aim of exploring and facilitating optimal teaching in large classes and lecture halls. This project assumes that, due to the high student numbers, large classes will remain a given at UJ and is exploring both pedagogies that have been shown to be effective in large classes, as well as the use of ICTs for the management of large student numbers and for the support of student learning. The new teaching venues on SWC have all been equipped with up-to-date ICT equipment, and planning is now taking place for similar refurbishments on DFC.
- (d) Undergraduate student experience survey: The biennial undergraduate student experience survey, aimed at the collection of student perceptions and experiences on all campuses and in all faculties, targeting as many students as possible, will, once again, be undertaken by the UIRDS in 2011. The analysis and comparison of survey findings with the findings and Quality Improvement Plans of previous surveys (especially focusing on campus perspectives), constitute a pivotal form of quality assurance.
- (e) Postgraduate student experience survey: The biennial postgraduate student experience survey was originally scheduled (in terms of the UJ's institutional research rhythm) for 2010, but will only be undertaken by the UIRDS during the second semester of 2011. The survey is aimed at the collection of postgraduate (master's and doctoral) students perceptions and experiences in respect of their postgraduate studies at UJ, inclusive of supervisory and faculty/departmental or institutional support. Postgraduate students on all campuses and in all faculties are targeted. The analysis and comparison of survey findings with the findings and Quality Improvement Plans of previous surveys in this regard, constitute another important form of quality assurance.

2.1.2.3 A planning office

The Unit for Institutional and Strategic Planning was transformed in 2010 into the Unit for Institutional Research and Decision Support (UIRDS). Action Plan 3 below addresses the degree of sophistication, the desirable visionary inclination, the perceived lack of academic

planning involvement, the perceived lack of capacity and the envisaged future role of UIRDS.

Action Plan 3: The Unit for Institutional Research and Decision Support

The following action steps are envisaged as part of this Action Plan:

- (a) Management Information (MI) as the overarching responsibility of the UIRDS: After in-depth benchmarking and external environmental scanning project (from July 2009 until August 2010), incorporating valuable inputs from MI specialists of other HEIs, Management Intelligence (MI) activities were incorporated into UIRDS's institutional research activities. This will have a marked positive effect on the Unit's perceived lack of academic planning support, clout and involvement. The MI portfolio will enable the Unit to feed into the academic planning function of the institution and thus address its perceived lack of planning support sophistication.
- (b) The UIRDS's perceived lack of visionary inclination: Surveys and benchmarking are essential for planning, quality assurance and promotion purposes. Annual benchmarking for reporting and planning purposes at Executive Leadership Group (ELG) level has been an institutional practice since 2007. A fair number of institutional, faculty and divisional surveys, aimed at monitoring and improving quality have been conducted, but institutional oversight was lacking. A revised role for the newly established UIRDS, which will coordinate and support regular surveys, impact studies and the provision of (strategic and other) information relating to annual reporting and decision-making, is envisaged. The most effective response to this concern is the development and implementation of an institutional research and decision support framework that coordinates and guides benchmarking, surveys, impact studies and quality reviews; the timely dissemination of findings and communication to stakeholders; and the accountability of the relevant managers for follow-up activities, such as targeted Quality Improvement Plans. The envisaged actions and processes will position the Planning Office at the heart of the UJ's visionary intent.
- (c) The UIRDS's perceived lack of capacity: The current capacity of the Unit is not geared to fulfil its key cross-institutional role, as planned in (b) above. A staff capacity-building plan, combined with a review of the job portfolios of all permanent and temporary staff in the Unit, is envisaged. The latter will be linked to the temporary secondment and/or recruitment of appropriate IR persons to key posts in the Unit, when required. It is intended that the Unit will reach full operational capacity by the end of 2012.

2.1.2.4 Cultural transformation

At a Management Executive Committee (MEC) strategic breakaway on 16 and 17 January 2008, cultural integration was identified as one of the strategic priorities for the University in the next few years. The MEC established a Steering Committee for the new Cultural Integration Project. The aim of the project was (and still is) to establish an enabling institutional environment that allows for maximum cultural integration and for employees and students to practice the UJ values. Action Plan 4 below (and its various action steps) addresses this concern – also consult 3.1.2.2 (c) for an HR perspective on the Cultural Integration Project.

Action Plan 4: Cultural Integration Project

The following action steps are planned and/or in place:

- (a) Phase 1 Cultural Integration Survey (2008): A Cultural Integration Survey was conducted in 2008, to determine the nature and scope of the diversity challenges that confronted the University. Based on the survey results, attention was paid to the following five areas:
 - (i) Communication
 - (ii) Values
 - (iii) Leadership
 - (iv) The HR value chain
 - (v) Diversity sensitisation, management and appreciation.

The quantitative component of the survey revealed that the UJ had a "culture index" of 52%. Conclusions drawn from the quantitative component included:

- Culture fault lines at UJ were drawn on the basis of race (linked to language) and legacy institution (linked largely to campus and vocational vs. formative education).
- The fault lines manifested in perceptions of unfair and inequitable treatment and a sense that difference/diversity was not valued or accommodated.
- Transformation was believed to be poorly planned and managed, and a large number of staff (black and white) was anxious about the consequences that transformation would have for them.

It was decided to address the abovementioned findings and conclusions via an institutional Change Management Strategy.

- (b) Phase 2 Change Management (2009): The Change Management Strategy aimed, via a series of interactive engagements, to enhance staff commitment towards the UJ vision, mission, strategic goals, Leadership Charter and values. Input from a pilot workshop (involving the Steering Committee) was used, and 12 workshops were conducted over a period of four months, involving 270 employees at middle and senior management levels. In September 2009, the implementation of the cultural integration process was discussed with the full ELG (with reference to their respective domains). Thereafter, seven 2½ hour workshops were conducted with the 40 Peer Educators (Leaders) identified by the Line Managers, to assist them in taking the cultural integration process further.
- (c) Phase 3 Cultural integration day and a follow-up Cultural Survey (2010): On 26 February 2010, a successful fun day, which celebrated the UJ's cultural diversity and recognised cultural integration successes by means of "living the UJ values" took place. The MEC requested the Resolve Group to conduct a follow-up Cultural Survey during March 2010, in order to compare the results with those of the 2008 survey. The "global cultural index" had increased from 52% to 57 %. The results showed an increase in scores for all themes, with Transformation showing the largest proportional increase. However, the theme of Fairness and Equity remained a problem area, and it will be the focus of future initiatives. In general, the differences in scores between different

demographic groups are less marked than in 2008.

- (d) Phase 4 Diversity week (second semester of 2010): The UJ celebrated its first Diversity week from 20 23 September 2010. The DVC (HR and Institutional Planning) was assisted by four Campus Coordinators who developed a unique programme for each campus. They included cross-cutting themes such as HIV/Aids and disability. The aim of the project, namely to establish an enabling institutional environment that allows for maximum cultural integration of employees and students via living the UJ values, was achieved.
- (e) Phase 5 A permanent Transformation Office (2011): Towards the end of 2010, the Cultural Integration Committee was replaced by a Transformation Office and a more permanent Transformation Steering Committee. The latter committee's charter was approved by the MEC on 22 February 2011. Continuous institutional progress in attaining an ever-increasing level of cultural integration will be monitored. The Transformation Office's impact on UJ staff and students will be monitored regularly, and a third Cultural Integration Survey will be conducted in 2012.

2.1.2.5 Campus Directors

The responsibilities, authority and impact of Campus Directors are addressed in this concern. From the outset, the University was committed to a unitary governance model where reporting is done along functional lines and not according to geographical location. In practice, this implies that any staff member reports to her/his superior in the division/department/unit to which (s)he belongs, regardless of the campus where (s)he is stationed.

Yet, a need was expressed for a person of authority on each campus. This resulted in the appointment of Campus Directors on each campus, since 2007. The Campus Directors have no line authority over the staff on campus. They are responsible for monitoring the secure and orderly functioning of the campus and for liaising with the necessary authorities regarding any remedial action required. In addition, they represent the interests of their campuses in relevant University committees and meetings.

Selected improvement actions are described in Action Plan 5 below.

Action Plan 5: Campus Directors

The following action steps are envisaged:

The post and role descriptions of Campus Directors have been revised (the Campus Directors and HR jointly steered the process). The proposed new descriptions clearly highlight the envisaged 'new' responsibilities and authority of Campus Directors, and are expected to contribute to their increased impact on the institution, and specifically to an environment conducive to learning on all campuses.

The proposal was discussed at length among the various Campus Directors, the Director: Protection Services and the Manager: Occupational Safety. It was decided by the whole Operations Management team present that the job profile of the Campus Directors will be revised. The revision has been completed and a Peromnes job evaluation was done for all 3 Campus Director positions. The outcome of the revision is still in process.

The MEC approved that, from an operational point of view, the APK and APB campuses will be managed as one campus, namely Auckland Park, with precincts east and west, under the leadership of Adv. André Coetzer (until the end of September 2011).

2.2 RECOMMENDATION 4

The HEQC recommends that the University of Johannesburg develops and implements an innovation strategy to ensure that the Institutional Forum's functions are in line with legislative requirements.

2.2.1 Related concern

The following related concern was identified:

Set up a process to investigate the reasons for the IF's disfunctionality in a systematic manner, as the basis to address the problem (p.27).

2.2.2 UJ response and action plan

The official DHET report (national once-off report) on the functioning of institutional forums is being awaited. This report will inform and empower the changes to the composition and functioning of the IF. The University did, however, address the matter.

Action plan: Institutional Forum

- (a) The UJ Statute was promulgated on 27 August 2010. In this Statute, the Institutional Forum (IF) is specifically addressed in Section 62, which has an impact on the following aspects of the IF:
 - Composition of the IF: An increased number of academic, as well as non-academic members will be elected. The Executive Director: Human Resources and the Executive Director: Student Affairs will also be members of the IF.
 - Chairperson of the IF: The chairperson should be a member of Council and a member of the MEC.

The proposed **changes to the IF** served at the October 2010 meeting of the IF and at the 19 November 2010 meeting of the UJ Council. The appointment of the new chairperson was also formalised at the Council meeting.

- (b) The newly composed IF will develop a strategy and actions to align their functions with legislative requirements during 2011.
- (c) The Annual Performance Review of all the UJ's committees will reveal further improvement needed concerning the IF and its functioning. The following will become standing items on all IF agendas:
 - Transformation and diversity management
 - Employment equity reports
 - Language policy implementation
 - Policy on People with Disabilities: Implementation and review
 - HR policies: Recruitment, retention and promotion.

2.3 RECOMMENDATION 6

The HEQC recommends that the University of Johannesburg develops mechanisms to ensure that the findings of surveys are systematically implemented and evaluated.

2.3.1 Related concerns

A number of related concerns were identified in the HEQC Audit Report and are listed below.

- (i) During interviews with management the Panel heard that there was a need for more regular surveys to be undertaken, in order to measure the effectiveness of the student learning experience accurately (p.32).
- (ii) A need for an Institutional Research Unit was discerned (This concern is also addressed in 2.1.2.3, under Recommendation 1).
- (iii) The UJ conducts a number of surveys as a means to measure its performance in its core functions. During interviews with staff the Panel heard that the University had not yet implemented improvements in the identified areas, and consequently, had not succeeded in ensuring that the surveys do indeed result in improvements. The Panel encourages the UJ to ensure:
 - that the findings of surveys are implemented systematically; and
 - that a monitoring process is put in place, with clear allocation of responsibility, so that the quality of both the core functions and the support services can be enhanced.

2.3.2 The UJ response and action plan

The UJ currently conducts a number of (annual and biennial) surveys as a means of measuring its performance in the core functions. Some examples of institutional effectiveness surveys are:

- the Institutional Cultural Survey
- Undergraduate Student Experience Survey
- Postgraduate Student Experience Survey
- UJLIC Survey (LibQual).

The following surveys, introduced in 2011, will in future be part of the regular surveys: An HR survey, a Finance survey and an Operations survey.

The University also benchmarks itself in a number of ways:

Firstly, it participates in a national benchmarking project along with nine other South African higher education institutions, in terms of the number of research publications, undergraduate and postgraduate student enrolment numbers, and ratio of academic staff members to students.

Secondly, all ELG members are required to benchmark their faculties or divisions against three corresponding external faculties or divisions in terms of performance indicators that are set out in their strategic plans.

Thirdly, as part of the annual academic review, all the DVCs report on progress towards goals, as set out in their respective portfolios, also including comparisons with other institutions.

Fourthly, by means of what is known as the Integration and Renewal Project, the University of Johannesburg benchmarks itself against some selected best practice models. Benchmarking projects are also undertaken by support divisions, such as the Library and Academic and Support Units at South African universities.

Action plan: Institutional surveys

The following action plans and steps are envisaged and/or are in place:

- (a) In mid-2010, the University established a Unit for Institutional Research and Decision Support (UIRDS).
- (b) Annual/biennial reports on institutional effectiveness surveys are submitted by the UIRDS to the MEC, MECA, MECO, Executive Leadership Group (ELG) and the relevant Senate Committees.
- (c) A working document, proposing steps and procedures to ensure implementation of remedial actions resulting from institutional effectiveness surveys, is being drafted by the UIRDS. This will be submitted for approval by the end of 2011, for implementation in 2012.
- (d) The undergraduate and postgraduate student experience surveys are conducted biennially by the UIRDS. Both these reports will be available towards the end of 2011.

3. HUMAN RESOURCES

Recommendation 2

- Functioning of the HR Division
- Attraction, appointment, promotion and retention
- ADS staff matters

3. HUMAN RESOURCES

3.1 RECOMMENDATION 2

The HEQC recommends that the University of Johannesburg, within the existent systemic constraints, investigates the issue of recruitment and retention of black and women academics as a multi-layered problem which requires complex interventions encompassing not only salary packages and overall conditions of service, but also the development of an institutional culture which is attractive and supportive of black and women academics.

3.1.1 Related concerns

The following related concerns were identified and clustered into sub-themes:

Functioning of the HR Division

- (i) Steps should be taken to ensure optimal functioning of HR (p.46).
- (ii) The Panel would like to encourage the institution to investigate whether there were sufficient grounds for a perception of lack of consistency in the application of policies and procedures for the recruitment, selection and appointment of various categories of staff (p.22).
- (iii) A communication strategy that ensures continuous staff and student consultation is a prerequisite for successful implementation of the Campus Master Plan (p.29).

Attraction, appointment, promotion and retention

- (iv) There were still misconceptions among staff regarding promotion criteria (p.35).
- (v) The Panel was particularly concerned to find that, despite UJ's targets and enabling policies, there still was a very small percentage of black academic staff. The institution was strongly encouraged to investigate whether there were internal obstacles that hindered the attraction and retention of black staff (p.22).
- (vi) The University was encouraged to develop and implement mechanisms that would support the recruitment and promotion of women academics that were still generally under-represented in most categories (p.22).
- (vii) The University was encouraged to look into concerns expressed regarding posts held by persons who lacked sufficient seniority for their posts as well as the appointment of too many junior staff, and to find creative ways of balancing the tension between equity and quality imperatives within a framework of transformation (p.24).
- (viii) The UJ's inability to attract and retain "top class" academic staff was a concern (p.24).

ADS staff matters

- (ix) ADS had staffing problems, with an unusually large number of temporary and parttime staff, while inter alia, lack of clarity on conditions of service inhibited the attraction and retention of suitably qualified staff (p.40).
- (x) The Panel encourages the institution to clarify the conditions of service of the ADS staff (p.40).
- (xi) There was uncertainty about the roles and responsibilities of the ADS management team (p.40).

The following related challenge is included in the HEQC's concluding comments:

The lack of human and infrastructural resources to provide quality education to a growing student body.

3.1.2 The UJ response and action plans

The Human Resources (HR) Division strives towards a strategic and integrated approach to managing the UJ's most valuable asset - its employees - as they individually and collectively contribute to the achievement of the UJ's core business goals. Although undeniably committed to provide excellent client focused service and to deliver quality business results, the UJ's HR Division is stretched in terms of its human resources maturity and capacity and does not yet fully 'live' its institutional role as key strategic partner and core business ally. The Division continuously emphasises its 'people first' philosophy, and its key role as the face of the UJ, as well as first point of contact for entry employees. The Division strives to attract, professionally develop and retain employees and also seeks to provide optimal support to faculties and divisions to manage their own human resources effectively. Actions taken to ensure more optimal functioning of the HR Division are addressed below.

The following action plans have been taken or are planned under the guidance of the DVC: HR and Institutional Planning:

Action Plan 1: Functioning of the HR Division

- (a) A UJ staff (stakeholder) experience **survey** of the HR Division was undertaken during the second semester of 2010, under the supervision of the DVC (HR and Institutional Planning) and steered by an external HR specialist. The findings of the survey have already been analysed and interrogated. An HR Effectiveness Plan, geared at greater HR effectiveness and efficiency, will be implemented from February 2011. The latter implies one-on-one liaison between the HR Division and all internal stakeholders (faculties, divisions, units and centres), institutional buy-in and regular monitoring of the HR Effectiveness Plan.
- (b) **Recruitment and selection processes** have been scrutinised with a view to achieve optimal transparency and efficiency. Short-listing and interview processes involve participation of the recognised Unions, as well as SRC representatives, if related to student affairs. Further refinements to these processes are ongoing.
- (c) All HR business processes and procedures (including recruitment) will be available on the **UJ Intranet** by June 2011.
- (d) The Unit for Quality Promotion facilitates the cyclical process of Service and Support Units' self-evaluations and peer reviews. The HR Division is due for a **self-evaluation and peer review** in 2013, after the measures in their Effectiveness Plan had been implemented for at least a full year. The self-evaluation and peer review will automatically result in a Quality Improvement Plan for the Division, to be steered by the HR Leadership Team and monitored by the Senate Quality Committee.

Action Plan 2: Attraction, appointment, promotion and retention

- (a) Annual Employment Equity targets are set by Council, taking account of the demographic profiles of HE institutions nationally. Executive Deans and Executive Directors are performance managed with respect to compliance with targets set for their respective environments. This is an ongoing process: In line with current practice, mid-year and annual reports that monitor and report on progress will be submitted to the MEC and the Executive Committee of Senate, and an annual report will be submitted to the HR Committee of Council.
- (b) An MEC sub-committee approves all **non-designated (i.e. White) appointments.** In line with current practice, mid-year and annual reports on appointments made will be submitted to the MEC and the Executive Committee of Senate.
- (c) A Cultural Integration Project has been running since 2009. In August 2010, the MEC approved the establishment of a Transformation Office, which became operational in February 2011. A Transformation Steering Committee (a sub-committee of the MEC) was established to advise the Office, which coordinates and supports all transformation-related activities in the institution, including the ongoing Cultural Integration Project, and acts as institutional liaison for sectoral transformation initiatives. The purpose of the Transformation Office is to design and manage internal processes and transformational change initiatives and interventions in the UJ that will contribute to creating an institutional culture of diversity, equity and excellence.
- (d) A First-Year Employee Experience (FYEE) programme has been operational since 2010, to ensure that new staff members integrate seamlessly into the institution. The programme includes the provision of an information pack prior to staff members joining the UJ, a guidance booklet for line managers to assist with the orientation of new employees, an induction programme at the beginning of each year and a further three induction sessions (including themes such as the probation period; the UJ strategy and values; transformation imperatives; performance management; conditions of service, etc.), and assistance (via the HR Business Partner) with employment-related development. The FYEE also pays special attention to the induction and full integration of Black academic staff into the institution.
- (e) Strategic Thrust 6 of the eight *Strategic Thrusts for the Next Decade* (approved by Council in 2010), is "Leadership that matters, in the institution and in civil society". One of the key indicators for this Strategic Thrust is to **increase**, **by 2020**, **the number of senior academic staff** (i.e. professors, associate professors and principal lecturers) from the current 13% of permanent and fixed-term contract staff to 18%. Another key indicator is for all Heads of Academic Departments to be either professors, associate professors or principal lecturers by 2020, unless exceptional circumstances dictate otherwise. This way, the UJ seeks to address the concern that there might be too many junior academic staff in the institution. The MEC requested HR to analyse the range, quantity and quality of temporary academic appointments comprehensively. HR will also, within the new Business Partner model for the institution, monitor seniority levels of academic staff, staff development and staff

- turnover continuously.
- (f) The HR Division is revising appointment targets for **people with disabilities**, to ensure greater representation for this group.
- (g) A Staff Qualifications Project was established under the guidance of the DVC: Academic, intended to ensure that all permanent lecturing staff have at least a Master's qualification, and 50% have a doctorate (from a current base of 35%) by 2020.
- (h) The UJ continues to seek to attract and retain **highly rated researchers**. Its success can be measured by the increase in the number of A and B rated researchers to 90, by December 2010.
- (i) The UJ awards three annual prestigious **VC Awards** for research, namely Outstanding Researcher of the Year, an Emerging Researcher Award and the Innovation Award. In the teaching and learning domain, three annual *Distinguished Teacher Awards* are awarded. The establishment of an award for most promising teacher is being considered. A third award is awarded to support staff for *Exceptional Service beyond the Call of Duty*.
- (j) In 2010, Senate also approved the introduction of a research incentive scheme, in terms of which researchers are able to earn a differentiated percentage of the subsidy income they generate for the University by means of accredited research articles, as private, taxable income.
- (k) A new remuneration strategy for staff was introduced by the VC in late 2010. The remuneration of associate professors and professors, who were remunerated below the market median, was adjusted to market and beyond. It is the intention of the institution to implement this approach across the board for all staff in the next couple of years. Aligned to this is a cost-to-company approach to remuneration. The principle of performance-based remuneration has also been adopted as a long-term remuneration strategy for UJ.
- (I) In August 2010, Senate approved an amendment to the **minimum appointment and promotion criteria** for academic employees, to create a career path for teaching-focused staff. A new appointment category of "Principal Lecturer" (at the equivalent level of Associate Professor) was approved. This will allow academics who pursue a teaching-focused (rather than a research-orientated) academic career, to gain promotion to the equivalent level of Associate Professor.

Action Plan 3: ADS staff matters

The UJ Conditions of Service are being reviewed, in order to appropriately capture an employment category of staff within the Academic Development and Support Division, whose conditions of service encompass both "academic" and "academic support" functions. This work will be completed in 2011.

4. TEACHING, LEARNING AND PROGRAMMES

Recommendation 7

- Large classes and underprepared students
- Teaching strategy and academic drift
- Work integrated learning
- Contact time

Recommendation 3

- Integration of foreign African students
- Racist, sexist and conservative attitudes among staff

Recommendation 16

- Assessment policy and rules
- External moderation
- Student grievances and RPL

Recommendation 8

Extended programmes

Recommendation 9

 Evaluation of courses and lecturers by students

Recommendation 10

Academic planning

Recommendation 14

Non-subsidised programmes

4. TEACHING, LEARNING AND PROGRAMMES

In the HEQC Audit Report to the UJ, the following recommendations, focusing on teaching, learning and assessment, as well as programmes, were made.

4.1 RECOMMENDATION 7

The HEQC recommends that the University of Johannesburg investigates the most appropriate strategies particularly in large classes to deal with the pedagogic challenge of teaching of, mostly, "underprepared" students with insufficient staff and infrastructure. This could include, but should not be limited to, increasing the number of contact hours.

4.1.1 Related concerns

The identified concerns were clustered, as follows:

Large classes and underprepared students

Concerns (i) - (iii) below refer directly to the Recommendation above:

- (i) The rapid expansion of enrolment at the UJ causes a number of concerns (p.37):
- Pressure on physical infrastructure, together with parallel medium instruction at the APK campus, forced the institution to reduce contact time. Although it seems to have improved recently, the Panel heard from both lecturers and students that this constituted a source of concern.
- Enrolment expansion puts pressure on human resources. The Panel learned via interviews that many staff had become seriously overloaded.
- The majority of students enrolling for higher education required increased attention and support, not less. While the only solution to this problem is not to teach more, it is also true that a variety of forms of contact are needed and that overloaded staff is unlikely to be able to respond to this challenge adequately.
- Overloaded staff and large classes with fewer contact hours can lead to reduction in curriculum content, lack of academic renewal, etc.
- (ii) The Panel would like to encourage the institution to monitor enrolment patterns in faculties with relatively low participation of female students (p.21).
- (iii) The nature of the teaching and learning challenges faced by the institution would require systematic interventions beyond the first year (p.21).

Teaching strategy and academic drift

The following concerns are listed here, as they address teaching, learning and assessment in general.

- (iv) There was no consistent understanding of the concept *learning to be* and its implementation (p.34).
- (v) The UJ should guard against academic drift away from vocational type programmes
- (vi) (p.35).

Work Integrated Learning (WIL)

- (vii) The Panel concurs with the institution that a Senate committee should be established to deal with all aspects of WIL (p.38).
- (viii) During interviews with academics the Panel also heard with concern that there was

doubt about the future role of WIL. This needed to be investigated and clarified (p.38).

Contact time

The following challenge was included in the HEQC's concluding remarks:

The low contact teaching hours that characterise many of the undergraduate learning programmes.

4.1.2 The UJ response and action plan

In 2009, the year of the HEQC Audit Panel visit, the UJ experienced an unanticipated 'bulge' in first-year enrolments, associated with the implementation of the national Senior Certificate. Since then, enrolments have been carefully managed, to avoid any inadvertent repetition of this increased intake. Enrolment planning for the University as a whole, pegged the total number of students at 48 000, and the Enrolment Plan for each coming year is considered and approved by the MEC, and Senate, early in the second semester.

In addition, senior students are now registered before new first-year students, to ensure that the numbers approved for each Faculty – in terms of staff, availability of venues, etc. - are not exceeded. An MEC Registration Management Committee was established, involving all Executive Deans, together with the respective DVCs, and this committee meets regularly during the Registration period, to monitor and respond to any shifts in registration patterns.

Note: The additional 5 000 first-time entrants explicitly allowed by the MEC to register in 2011 resulted from unforeseen and unplanned circumstances.

The following action steps are undertaken to address this recommendation and the clusters of concerns listed above:

Action Plan 1: Large classes and underprepared students

- (a) The UJ recently launched a large class project (reporting to the STLC), with the purpose of exploring and facilitating optimal teaching in large lecture halls. This project assumes that, due to the high student numbers, large classes will remain a given at the UJ, and is exploring pedagogies that have been shown to be effective in large classrooms, as well as the use of ICTs for both the management of large student numbers, and for the support of student learning. For instance, the new teaching venues on the Soweto Campus have all been equipped with up-to-date ICT equipment, and planning is now taking place for similar refurbishments on the Doornfontein Campus. These matters were reported to the Senate Teaching and Learning Committee of October 2010. In future, annual reports will be submitted to the STLC.
- (b) The University agrees that many students enrolling for higher education need considerable attention and support, and put in place a comprehensive programme to address their needs. Given that their first year requires a transition from school to university, much attention has been focused on this initial year, by means of the First-Year Experience (FYE) programme, which was rolled out for the first time during 2010, and offers comprehensive support. The FYE programme components include:

- the requirement that students write the National Benchmark Tests, as a means of assessing their level of preparedness for higher education
- an Orientation Programme that includes academic, as well as social components
- Extended Orientation, which continues with the academic orientation process through the first semester
- the introduction of tutorials as a complementary form of small group contact (underpinned by the UJ Policy on Tutors and Tutoring, approved by Senate in 2009) the SAFENET project, which allows for the early identification of 'at-risk' students, so that interventions can be made a programme of academic excellence in the University residences, including support for learning communities.

Initial response to the roll out of this programme was excellent (first-year performance improved substantially, although there are without doubt a number of contributing factors), and careful consideration is now being given to the sustainability of FYE, so that any additional pressures on staff workload can be managed properly. In addition, attention is being paid to the productive use of online support for students, both in terms of management of student performance (e.g. SAFENET), and by making different types of teaching/learning inputs available, e.g. regular formative assessments via using the online learning system, Edulink. In its planning for 2010, the FYE Committee included the need to focus intensely on good practice (including that of the Faculty of Education), and to find additional ways of disseminating such practice across the institution. One means to achieve this, is the annual UJ Teaching Excellence Conference and another, the annual UJ Teaching and Learning Report, which appeared for the first time in 2010 and inter alia thematised the good practice of the Faculty of Education with regard to their first-year students. The specific challenges faced by international students entering UJ for the first time has been recognised and a UJ staff member has been co-opted onto the FYE committee to represent their interests.

- (c) During 2011, consideration is being given to ways of extending the FYE programmes to a comparable programme, also focusing on the quality of experience and success of students in senior undergraduate years. In future, annual reports will be submitted to the STLC.
- (d) The gender of registered students is monitored, together with other variables. It is noted, for instance, that in addition to low female registration in some sections of the Faculty of Engineering and the Built Environment, registration in the Faculty of Health Sciences show low male registration, whereas the Faculty of Science appears to be managing gender equity fairly successfully.
- (e) Faculty-specific workload models for academic staff are being implemented in faculties to address the various responsibilities of academic staff (e.g. teaching, research, module coordination, contribution to faculty matters, the Executive Deans' responsibilities and also the HoDs who are responsible for the allocation of responsibilities). These models also take into account the needs of new academic staff who seek to develop a research portfolio.

Action Plan 2: Teaching strategy and academic drift

(a) Towards the end of 2008, the **Teaching and Learning Strategy** was approved by Senate. The accompanying learning-to-be philosophy concept document had not been widely disseminated by the time of the audit (August 2009), with the result that very few staff members were familiar with it. Since that time, a three-phase process of dissemination via the faculties (as described below) was devised and is now well under way.

Phase one, completed by April 2009, consisted of a series of generic workshops, offered by staff from the Faculty of Education to all Heads of Department, plus one additional departmental representative. The purpose of these workshops was to introduce senior academics to key concepts of the learning-to-be philosophy and to identify its implications for teaching and learning in the respective faculties.

Phase Two, facilitated by staff from the ADS, began with a shift of focus to specific disciplines, which to date includes the Departments of Graphic Design, Business Information Technology, Law, Commercial Accounting and Civil Engineering Technology, as well as ADS staff. The purpose of the two workshops is to consider the learning-to-be philosophy, as it applies to particular knowledge domains, identify the precise nature of specific curricula, and ensure that there is alignment between programme and module outcomes, assessment practices and pedagogical practice. This process will continue in 2011 and will also be formally monitored by the staff involved. By the end of 2011, at least twenty departments will have completed these workshops.

Phase Three involves independent and ongoing development of curriculum reform in departments. This Phase will begin early in 2011 and run parallel to Phase Two. Departments that have completed the discipline-specific workshops will be in a position of being sufficiently familiar with the learning-to-be philosophy and its implementation to ensure its ongoing development, and to disseminate the philosophy to other departments in the Faculty, thereby both sustaining existing developments and increasing staff participation.

(b) The University is constantly guarding against **academic drift** away from vocational programmes, while including and carefully considering such programmes in enrolment planning, and monitoring registrations continuously.

It should be noted, however, that several structural impetuses (mentioned below) are currently impacting on the **vocational programmes** offered by the UJ. Firstly, the present funding formula does not support the offering of low-level qualifications. Secondly, there is pressure from the market – for instance, on the Faculty of Art Design and Architecture, where private providers are offering degrees; and from professional councils - for instance, from the HPCSA on the Faculty of Health Sciences. Given that this professional council is requiring the latter faculty to convert its present diplomas to degrees, it is planned to compensate for this to some extent by introducing two-year diplomas for mid-level health workers.

4.1.2.3 Work integrated learning

As far as WIL is concerned, a considerable amount of work was done during 2010, on developing institution-wide structures for the enhanced management of WIL, previously managed primarily at faculty level. At the same time, it is important that Executive Deans retain overall responsibility for WIL, as a credit-bearing component of the teaching programme.

At a meeting of the Senate Teaching and Learning Committee (STLC) in October 2010, a framework for the management of WIL, which will require a twice-yearly reporting forum for the coordination of WIL (rather than a Senate committee), was approved. The forum will report to the STLC, which in turn, reports to Senate. This way, the University has reaffirmed its commitment to maintaining WIL, as an important credit-bearing component of its diploma qualifications. In particular, the Faculty of Management is seeking to extend a form of WIL to all qualifications offered by the Faculty.

Action Plan 3: Contact time

Attention is being paid to **contact teaching time**. Principle 6 of the UJ Teaching and Learning Strategy states: *In principle, formal contact (i.e. lecturing and tutoring, but excluding "practicals") should, in the case of undergraduate modules, preferably not be less than 150 minutes per week, and should also preferably not exceed 250 min per week, unless approved by Senate*. The Strategy requires gradual implementation of the policy on increased contact time, with an initial focus on first-year modules with unsatisfactory performance. Venue constraints are being experienced on the APK campus. In 2009, the University spent R10m on the construction of additional tutorial venues on this campus, which have been very well used. Currently, an MEC task team is considering the construction of additional tutorial venues or refurbishment of existing space for tutorial purposes.

Standardising the **timetable** across campuses and increasing the number of contact hours in a clash-free timetable proved to be quite a challenge. In 2005, the University established a Timetable Committee (i.e. faculty representatives and staff from Academic Administration) under the leadership of the Registrar. The Committee reports to Senex, but regular reports are also submitted to MECA and the STLC.

The UJ uses the well-known *O!Class* software of ITS Abacus, but due to the extreme complexity of the academic qualification structure (especially on APK campus), the software has since been rendered useless. This complexity relates to the dissimilar structure of the qualifications on offer by each faculty, the choice offered to students to select from a large number of electives, the presence of service modules, which links the complexity of one faculty to another, and the large number of lectures and tutorial sessions offered per module per week. (In 2011, the University offers ± 6 500 active modules.) Large classes (e.g. 4 800 students in Business Management) are divided into smaller groups – each one requiring the same number of contact sessions (e.g. lectures, tutorial sessions, etc.). Limited human resources imply that the same lecturer has to repeat the lecture 4 - 6 times – putting the timetable under increased stress. Some modules require two sets of contact sessions, one for Afrikaans and one for English. Legacy timetabling on the former TWR and RAU campuses also contributed to the challenge.

The purpose is to standardise the timetable across campuses. The challenge on the APK campus is to implement a timetable that offers at least three contact lectures of 50 minutes each, per module, to align contact time with the requirements of the UJ Teaching and Learning Strategy. The following has been achieved:

- On SWC, a zero-based timetable was implemented successfully.
- On APB, a zero-based timetable was introduced. After experiencing some problems reverted to a zero-based timetable a second time, which proved to be successful.
- DFC proved to be more problematic, with some faculties not complying with the zerobased timetable. This matter is addressed by the Registrar in collaboration with the relevant Deans on a continuous basis.
- APK proved to be a real challenge. The action plan below refers to the steps taken to address the matter on this specific campus.

The action plan for APK consists of the following two phases:

Phase 1: 2011

- (i) During the second semester of 2011, the identified high-risk modules will have three contact lectures on the timetable. This will involve ±50 modules with poor student success.
- (ii) Lectures will be offered during lunch time.
- (iii) Lectures will commence at 7:30.
- (iv) A culture period will be included on Fridays (all campuses).
- (v) Ad hoc non-subsidised programmes will be moved to Saturdays.

Phase 2: 2012

- (i) The number of electives will have to be decreased. This can be done by identifying the popular modules (i.e. the 20% electives in a programme, taken by 80% of the students).
- (ii) Modules with exceptionally small numbers of students (e.g. less than five students) will be identified. This will inform decisions regarding the number of electives that should be excluded, or the development of alternative strategies to accommodate such students outside the official campus timetable.
- (iii) Timetabling workshops will be conducted in 2011, to facilitate the processes and discuss the implications for faculties.
- (iv) A zero-based timetable will be implemented on APK in 2012.

4.2 **RECOMMENDATION 3**

The HEQC recommends that the University of Johannesburg investigates the teaching and learning experience, as well as the learning environment of its foreign and black students to understand the nature of racism and xenophobia and then develop and implement programmes that will ensure that such students are integrated and fully supported. In the case of the foreign students this should include the review of the role of the International Office.

4.2.1 Related concerns

The following concerns were identified and clustered, as follows:

Xenophobia

- (i) The Panel heard of instances of behaviour among students that suggest that there was a lack of genuine integration of foreign African students into the University of Johannesburg's student life. This was reinforced by the apparent xenophobic attitudes on the part of South African Black students. The Panel would like to urge the institution to investigate the extent of xenophobia among students and between staff and students and to develop the appropriate mechanisms to make tolerance and democratic values important aspects of the curricula and non-curricular experience at the University of Johannesburg (p.24).
- (ii) The institution might also want to consider the role of the International Office to extend beyond its most obvious administrative function (p.25).

Racist, sexist and conservative attitudes among staff

(iii) The Panel heard and observed racist, sexist and conservative attitudes among staff and would like to encourage the University to develop appropriate interventions to ensure that individual attitudes do not compromise the goal of developing an embracing and inclusive institutional culture (p.25).

4.2.2 UJ response and action plans

The following two action plans are envisaged:

Action Plan 1: Integration of foreign African students

Towards the end of 2007, the UJ embarked on integration and diversity interventions that were aimed at addressing the racism issues experienced in some of the UJ residences. After an intervention of almost three years, it is believed that the issues of racism in the residences have been erased, as not a single incident was reported to management or the local media.

Black, White and international students co-exist peacefully and are fully integrated in the residences. According to the Guiding Principles for the Admission and Placement of Students in the UJ residences, the institution strives to reserve 20% of the beds in the residences for international students, although the latter constitute only 4-6% of the total number of UJ students.

International students can be elected to a campus SRC, and the UJSRC deputy president is responsible for international students in his/her portfolio. When reviewing the SRC constitution for 2012, it is intended to have international student support included in the portfolio of every campus SRC Transformation Officer.

As indicated above, the workshops were successful and have laid a sound foundation for further interventions in the themes that follow below. However, xenophobia can flare up at any time, despite best efforts. Gender-based violence was identified as a new challenge that is not only facing society, but also higher education institutions. In order to address this problem, the UJ will embark on specific interventions (below) from 2011, to support student leadership and residences that have become fully integrated, as indicated earlier. The themes below were identified for a series of workshops.

(a) Gender-based violence

The following questions will be addressed:

- Are males inherently violent?
- What is the general understanding of masculinity?
- Which factors contribute to violence?
- In what ways are women abused by men?
- How can women avoid or escape gender violence?
- What precautionary measures can they take?
- In what ways can a gender and violence free campus be created at the UJ?

(b) Xenophobia

The following questions will be addressed:

- What is xenophobia?
- What are the key factors that contribute to its spread?
- Is xenophobia consistent with "University" life?
- How does xenophobia manifest itself?
- What are the determinants of xenophobia among South African students?
- What is the connection between culture, race, class, ethnicity and xenophobia?

Gender violence cuts across race, class, culture and ethnicity, and by tackling these aspects in a series of workshops, a strong sense of belonging and unity among female students and male students who abhor such practices, will be forged.

Upon completion of the workshops, a composite report will be prepared for the MEC, covering key issues discussed and conclusions reached.

Action Plan 2: Racist, sexist and conservative attitudes among staff

Consult Action Plan 4: Cultural Integration Project in Section 2.1.2.6. The five phases are discussed, beginning with the Cultural Integration Survey in 2008, and follow-up activities such as workshops on change management, up to the establishment of a Transformation Office.

4.3 RECOMMENDATION 16

The HEQC recommends that the University of Johannesburg develops an appropriate process to use external examiners' and moderators' reports to identify those courses in which issues of standards might constitute a problem and to develop interventions when necessary to correct this situation.

4.3.1 Related concerns

The following clusters of concerns are relevant:

Assessment policy and rules

- (i) Rules regarding assessment should be incorporated into all faculty handbooks (p.47).
- (ii) The UJ did not have a policy for blind marking assessments (p.47).
- (iii) The assessment policy was not applied consistently by all faculties (p.48).

External moderation

- (iv) There was no centralised system to receive reports of external moderators, nor a centralised process of reporting their findings (p.47).
- (v) The Panel had the opportunity to interview moderators and external examiners, as well as to peruse a variety of assignments and examination questions across departments. In many cases, the Panel found no reason for concern, but in some areas it was found that the knowledge and competence requested from students was not always at the expected level (p.47). (This aspect is addressed under Quality Assurance w.r.t. the UJ Quality Promotion Plan.)

Student grievances

(vi) No evidence was found that processes for handling student grievances regarding assessment were monitored and reviewed (p.47).

RPL

(vii) The RPL Policy was not applied consistently by all faculties (p.48).

4.3.2 The UJ response and action plans

The following action steps were taken:

Action Plan 1: Assessment policy and rules

- (a) The Deans are responsible for the implementation of the assessment policy in their faculties.
- (b) Rules regarding assessment will be incorporated into some faculty handbooks, where these have not already been included.
- (c) During the second semester of 2009, a process was introduced, whereby students have the option to enter only their student number and/or identity number on assessment scripts, should they prefer blind marking. However, many students still prefer to enter their name. The system will be monitored regarding its effectiveness and impact.

Action Plan 2: External moderation

- (a) Reports of external examiners and their recommendations are provided to Faculty Assessment Committees in all faculties, where student performance is carefully monitored. Given the size of the UJ faculties, it is felt that a centralised process will not be ideal, nor will it be likely to be effective. At MECA, in March 2011, the Executive Deans indicated that they were decidedly NOT in favour of a centralised process, as this would simply result in a proliferation of reporting.
- (b) The quality review processes that were put in place will address issues such as possible inadequate levels of assessment. In addition, comments from external assessors raising any such issues, must be dealt with by the relevant faculty committee, e.g. the Faculty Assessment Committee.

Action Plan 3: Student grievances and RPL

(a) The Deans are responsible for the establishment and implementation of grievance procedures that also address assessment-related grievances in their faculties.

(b) The RPL Policy is currently being updated by a task team, and is being circulated for comment by faculties. In addition, detailed RPL processes are being developed, to ensure consistency across faculties. Once the draft documents have been finalised, they will be submitted to the UJ Senate for approval, and will then be applicable to all faculties.

4.4 RECOMMENDATION 8

The HEQC recommends that the University of Johannesburg monitors the effectiveness of extended programmes across faculties and that decisions about the future of these programmes are based on teaching and learning criteria, as well as on enrolment considerations.

4.4.1 Related concerns

The following related concerns were identified in the HEQC Audit Report:

- (i) The Academic Development Centre manages the initial year of extended programmes in some faculties, and these modules may not be fully integrated into curricula.
- (ii) In interviews with staff, the Panel heard that one of the faculties was considering to discontinue its extended degree programme, in order to reduce student numbers (p.38).

The following challenge in the HEQC's concluding remarks does not refer directly to any of the recommendations on teaching and learning or programmes. It is addressed here, as Recommendation 8 focuses on (extended) programmes:

The development of clear forms of internal differentiation and articulation between technological and academic programmes.

4.4.2 The UJ response and action plan

The University confirms that all modules offered by the Academic Development Centre within the various extended curricula are fully integrated into the curricula of the respective faculties. This has been a special focus of curriculum development.

Action plan: Extended programmes

The performance of students in these curricula is being monitored carefully. A longitudinal study of students registered for extended diplomas offered by the Faculty of Engineering and the Built Environment since 2004, has been conducted and revealed good performance by students registered for the extended curricula. (This resulted in a paper presented at HELTASA 2009.) A similar study of the extended curricula in the Faculty of Management is currently being conducted.

The UJ remains committed to the extended programmes in five faculties, which since 2010, have moved away from offering alternative access to students who do not satisfy faculty entrance requirements, to accommodating students at the lower end of those who do satisfy faculty entrance requirements. Monitoring of student performance revealed that such students will most likely need at least one additional year to complete their

qualification, and that they were likely to be better prepared and hence more successful by being placed within an extended curriculum.

4.5 RECOMMENDATION 9

The HEQC recommends that the University of Johannesburg ensures that the evaluation of courses and lecturers by students is consistently applied and that its results are used appropriately as one tool for the improvement of teaching and learning.

4.5.1 Related concern

The following related concern was identified:

The Panel found a number of disparities in the application of the policy on course and lecturer evaluations across faculties, with a tendency within some departments to rely solely on informal faculty-level discussions (p.39).

4.5.2 The UJ response and action plan

The following action steps are in place:

Action plan: Evaluation of modules and lecturers by students

The UJ Teaching and Module Evaluation Policy was approved by Senate on 30 September 2009 and amended in 2011. The Centre for Professional Academic Staff Development (CPASD) provides support in the development of the questionnaires, collecting and analysing the data and providing the staff member, the HoD and the Dean with a report. This Policy focuses on student feedback on both teaching and modules, and prescribes 13 core mandatory questions and 12 additional questions that lecturers can select from the approved questionnaire bank. The policy currently states that module and teaching and learning evaluation by students are compulsory. Module evaluations and the evaluation of teaching and learning should be done at least every 3 years. All new staff must conduct an evaluation in their first year at the UJ. In particular, academic staff members who apply for promotion are required to include recent teaching evaluations in their application. In 2010, 415 teaching evaluations and 135 module evaluations were conducted. Deans have been tasked to monitor the compulsory evaluations.

Follow-up discussions with CPASD staff are available to academic staff members who receive a poor evaluation from their students.

At its last meeting in 2010, Senate also approved a framework for the introduction of peer evaluation of teaching, which is intended to complement evaluation by students, and will be introduced on a developmental basis from 2011-2013.

4.6 RECOMMENDATION 10

The HEQC recommends that the University of Johannesburg uses its well-developed information management systems as tools to plan, monitor and assess teaching and learning at programme level. This will require that the institution ensures that academic staff is sufficiently familiar and technically competent to use the available interfaces.

4.6.1 Related concerns

The HEQC Audit Report included the following concerns in this regard:

- (i) The Panel would like to encourage the institution to use the implementation of its Teaching and Learning Policy as an opportunity to assess the utilisation of the knowledge gathered by profiling students, in order to review existing approaches to teaching and learning (p.37).
- (ii) With regard to the management of teaching and learning, the Panel noted with concern the lack of synchronisation between the data used to plan and inform teaching and learning initiatives (p.39).
- (iii) From interviews with staff, data gathering approaches appeared at best mechanical, and at worst, unresponsive. In part, this resulted in a lack of shared understanding among middle and senior management and lecturers about the emerging student profile of the institution (p.39).
- (iv) The Panel encourages the University to make effective use of its available information systems as tools for the improvement of teaching and learning at the institution (p.39).

4.6.2 The UJ response and action plan

The following action steps are in place:

Action Plan: Academic planning

Student profiling, involving the gathering of data from first-year entrants during Orientation, by means of questionnaires, has become established practice at the UJ over the past five years. The data has been gathered and analysed, and formed the substance of a completed doctoral thesis.

An Incoming Student Profile (including NSC and NBT results) is made available to faculties during March each year. Further research is being undertaken to assess the possible predictive validity of key indicators, regarding subsequent performance in higher education studies. The purpose of this project is to alert teaching staff about the profile of their class (e.g. the percentage of students with English as a second language; study habits; NBT performance), so that these issues can be accommodated in pedagogical approaches. Given the availability of longitudinal data, changes in student profile can be identified over years, and these can be incorporated into the development of learning materials, assessment approaches and tutorials.

Regular monitoring, reporting and analysis of student performance data was put in place. In a discussion with Executive Deans in late 2010, agreement was reached on dates for finalisation of input data, namely mid-August for first-semester results, and the end of February for the previous year's results. These reports now serve at the STLC and at Senate regularly.

Special focus has been placed on risk modules, i.e. modules with a student success rate of below 60%, and Faculties are required to put in place and report on suitable interventions. Similarly, SAFENET (within FYE) is using the UJ's information management systems to identify students who appear to be 'at-risk', well before the final examinations.

Training was put in place for staff to draw information from SAFENET. Initial training of selected staff only took place towards the end of 2010, and training will be rolled out more widely during 2011, as the project develops further.

4.7 RECOMMENDATION 14

The HEQC recommends that the University of Johannesburg reviews its policy in offering the range of Short Learning Programmes to ensure that these do not negatively impact in the quality of the mainstream teaching and learning programmes.

4.7.1 Related concerns

The following concerns are relevant:

- (i) The Panel is concerned that the wide range of short learning programmes offered,
 (a) are competing with the subsidised programmes; (b) detract from the institution's core academic activities; and (c) are not linked strategically, to articulate with the institution's postgraduate initiatives.
- (ii) The Panel is of the view that the large number of short learning programmes might be impacting negatively on the core teaching programmes of the institution (p.44).

4.7.2 The UJ response and Quality Improvement Plan

The issue of short learning programmes is addressed in the wider context of non-subsidised programmes that include a variety of programmes, namely:

- Non-credit-bearing short learning programmes (SLPs)
- Credit-bearing short learning programmes (i.e. fewer than 120 credits)
- Whole qualifications (i.e. 120 and more credits).

Action plan: Non-subsidised programmes

The following action steps have been taken and/or are planned:

- (a) A survey on non-subsidised programmes was conducted in 2010, with the purpose of identifying the scope and nature of these programmes and to collect appropriate information for the development of an institutional data base for non-subsidised programmes. A number of concerns were identified, e.g. number of additional SLPs, sites of delivery, resource implications, financial management, etc.
- (b) The report was disseminated in January 2011, and it was decided that a comprehensive framework for non-subsidised programmes should be developed, to address matters such as the development and approval of these programmes, alignment with subsidised programmes, inclusive of postgraduate programmes (w.r.t. the PQM), permission to offer these programmes (e.g. by taking the purpose, i.e. commercial versus professional/community development, into consideration), sites of delivery, governance at institutional and faculty levels, financial and human resources matters.
- (c) The existing programme policy has to be revised, and a separate policy for non-subsidised programmes developed.

- (d) Data bases for non-subsidised programmes, including SLPs, should be developed, taking the approved institutional PQM into consideration.
- (e) The existing quality system should be modified, to include quality promotion processes and mechanisms for non-subsidised programmes. The units of analysis in the UJ Quality Promotion Plan: 2011 2016 will be adjusted, to include the reviews of non-subsidised programmes as well as the centres/units in faculties that manage such programmes.

5. ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT

Recommendation 11

- •Staff:student ratio (UJLIC)
- Book titles per student
- Library hours
- Student:PC ratio

Recommendation 12

ICT Strategy

Recommendation 15

Professional academic staff development

Recommendation 13

Certification

Recommendation 17

Security of student records and examination documentation

5. ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT

All the recommendations that focus on academic administration and support are addressed below.

5.1 RECOMMENDATION 11

The HEQC recommends that the University of Johannesburg takes steps to ensure that there is equivalence of provision of library services across all campuses and strengthen the underdeveloped sections of the library such as the undergraduate collection.

5.1.1 Related concerns

The following concerns w.r.t. the UJLIC are relevant:

- (i) The University acknowledges that the library is inadequately staffed, more especially at the SWC and DFC campuses. The poor staff:student ratio in comparison with other South African university libraries has resulted in the extensive use of student assistants (p.41).
- (ii) The University acknowledges that the ratio of book titles per student is inadequate in comparison to other South African academic libraries. The undergraduate collection is particularly poor (p.41).
- (iii) The libraries have varying opening hours, ranging from 52 hours at the SWC campus to 82 hours at the APK campus. The Panel suggests that the institution give immediate attention to this inequitable situation (p.41).

5.1.2 The UJ response and action plans: UJLIC

The following action plans are in place:

Action Plan 1: Staff:student ratio

One of the outcomes of the UJLIC investigation into **staff:student ratio** was that a task team was appointed at the end of 2009, to develop an efficient and effective HR structure. The UJ Library and Information Centre (UJLIC) structure was benchmarked against those of other SA university libraries. The purpose of the UJLIC HR structure is to align the HR provision of the library with the library's five-year strategic plan (approved in 2009). The technology approach adopted by the UJLIC, has implications for the reallocation of staff and the reorganisation of services and functions. Inadequate staffing will be addressed once approval has been obtained. In the interim, student assistants and temporary staff are appointed for effective service delivery. The following action steps are envisaged:

- (i) Implementation of the new HR structure: As soon as the MEC approves the structure (submitted for the May 2011 meeting).
- (ii) Benchmarking was done against four leading South African traditional university libraries and three universities of technology in 2009, in order to establish the UJLIC five-year plan (2010-2014), including the HR structure. An amount of R41 million was projected for the HR structure budget in 2014.
- (iii) Determining staff:student ratios per campus library according to the current structure.

 The ratio of students:campus library staff per campus is currently (2011) as follows:

Campus	Number of students	Campus Library staff members*	Student:staff ratio
APK	27437	33	831:1
APB	9374	18	521:1
DFC	8040	11	731:1
SWC	5560	12	463:1
TOTAL	50 411	74	672:1

^{*} This does not include centralised, technical support staff members who serve all campus libraries.

(iv) In the medium term, staff:student ratios will be addressed by the phased implementation of the new library structure as well as the Campus Master Plan. Faculty Librarians will be relocated to the home campus of the faculty they support when the Master Plan is implemented.

Action Plan 2: Book titles per student

A comparative evaluation on the ratio of **book titles per student** was done per campus in 2010. The declining information budget over the past three years, resulted in a poor title:student ratio. The situation can be addressed because of a significant increase in the overall budget in 2010.

The purchase of prescribed titles for first-year risk modules for the first semester of 2011 has been done. In 2011, one hundred and thirty four (134) copies of twenty five (25) prescribed titles were purchased at a total cost of R 66 400 40. The UJLIC funded the project during 2010 and for the first semester of 2011. However, the University will have to make provision for specific funds for text books should the provision of multiple copies of text books for risk modules become standard practice.

A comparison of the number of titles per student indicates a distribution of the UJLIC collection as a whole, with a ratio of 11:1 titles per student for 2011. The situation looks different when campus libraries' collections are assessed separately, as indicated in the table below.

Campus	Students	Book titles	Ratio: titles per		
	(Headcount)		student		
APB (including FADA)	9 324	46 241	5:1		
APK	27 437	405 739	15:1		
DFC (including ERC)	8 040	55 496	7:1		
SWC	5 560	36 564	6:1		
Total	50 411	544 040	11:1		

The title:student ratio will be impacted by the Campus Master Plan, as relevant collections will be moved with the faculties.

The allocation of the available budget for purchasing books is done according to a formula, based on relevant aspects, such as FTEs per faculty and the average cost of a book for a specific subject. The formula is currently under review, in an attempt to achieve an equitable allocation of funds. If this can be achieved, it will contribute to the alignment of the book titles per student ratio across campuses. The final date for the completion of the review process is 1 June 2011.

Action Plan 3: Library hours

Approval was obtained for:

- (i) the extension of library hours **till midnight** during study weeks and examinations in June-July and October-November 2010; and
- (ii) the SWC library to stay open till 22:00 on weekdays, and on Saturdays till 15:00.

The SWC library extended its hours till 22:00, from 1 February 2011. The additional cost of opening the libraries till midnight during examination periods was determined as R249 325 per annum. This amount is subject to inflationary increases. The availability of staff willing and able to work such late hours poses specific problems. A report in this regard was submitted to the MEC.

Action Plan 4: Student:PC ratio

Reduce **student:PC ratio** by 50% over next 5 years, in order to achieve an average student/PC ratio of 70:1. Achieving the proposed student:PC ratio of 70:1 by 2015 is subject to the availability of the budget for both PCs and staff to maintain the increased number of PCs.

One hundred and sixteen (116) additional student workstations have been purchased and installed, in order to reduce the student:PC ratio, as indicated below. Eighty (80) PCs were donated to the SWC library as part of campus renovation. These will be installed when the necessary technology infrastructure has been installed.

The table below provides an overview of the current student: PC ratio per campus (2011).

Campus	Number of students*	Number of PCs	Student:PC ratio
APB & FADA	9 374	83	112:1
APK	27 437	201	127:1
DFC	8 040	49	164:1
SWC	5 560	50	111:1
TOTAL	50 411	383	131:1

The increase in student numbers on DFC and SWC impacted negatively on student:PC ratios, despite the increased number of PCs. The implementation of the Campus Master Plan will cause some fluctuation in numbers.

5.2 RECOMMENDATION 12

The HEQC recommends that the University of Johannesburg ensures equivalence of provision across all campuses of its information and communication technology services.

5.2.1 Related concerns

The following concerns refer to the information and communication technology services in Recommendation 12 above.

- (i) The Panel learned from the AP and through interviews with academics from campuses other than APK that Edulink is available, and is equally accessible at all campuses. However, the Panel urges the institution to address the under-utilization of this resource at some campuses (p.41).
- (ii) The Panel found during interviews and campus visits that there are considerable infrastructural inequalities regarding the availability of computer laboratories and computer equipment across the various campuses. This negatively impacts on the quality and equivalence of provision across the campuses (p.42)

5.2.2 The UJ response and action plans

In accordance with the UJ Campus Master Plan (30 May 2008), the projected 2014 student numbers on the various campuses will change the total number of students on each campus drastically, in comparison with the current situation. The responsibility for monitoring and updating the Campus Master Plan resides with the DVC Strategic Services. The Campus Master Plan is updated on a regular basis. (Consult Action Plan 2 in Section 2.1.2.2 for more information on the Campus Master Plan.)

An analysis of the number of computers in general (i.e. 'open') computer laboratories on the various campuses, together with the total number of students registered in 2009 and 2010 on the various campuses, indicated that the ratios were different on each campus.

In January 2011, the Faculty of Education will have largely relocated to the SWC, and several programme offerings from Education, as well as the Faculties of Management and Economics and Financial Sciences, which will move to SWC, i.e. the total number of students, especially on APB and APK, will change from 2011 onwards. New ratios will emerge, based on the projected number of students, as the implementation of the UJ Campus Master Plan is rolled out. All new developments and additions to the delivery of information and communication services on the various campuses will consider the future impact of the UJ Campus Master Plan, to ensure equitable resource and equipment allocation.

Action plan: ICT Strategy

During 2010, the MEC constituted an ICT task team during 2010 under the leadership of the DVC: Strategic Services. The task team has the task of delivering a ten-year ICT Strategy for the University. A working document, developed in October 2010, identified the following themes from the work of the various sub-task teams:

- Governance
- Staffing of the ICS function
- Support for open access models

- Use of open source applications
- Large bandwidth
- Supercomputing capability
- Ubiquitous access to systems
- Providing students with technology, software and infrastructure support
- Management information provision
- Federated identity management
- Electronic document management
- Customer relationship management
- Modern student management system
- Upgrade APB and DFC data centres
- Upgrade campus networks
- Upgrade inter campus networks
- Virtualising of infrastructure.

The Centre for Technology-Assisted Learning (CenTAL) is increasing its visibility on DFC, APB and SWC. Increased professional development of lecturers, training of students and support services are offered to Edulink users on the various campuses. However, the number of CenTAL staff members has not been increased, to cope with the growth and increased expectations of users and management over the past years.

There is already a significant increase in the number of lecturers who use Edulink and other educational technologies on DFC, APB and SWC. (Currently, more than a 1 000 lecturers have several modules activated on Edulink, which is used by more than 43 000 students.)

Based on the number of FTE students for which the DFC Campus is planned (2009 figures + 11%), the headcount of 12 000 should be used as a basis for planning purposes. The average ratio of students to computer stations for the University seems to be 12:1. This implies that 1 000 computer stations would be required of which 400 have already been supplied. This leaves 600 new stations to be provided.

The work of the ICT task team is geared towards ensuring the equivalence of provision of information and communication technology services across all campuses. As a result, an audit was conducted, and the findings on computers and computer labs on the various campuses were reported to the DVC: Strategic Services. However, Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) are not only about computers and computer labs – the use of technology in Education also implies the use of other new technologies. Therefore, the findings and recommendations of the ICT task team will also focus on the equivalence of provision of technologies other than conventional computers (e-learning, m-learning, etc.), across all UJ campuses.

The intention is not to build many more computer labs on the various campuses, except on DFC in 2011, but to enable/assist students to acquire/access mobile devices such as net books, tablets, smart phones, etc., to be used in open learning spaces where they can easily access and use the internet and other social media to engage in a range of teaching and learning activities and collaboration with peers and friends. For students who cannot afford

to buy their own devices, the University will still provide access via computer labs that are appropriately resourced and situated, where there is an identified need.

5.3 RECOMMENDATION 15

The HEQC recommends that the University of Johannesburg uses the opportunity presented by the preparation of the Professional Academic Staff Development Framework to deal with the regulation (obligatory or voluntary), monitoring and evaluation of continuous academic staff development, as well as induction opportunities.

5.3.1 Related concerns

- (i) The Panel learned from members of CPASD that a major weakness in academic staff development is poor attendance of their workshops. The Panel heard during interviews with various categories of staff that time constraints and workload are the main reasons for non-participation in staff development opportunities.
- (ii) There is no obligation for part-time and contract staff to attend sessions of the preparation programme for new staff. Furthermore, it is not compulsory for newly appointed academic staff to attend orientation or other staff development opportunities. The Panel suggests that the institution use the opportunity presented by the preparation of the Professional Academic Staff Development Framework to deal with these issues and those regarding staff participation in academic development opportunities (p.46).

5.3.2 The UJ response and action plan

The following action steps are in place:

Action plan: Professional academic staff development

Concerted strategies have been implemented to increase workshop attendance by publicising the programmes via the Executive Deans and HoDs. The CPASD has now also scheduled the academic preparation workshop and follow-up compulsory workshops for new staff bi-annually, before lectures begin in January and again in the July recess, i.e. when no teaching activities take place.

In 2010, 77 newly appointed academic staff attended two three-day programmes for new staff. In addition, a further 44 professional development workshops were presented, with a total attendance of 925 academic staff. Attendee information is analysed in terms of faculties and departments, to create an awareness of under-represented faculties and departments.

The Professional Academic Staff Development Framework was approved by Senate on 30 September 2009 and implemented by the CPASD from January 2010. In terms of this framework, attendance at the 'Induction into academic practice' programme is now compulsory for newly appointed academic staff (temporary, fixed-term contract and permanent). Similarly, attendance of the academic management and leadership development programme for HODs is also compulsory. (Attendance of two out of four workshops is required.)

Attendance of the numerous workshops on the broad field of teaching and the facilitation of learning, curriculum and materials development, assessment of learning, and feedback for enhanced student learning, is open to staff appointed on contract, and some of these staff members do attend.

5.4 RECOMMENDATION 13

The HEQC recommends that the University of Johannesburg reviews its allocation of responsibilities pertaining to management, issuing and printing of certificates to minimize the institutional risk arising from exclusive responsibilities residing with a single person.

5.4.1 Related concerns

Relevant concerns are:

- (i) Single member of staff appears to have the sole responsibility to manage the processes of issuing and printing of the certificates (p. 56).
- (ii) No evidence of any controls being in place to ameliorate any possible institutional risk (p.56).
- (iii) No evidence that there are regular or ongoing reviews of the processes (p.56).

5.4.2 The UJ response and action plan

The following action steps are in place:

Action plan: Certification

Academic Administration is responsible for centralised control and governance of the certification process for all faculties across all campuses. Currently reporting to the Senior Manager: Faculty Coordination, there is only one Senior Academic Administration Officer: Certification, responsible for the logistical arrangements and printing of certificates. The Senior Manager: Faculty Coordination serves as back-up support, to take over in the event of any crisis.

The following management support structures are in place to support the process:

- Institutional Graduation Committee
- Monthly work schedules
- The Certification Policy
- The Graduation Policy
- Academic Regulations
- Academic Administration internal review (conducted in 2008).

Additional ITS system changes and improvements (e.g. stricter control for the identification of graduates and certificate number record locking) were implemented, to secure the processes in a multi-campus environment.

This will be the fourth year in which certificates issued, will be audited externally by external auditors (PriceWaterHouseCoopers) for policy and governance compliance. No exceptions or critical concerns were noted in the final evaluations from 2006 to 2009, and every audit concluded with a positive response on the management of the process.

After the 2008 Academic Administration internal review, the following improvement strategies were proposed:

- The University must provide additional internal auditors, to assist in the evaluation of reliable data structures, risk mitigation strategies and quality assurance mechanisms.
- Additional benchmarking must be done via Conferences ITS User Group/TIFAF, and collaboration with other universities.
- Additional staff should be employed to act as back-up support for the printing of certificates and the verification of qualifications. Currently, there is only one staff member with this responsibility.

Extensive benchmarking and collaboration strategies were initiated over the past two years. A full-time staff member was employed, to assist with certification duties. Unfortunately, this post could only be approved on a three-year contract basis (until the end of 2012).

The following action steps for improvement are proposed in view of the HEQC audit recommendation:

- (a) Convert the three-year contract post (approved to support the one staff member with certification duties and to act as back-up support for printing certificates) to a permanent post.
- (b) Initiate an internal audit on the certification process and control mechanisms currently in place at the UJ, in addition to the external process already in place.

5.5 RECOMMENDATION 17

The HEQC recommends that the University of Johannesburg takes immediate action to ensure the security of student records and the examination documentation and implement measures that will curb all forms of academic fraud at the institution.

5.5.1 Related concerns

The following concerns are relevant:

- (i) Student records were found in an unlocked cupboard that could be easily accessed.
- (ii) Examination answer books are used for tests and returned to students.
- (iii) An increase in academic fraud at the University, which has resulted in disciplinary action, was noted (p.48).

5.5.2 The UJ response and action plan

At institutional level, Academic Administration (reporting to the Registrar) is responsible for examinations and coordination of faculty administration.

Action plan: Security of student records and examination documentation

- (a) A learner record refers to the academic achievements and history of a student. Administration of student records, as well as that of faculty assessments is the responsibility of the Head of Faculty Administration (HFA) of each faculty. The processes and security of learner records are described in the teaching, learning and assessment policies of the University, as well as in the following policies:
 - Academic Regulations

- Policy on Access to the Student Administration System
- Policy on the Rules of Assessment and Invigilation
- Recording of Assessment Results
- Retention of Learner Records.

Basic processes are listed, but processes are not implemented uniformly across faculties, as a result of unique faculty-specific factors.

(b) The UJ enlisted the assistance of a firm specialising in the secure storage of hard copy documentation (METROFILE) for the purpose of having all documents with security value, for instance student and examination documentation (including examination books and mark sheets), securely filed, from where it can be retrieved, when necessary.

Electronic versions of student academic records will still be stored on ITS at the UJ. ITS functionality will be enhanced to accommodate test marks in addition to examination results.

- (c) During 2010 and 2011, faculties were once again instructed to use only specially designed test paper for the purpose of tests. Examination answer books should only be used for official examinations. This rule is brought to the attention of the faculties on a regular basis and was also discussed at the Final Assessment Coordination Committee meeting of 8 June 2010. Communication about the use of test and examination answer books will be continued and reinforced at various levels.
- (d) All **examination invigilators** are instructed to be on the lookout during all tests and examinations that this rule (see (c) above) is being applied and to report any deviation from the rule. This rule has also been included in the Examination Instructions that are sent to all academic, administrative and invigilation staff involved in examinations on a regular basis. Invigilators report discrepancies to the Invigilators' Coordinator.
 - (e) Electronic fingerprinting will soon be used to monitor student attendance of lectures and examinations. A system, **Integrita**, is being developed in collaboration with external consultants. For this purpose, the fingerprints of students were already captured during registration in 2010 and 2011, and the data base for comparisons will be extended every year. The system was tested in selected large classes, and the pilot phase will be introduced during the second semester of 2011. It is expected that the system will be fully operational in 2012.
- (f) From an examination perspective, the UJ is currently developing a **computer programme to formalise all test mark procedures** in academic departments. Test marks are to be captured on the main data base, as is the case with examination marks. Computer log files will then be accessible to monitor changes to test marks by academic departments.

6. RESEARCH AND SUPERVISION

Recommendation 18

- Young researchers
- Research foci
- Financial support

Recommendation 19

- Postgraduate supervision
- Postgraduate enrolment
- Postgraduate throughtput

6. RESEARCH AND SUPERVISION

6.1 RECOMMENDATION 18

The HEQC recommends that the University of Johannesburg investigates the workload of young academics involved in furthering their qualifications and research career in order to develop adequate and realistic support systems for them and the university to fulfil their research ambitions.

6.1.1 Related concerns

The relevant concerns have been clustered as follows:

Young researchers

- (i) The Panel would like to caution the institution about the need to look into the ability of its undergraduate programmes to produce students with sufficient depths of disciplinary knowledge and basic research skills which will facilitate the articulation between undergraduate and postgraduate studies (p.53).
- (ii) The Panel is concerned that there are no researchers in the 'P' category and the decline in the 'L' category which are the indicators of the development of young and previously disadvantaged researchers (p.51).
- (iii) In interviews with younger academics the Panel heard of alienation from senior management; inordinate pressure to publish; and to do so in conditions in which academics are carrying heavy teaching and administrative loads (p.54).
- (iv) While the Panel heard of strong support from senior established researchers for the initiatives taken in implementing the research and innovation strategy, it is concerned about the negative experiences related by some younger academics (p.54).
- (v) The Panel would like the institution to consider ways in which young academics can be supported (p.54).

Research foci

(vi) UJ was cautioned against a range of research foci that might be too disparate and therefore be unattainable (p.50).

Financial support

- (vii) There was an absence of a multi-year view with corresponding key indicators and budget plans for research (p.50).
- (viii) Procurement of research material and equipment was seemingly problematic (p.53).
- (ix) Some researchers found it difficult to access their own research funds (p.53).

6.1.2 UJ response and action plans

6.1.2.1 Young researchers

An institutional circular, drafted by the DVC: Research, Innovation and Advancement towards the end of 2010, entitled *Institutional Expectations for Research Output*, was prepared in order to respond to Recommendation 18 and related concerns, namely:

How the UJ research drive is directed through faculties?

- What are the expectations of staff in the different faculties regarding research outputs?
- What is the research output requirements needed from the ex-Technikon staff?

The Circular highlights that UJ is committed to be a *research-focused* university and has set itself a definitive goal to reach at least 600 accredited research outputs by 2012. Generally, it is acknowledged that research prowess, measured in terms of research output, research impact and research capacity, determines in most cases the reputation of a university.

Currently, the University's strong research programmes reside in the faculties of Humanities, Science, Law, Health Sciences and Management as measured by the number of members of staff with postgraduate training. A lot of potential exists at FEBE and given the recent strategic interventions; the faculty will play a significant role in the future. The University recognizes that some faculties, because of the nature of their discipline, academic programmes and staff profile are in a better position to contribute more towards the research agenda. Given this differentiation, the UJ has different expectations on research outputs from the faculties and their individual members of staff. In other faculties where research traditions are not so strong and where staff members come from a technikon environment, the UJ expects staff's research productivity to be one research unit per staff member over two years. In these faculties, staff members are also expected to be involved in the production of other creative outputs like theatre productions, paintings, and so on.

At the UJ, the strong research faculties are nurtured and at the same time latent research and potential are unlocked across the other faculties. Thus, there is a strong drive to develop and encourage new researchers, but at the same time to develop different expectations and targets. The expected research output targets for a year per faculty are set in consultation and agreement between the relevant Executive Dean and the DVC Research, Innovation and Advancement. In turn, the individual member of staff yearly research output is managed at the faculty level. It is to be commended that all faculties have placed measures and incentives to stimulate academic members of staff to publish in accredited journals.

To ensure that the UJ adequately fulfils its research ambitions over the coming years, various strategic research-related plans have already been devised and approved. Most of them are in the implementation stage. Action Plan 1 below (and its various action steps) denotes several initiatives aimed at furthering the qualification levels and research careers of talented young academics, via an appropriate research support and incentive system.

Two of these initiatives are of particular pertinence because of their focus on promoting postgraduate studies at the UJ, and increased participation:

Action Plan 1: Young researchers

This Action Plan consists of the following components:

A. Next Generation Scholarship Programme (NGS)

(a) The NGS

UJ set aside R25-million for scholarships for Master's and Doctoral students.

Successful M and D students receive R80K and R130K per annum respectively. On successful completion of their studies, doctoral graduates are guaranteed a job at the UJ. The NGS is meant to provide future academic staff to the UJ. The programme structure ensures that the best 50% of the Master's graduates progress to PhD studies and at the completion of the PhD degree, the candidates are guaranteed a job at UJ. There is a direct impact of the programme on UJ staffing needs in the future as the Faculties are obliged to employ these candidates. The trajectory of students cannot be predicted in terms of their progress. It is, however, anticipated that a total of 87 graduates will emanate from the programme, i.e. 47 Doctoral and 40 Masters. The NGSP is a real incentive for younger and emerging researchers. The Postgraduate Centre (PGC) is currently responsible for the overall operational management of the NGS Programme.

- (b) Combining NGS with NRF Scholarships: Students holding scholarships with contractual obligations (such as within the NGS programme) are not normally allowed to hold NRF scholarships concurrently with such scholarships. However, the purpose of the NGS scholarships meets the NRF's aim of retaining capacity in academia and research (this case was presented to the NRF). The NRF thus agreed to award bursaries to students holding NGS scholarships up to a maximum value, viz. R100K at Master's level and R150K at Doctoral level. The CSIR also agreed to contribute top-up funding to two students who had applied for the UJ-CSIR scholarship.
- (c) Research-related training, development and exposure: A survey on training needs was undertaken in 2009 by the Post Graduate Funding Support. The survey revealed that the training needs varied across faculties, as well as across the levels of study. Generic workshops were therefore presented on topics such as: 1) The Masters Dissertation and 2) Argument in Research Writing. In 2010, NGS students attended various workshops arranged by the Training and Development Section of the PGC including RefWorks which was facilitated by the Library. A Postgraduate Symposium was also held in October 2010, which provided an excellent opportunity for NGS students to showcase their work in the form of presentations and posters. NGS students also chaired the various sessions.

B. Participation in the NRF's Thuthuka programme for upcoming researchers

The UJ has adopted an operational plan to encourage more researchers to apply for NRF-rating, via the NRF's Thuthuka programme, which is meant to nurture young and upcoming researchers. The outcomes and impact of the Programme are continuously monitored at various forums and levels.

Increased participation in the NRF's Thuthuka programme: By December 2010, UJ had 90 NRF-rated researchers. In 2011, **35** young and upcoming researchers (in comparison to **10** in 2010) have already applied for financial support through Thuthuka, to the amount of R2.3 million. The applications were for NRF rating, post-PhD tracking and PhD tracking.

The demographic profile (in terms of gender and race) of the 35 applicants in 2011, in comparison to the 10 applicants in 2010, is as follows:

- Female: 29 out of 35 (83%) in 2011 vs. 6 out of 10 (60%) in 2010;
- African: 9 out of 35 (26%) in 2011 vs. 2 out of 10 (20%) in 2010; and
- Black: 20 out of 35 (57%) in 2011 vs. 5 out of 10 (50%) in 2010.

Of the 35 researchers that applied for NRF funding, 13 were successful: 5 for NRF rating, 4 each for Post PhD and PhD tracking support at a total cost of R1.513 million. The Thuthuka programme for emerging researchers (especially in Categories 'L' and 'P') is beginning to produce research-related dividends for UJ and will hopefully continue to do so.

- C. Attracting an appropriate number of postgraduate students
- (a) Hons marketing campaign: The UJ has launched an 'aggressive' Honours recruitment marketing campaign (to the value of R12 million), to increase the number of students with real potential to proceed to postgraduate studies.
- **(b)** Campaign prioritises certain faculties: The marketing campaign is pertinently focused at Health Sciences, Science, Engineering and the Built Environment, Humanities and selected Honours programmes in Education.
- (c) Postgraduate targets (differentiated per faculty): There is also a focused strategy to meet envisaged postgraduate student numbers of 16% of the total student body by 2013 (11% at Postgraduate below Masters' level and 5% at Master's and Doctoral levels) on the assumption that the UJ headcount will stabilise around 50, 000 in the next few years. These postgraduate targets are differentiated per faculty.

6.1.2.2 Research foci

Having been born from the merger of a university and a technikon, the UJ has a wide range of academic programmes and has benefited from a large pool of researchers from different backgrounds and fields of expertise. This in itself also provides a large base for research and the ideal ground for interdisciplinary research. Research forms an integral part of the activities of the faculties and its academic programmes, and is regarded as a driver of excellence. The University recognises that some faculties, because of the nature of their discipline, academic programmes and staff profile are in a better position to contribute more than others towards the research vision. This differentiation also translates itself to disparate expectations for research outputs from the faculties and the individual members of staff.

To reach its target of 600 units by 2012, the institution has set annual targets at three levels: floor; target and ceiling. For example, in 2010, the UJ attained 467 accredited units which set it in a good trajectory to reach its target. Management has agreed to stabilize the research output at 600 units for the following years after 2012, with a new target of 700 units in 2020. It is also acknowledged that if the target would be stretched to more than 700 units, new investments in research would be required. UJ's response to the perceived need for a multi-year research view (with corresponding key indicators and budget plans), as well as the perceived inappropriateness of a range of research foci, are addressed in Action Plan 2 below.

Action Plan 2: Research foci

- (a) Operational multi-year research plan: The University relies on its internal funds and external funds to continue supporting research. Internal funds account for 53% of total research expenditure while NRF and other external income account for 47% research expenditure. Steps continue to be taken to grow the external income component in order to reduce the dependency on the University. Going forward, all the research centres will be heavily measured against generating external income. In 2010, the University spent R52.25 million for the operational research budget compared to R42.8 million in 2009. External income from the NRF grew by 72% from R19.97 million in 2009 to R34.36 million in 2010 as a result of the new administrative systems put in place. The UJ research strategy includes an Operational Plan with targets, indicators and budget plans, which is discussed and monitored twice annually by the Executive Leadership Group (ELG) to determine the progress. The indicators and targets are part of the KPAs of the DVC: Research, Innovation and Advancement, and the Executive Director: Research and Innovation.
- (b) Investments in research: The large investments made and strategic interventions such as establishment of research centres, research niches (quick wins), the post-graduate centre, appointment of research professors and high profile academic scholars and research incentive schemes are all testimony to the University's commitment to research. In addition to the significant progress in research outputs, the University also strengthened its research infrastructure, research support and management. The further development, application and commercialization of research outputs are priorities for the future.
- (c) Targeted research foci: A Circular was sent to all members of staff, to inform them of the new differentiated approach to research production per faculty at the University. Research targets are annually agreed between the DVC: Research, Innovation and Advancement, and the Executive Deans. Given the strategic interventions that have been implemented and investments made, the expectation is that the leading research faculties would continue to deliver the largest number of research outputs. The other faculties are therefore expected to play their roles in delivering agreed research output targets.
- (d) **New funding cycle for Research Centres:** Four years ago, the University implemented key strategic interventions to fulfill its research goals in the first decade of its existence. A total of 13 Research Centres and 7 Research Niche Areas were established funded to the tune of R39.02 million. These research entities were reviewed in 2010 for a new 3-year funding cycle which showed that the research output had increased from the period prior to their existence, and had a great impact in profiling the research capability of the University. Because the model works, a new funding cycle was approved and 6 new Research Centres were added.

6.1.2.3 Financial support

The streamlining of research funds management processes in order to eliminate perceived inefficiencies and frustration is addressed in Action Step 3 below (and its various action steps).

Action Plan 3: Financial support

- (a) Research and Finance cooperation: There is a working Service Level Agreement with the Finance Division and every month each researcher is provided with a statement. In September 2010, a strategic meeting was held involving the DVC: Research, DVC: Finance and the major research active faculties to streamline the researchers' budgeting and expenditure process. It was agreed that researchers should only use three budget and expenditure line items: running costs, bursaries and equipment.
- (b) **Research funding workshops:** The Research Office together with the Finance Division runs two workshops a year to meet and discuss problems/improvements with individual researchers.

6.2 RECOMMENDATION 19

The HEQC recommends that the University of Johannesburg conducts an assessment of its supervisory capacity, including the staff: student ratio for different postgraduate degrees as a point of departure to develop a multipronged strategy to enhance the institution's supervisory capacity not only in terms of numbers, but also in relation to appropriate teaching and learning ability at postgraduate level.

6.2.1 Related concerns

The following focus areas have been identified:

Supervision

- (i) There were instances of poor communication between students and supervisors and of Ph D students receiving poor levels of supervision (p.55).
- (ii) There is a need to decrease supervisor-to-student ratios (p.56).

Improving postgraduate enrolment

(iii) The lack of sufficient staff with doctorates might inhibit UJ's desire to grow postgraduate numbers (p.53).

Improving throughput of postgraduate students

(iv) Output of Masters' degrees fluctuated between 2005 and 2008 and the number of doctoral degrees declined (p.55).

The following research-related challenge is included in the HEQC concluding comments on the UJ:

The implementation of its identity as a research-focused institution.

6.2.2 UJ response and action plan

In the past five years, UJ has made large investments to establish an enabling environment for postgraduate research by developing strong strategic partnerships, both nationally and internationally, attracting quality academics, establishing research centres and research niche areas, organising a Postgraduate Student Centre, and implementing a staff qualifications programme for those academic staff without adequate postgraduate training. Such strategic initiatives should invariably support and provide a solid platform for postgraduate supervision and education. International partnerships usually attract international students, in particular postgraduate students.

Given that the UJ is one of the few universities nationally to offer a comprehensive suite of programmes across the horizontal spectrum of vocational, professional and general formative qualifications, as well as the vertical spectrum, from Higher Education Certificates up to and including Doctoral studies, quality assurance, development and monitoring of postgraduate research and education are important strategic focus areas. Furthermore, because of the resulting merger of two different tertiary traditions of a university and a technikon, the staff qualification profile, which currently has a low number of PhD qualifications, has to be enhanced in order to support postgraduate education.

Between October and December 2010, the Postgraduate Centre undertook the audit of the quality of supervision and of research methodology training in postgraduate studies. The recommendation from the audit includes various strategies on improving the quality of postgraduate supervision and improving communication between students and supervisors.

The Postgraduate Centre has also completed a comprehensive information brochure to address various concerns that postgraduate students have, and has also updated its website in order to communicate better with postgraduate students.

Action Plan 1: Postgraduate supervision

The following action plans/steps are envisaged or in place:

- (a) The **Staff Qualifications Programme** (see 3.1.2.2 (g)) aims to increase the current number of permanent academic staff with Master's and Doctoral qualifications by 15% by the end of 2011. Improvement in the teaching and learning competencies of academic staff increases the number of academic staff able to provide postgraduate supervision.
- (b) The UJ has also strengthened its postgraduate supervisory capacity by appointing **Research Professors**, especially in the Faculties of Humanities and Science, and by utilising the knowledge and experience of retired professors. In the short-to-medium term, this, together with the appointment of Visiting Professors, will expand the institution's postgraduate supervisory capacity.

Action Plan 2: Postgraduate enrolment

The decline in the output of Master's students over a 5-year period is slightly more than a thousand students (1 075). A positive trend is that the number of Master's and Doctoral students increased from 2 166 students in 2008 to 2347 in 2009, an increase of 181. This is

the highest number of Master's and Doctoral students registered at UJ since its inception in 2005.

The number of postgraduate students 2005-2010 is as follows:

Postgraduate	Data	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
	Headcounts	7 513.0	6 429.0	5 999.0	6 449.0	6 464.0	6 240.0
	Graduates	2 819.0	2 481.0	2 114.0	2 269.0	2 311.0	2 234.0

Note: HEMIS data audited up to and including 2009.

The abovementioned factors call for a Postgraduate Strategy that will ensure the fulfilment of the University's aspirations to attract and grow its postgraduate student profile by addressing the broad principles of increasing postgraduate enrolment and improving throughput. This is not only an institutional imperative, but also a response to the national requirement for high-level skills to support the envisaged knowledge economy.

The current enrolment plan of the University provides for a headcount enrolment of 48 000 in 2012 and 2013, with a revised 2011 target of 48 589. The UJ target for postgraduate enrolment for 2013 is for:

- postgraduate below Master's at 11%,
- Master's at 4%, and
- Doctoral at 1%, totalling 16%.

This translates to a total of 7 680 postgraduate students in 2013, with a projected growth of 1 499 postgraduate students on the 2010 numbers, and an increase in the percentage of postgraduate students from 12.8% in 2010 to reach a target of 16% by 2013. Another important factor is the demographic profile of the postgraduate students. In terms of ratios, the proportion of White postgraduate students is much higher than that of Black students. This effectively means that there must be a significant increase in the ratio of Black undergraduate students who proceed to pursue postgraduate studies.

The following action steps are envisaged:

- (a) A key component to improving enrolment is a marketing strategy that aims at active postgraduate enrolment, a clear and defined marketing plan and structures for co-ordination between the marketing division and the Postgraduate Strategy. This includes showcasing our research and research staff, research open days, postgraduate symposia, and working with national and regional input to promote UJ's research plans, activities and research.
- (b) Although no final decision has yet been taken by the Department on the 2011-2013 enrolment plan, it is in our strategic interest to **plan for an enrolment scenario** with a 48 589 student headcount for 2011 and with targets of 48 000 students adopted for both 2012 and 2013. In addition, student growth should be achieved in areas such as SET and at postgraduate level, with the percentage of postgraduate students to be increased to 16%. This can briefly be summarized by the following two tables detailing the outlines of the changing demography of the University according to four

broad disciplines: Business; Education; Other Humanities; and Science, Engineering and Technology (SET). The trends per qualification type are also shown below.

Postgraduate headcounts by qualification type 2005-2013

Post- graduate	Qualification Type	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
	Diplomas	15	16	8						
	Doctoral	563	535	538	502	559	587	498	616	635
	Honours	4 123	3 207	2 756	2 971	2 813	2 655	2 828	2877	2971
	Masters	1 891	1 683	1 638	1 664	1 788	1 897	1 860	1979	2040
	Other Postgraduate	921	988	1 059	1 312	1 304	1 101	949	1124	1155

Postgraduate headcount enrolments by major field of study 2005-2013

Post- graduate	CESM Category	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Post-									2177	2244
graduate	BUS/MAN	1 545	1 504	1 565	1 735	1 763	1 937	2 016	2177	2244
	EDUCATION	2 865	1 824	1 394	1 420	1 201	1 117	1 122	1187	1224
	OTHER HUM	1 547	1 449	1 347	1 353	1 470	1 073	1 024	1121	1156
	SET	1 557	1 651	1 694	1 942	2 031	2 114	1 973	2111	2176
Total post-										
graduate										
headcounts		7 513	6 429	5 999	6 449	6 464	6 240	6 135	6596	6801

The way in which postgraduate students will grow within each of the faculties will be determined by the simultaneous application of the two sets of trends as explained above. Detailed work is currently being undertaken within the University to define these growth patterns, in particular at postgraduate level.

- (c) Tuition fees and bursaries are important instruments in filling the planned student places for each postgraduate qualification with the best students at the lowest cost to the University. A review of student fees and bursaries at UJ in relation to Wits and UP suggests that when tuition fees and bursaries are taken into account, Wits and the UP provide a much more competitive fee and bursary structure than UJ at Honours level. At Master's level and at Doctoral level, UJ provides a higher takehome amount than the other two institutions.
- (d) The MEC in August 2010, noting the above, accepted the proposal that **Honours bursaries** be made available to those students who achieved 65% and upwards in their undergraduate degree. It recommended that the focus be on honours bursaries at SETH (Science, Health excluding FEBE as there is no PG), Humanities and SETH Education programmes. Over the next two to three years, the impact will be assessed and a further rollout considered. Twenty per cent (or a number

benchmarked with peers) must be the maximum for international students. It accepted the principle that such bursaries and scholarships must be focused in selected disciplinary areas in line with UJ's research strategy and institutional mandate, and South Africa's economic and developmental priorities.

- (e) Work with the International Office to actively support the strategy to recruit international students and establish a different and competitive fee and bursary structure for such students.
- (f) Continue to look at funding support from the business sector and donor agencies for successful strategies that develop the next generation of scholars. These dedicated and sustained programmes have created an academic environment that attracts and retains black postgraduate students, and where possible offers them employment opportunities in the University upon completion of their studies.

Action Plan 3: Postgraduate throughput

The quality and competencies of academic staff are critical to an effective Postgraduate Strategy. Currently, all permanent academic employees are expected to have at least a Master's qualification by 2011. A comprehensive *Staff Qualifications Project* has been embarked on, which requires employees who do not yet have a Master's qualification, to complete one by the end of 2011, or to have completed a postgraduate qualification that will enable them to register for such a Master's qualification. The University will similarly create an enabling environment for academic staff to acquire a Doctoral qualification, a plan that still needs to be developed and implemented.

The following action steps are envisaged:

- (a) Within the context of discipline-specificity, all academic employees with at least a Master's qualification are expected to attract and to supervise postgraduate students. An academic workload model, which is both generic to the institution and domain-specific, serves as a managerial instrument for Executive Deans and Heads of Departments to allow adequate time for postgraduate supervision.
- (b) Resources are made available from time to time to attract academic employees who are expected to **engage predominantly in research** ("research professors"). In terms of the workload model referred to above, such academic employees are expected to supervise postgraduate students beyond the norm expected of academic employees also engaged in undergraduate teaching and learning. In addition, postgraduate students must be tied to critical research programmes in which significant institutional investments have been made. This is particularly relevant to Faculties such as Humanities and Science.
- (c) The Centre for Professional Academic Staff Development in the Division for Academic Development and Support, in close collaboration with the Postgraduate Centre, presents annual programmes to academic staff nominated by the Faculties to **build their capacity** to appropriately supervise postgraduate students.

- (d) Resources are made available to equip the UJ libraries with research materials. Yet, a number of postgraduate students do not have easy access to journals, periodicals, etc. Given the importance of postgraduate education, greater investments will be made in the library and in the postgraduate centre to enable postgraduate students to have better access to research materials.
- (f) A **Postgraduate Centre** exists to provide support to Master's and Doctoral students in respect of the following matters: research methodology; writing skills for research publication; qualitative and quantitative analyses; proposal writing; supervisor relationship management, etc. Such support is exercised in conjunction with the supervisory and mentoring support within faculties and with the staff development support within the Unit for Professional Staff Development. An important component of the Postgraduate Centre is the Postgraduate Funding Section (PFS). The PFS is responsible for the administration of postgraduate funding opportunities.

In order to achieve the goal of increasing enrolment and improving throughput, the Postgraduate Centre undertook the following activities in 2010:

- A competitive bursary scheme established with Honours focus rolled in October-November.
- Established a PG Centre infrastructure, staffing and computer centre.
- Enhanced PFSA activities and improved disbursement up by 20% to 25 million in 2010.
- Held a workshop on the 15th September to align marketing, faculties, finance and admissions activities to address internal, external and international enrolment.
- Worked on international recruitment with a focus on the Middle East and SADEC.
- Undertook four research capacity building workshops at APK.
- Undertook a two day supervisor forum on the 13th and 14th October with ADS.
- Held a postgraduate symposium on the 18th October about 100 students and twenty eight presentations.
- Undertook research methods and supervision review for the URC and SHDC from September to December.
- Disbursed funds to faculties for writing support.
- Established an enabling environment for research through active engagement of ADS, the library, Statkon, Deans and Vice Deans.
- Improved its communication strategy to postgraduate students by completing a comprehensive information brochure by December.

The following activities are planned for 2011:

- Establish a database for all PG students.
- Conduct twenty research capacity building workshops.
- Present four supervisor forums.
- Present an academic writing symposium.
- Conduct 8 quantitative analyses research training workshops in collaboration with Statkon.
- Continue to work with the internationalization strategy to improve student enrolment from SADEC and the Middle East.

- Undertake three publication writing workshops.
- Participate and support the Social Science winter school.
- Continue to work with the Deans on monitoring Honours enrolment in the three faculties.

The postgraduate targets as agreed to in the postgraduate strategy means that we have to increase our student numbers to 16% of the overall student cohort by 2013 with the target being 6 400 students for 2011. All of the above activities contribute to the achievement of these targets which is also aligned to the university's strategic thrusts and plans for 2020.

- (g) Throughput management of research-based Master's and Doctoral students is a core component of faculty-based enrolment management, and incorporates control over maximum periods of study, quality assurance and supervisor management. An efficient Postgraduate Strategy is dependent on students acquiring their degrees within the agreed timeframes. The Postgraduate Centre via the PFS administers funding programmes promoting the throughput of research-based Master's and Doctoral students. An example of such a programme is the tuition fees remission programme. Full-time students completing their degree in the required term, viz. two years for a Master's and three years for a Doctorate may qualify for a full-fees remission upon graduation, depending on certain terms and conditions.
- (h) The University creates a culture of research by actively **encouraging and promoting research in undergraduate programmes**. This should create a desire for research and encourage successful undergraduate students to pursue postgraduate studies.
- (i) The University actively pursues **joint postgraduate programmes** with reputable international institutions, in order to strengthen its supervisory capacity and to provide additional research opportunities for its Master's and Doctoral students. Such joint programmes are subject to quality assurance controls and to accreditation requirements. Aspects will be incorporated into the *Study Abroad programme*.
- (j) Subject to capacity constraints, the University provides **adequate accommodation** for its postgraduate students on all its campuses. This is particularly relevant for attracting international students.

7. QUALITY ASSURANCE

Recommendation 5

Quality management

7. QUALITY ASSURANCE

7.1 RECOMMENDATION 5

The HEQC recommends that the University of Johannesburg reviews the structures responsible for quality assurance and promotion and their relationship to each other in order to ensure there is coherence between them and also clarify the roles of the structures responsible for managing the quality of the learning programmes.

7.1.1 Related concerns

The following concerns are relevant here:

- (i) While the Panel supports the creation of a joint "Academic Planning and Quality Committee", it stresses the need for this committee to engage systematically with the newly created Teaching and Learning Committee, in order to situate quality assurance and planning in a larger conceptual framework (p.32).
- (ii) The Panel is also concerned about the degree of overlap and lack of clarity in the responsibilities of most of these structures and encourages the institution to undertake a review to ensure that roles and responsibilities are not duplicated and that these are clearly defined (p.36).
- (iii) The Panel heard that, in some areas, the curriculum taught at the University of Johannesburg might have lost depth. It took a sample of undergraduate programmes in a range of disciplines and found a variety of standards and would like to suggest that the university gives serious consideration to initiating an investigation in order to ensure that the quality of the teaching and learning experience, as well as the depth of the curriculum are not being jeopardised by the institution's commitment to expand access (p.36, 37).

The following challenge in the HEQC's concluding remarks is relevant: Consistent provision of quality education across programmes and campuses.

7.1.2 The UJ response and action plan

The reference to the APQC is incorrect (and was addressed in the UJ comments to the HEQC). Currently, the Senate Quality Committee (SQC) addresses quality matters, while the STLC addresses teaching and learning matters.

Action plan: Quality management

- (a) A certain amount of overlap will always occur, as quality cannot be separated from the strategic and operational aspects of the University's core functions. Quality is regarded as an integral part of teaching, learning and research, and a certain level of overlap should be tolerated. Since there is a large overlap in the membership of the SQC and STLC (i.e. Executive Deans and Executive Directors) the danger of duplication is greatly reduced. The SQC's and STLC's different foci and responsibilities are clearly stated in the two charters. Continuous monitoring by all members and dealing with potential duplication in a responsible manner is the responsibility of all members of the STLC and SQC.
- (b) Furthermore, the UJ Quality Promotion Plan: 2010 2016 was approved by both the SQC and Senate in August 2010. This comprehensive plan includes quality reviews

of academic development, service and support divisions, as well as reviews of modules, programmes, academic departments, etc., in faculties. As part of the UJ quality system, reporting on these reviews has been addressed, i.e.:

- (i) All peer review panel reports in the academic development, service and support divisions serve at the SQC, as well as the divisions' Quality Improvement Plans and annual progress reports.
- (ii) Module review reports serve at faculty boards, and annual trend reports are submitted to the SQC. Faculties monitor the implementation of improvements, etc.
- (iii) All peer review reports on programme reviews, departmental reviews, etc., as well as Quality Improvement Plans and annual progress reports serve at the SQC.

The SQC has the right to refer reports to other Senate committees and to the MEC (and its sub-committees) for noting, implementation, support, etc., as it deems necessary.

A tracking system has to be developed by the Unit for Quality Promotion to monitor the submission of reports, i.e. the implementation of the Quality Promotion Plan. This should be done by the end of 2011.

(c) As far as the quality of teaching and learning is concerned, faculties develop their own Faculty Quality Plans (and schedules) for systematic reviews that include selfevaluation reports and external peer review reports.

These reviews are based on customised HEQC programme and audit criteria, as well as UJ and faculty-specific criteria. Reporting on these reviews forms part of the UJ quality system (see the UJ action plans in response to Recommendation 5). The main purpose of the reviews is to address quality at module and programme levels, as well as at management level, i.e. departmental reviews.

In the UJ Strategic Thrusts for the New Decade, one of the key indicators for Thrust 1 states that by 2015, academic programmes will be reviewed to determine their strategic significance to the core mandate of the UJ. A strategy will be developed to align a number of related processes in the University, namely the implementation of the HEQF (and reviews of the Category B and C programmes), reviews undertaken in faculties to reconfigure programmes (e.g. by taking professional requirements into consideration) and the UJ Quality Promotion Plan (that requires formal self-evaluation and peer reviews). This strategy will be developed and submitted for approval to the DVC: Academic and the DVC: HR and Institutional Planning and the SQC, in the second semester of 2011.

8. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Concerns

Community engagement

8. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT (CE)

Although no CE-related recommendations were made, the concerns below were identified in the HEQC Audit Report.

8.1 Concerns

- (i) There is a need for a new and more inclusive definition of Community Engagement (p.57).
- (ii) There was a need for a planned strategy to infuse Community Engagement into teaching and learning and research (p.57).
- (iii) Certain CE projects lacked integration with the curriculum (p.59).

The following challenge in the Audit Report's concluding comments is also included here, namely:

The development of an appropriate and dynamic focus for its community engagement activities.

8.1.1 The UJ response and action plan

At the UJ, the term CE embraces experiential learning, outreach, service learning and public scholarship. CE is still starting out with new systems, structures, policies and procedures being developed and implemented.

The University holds the view that a clear understanding of the academic underpinnings and alignment of CE within its core academic activities will result in CE becoming a positive and strengthening force within and across the institution. A CE Policy was approved by Senate in August 2009. The Policy identifies three categories of CE: service learning (not to be confused with WIL), community-based research and community outreach. The Policy provides for management, administration and quality assurance of curricular CE activities and community-based research to form part of the responsibilities of faculties. Committees of Senate (the STLC and the SQC) have oversight of CE activities in faculties.

A CE Advisory Board exists as a committee of the MEC, to advise the MEC on all CE activities and projects. A CE Office, in the Advancement Division, plays a coordinating, liaising, recording and monitoring role.

Strategic Thrust 1 of the Strategic Thrusts for the Next Decade provides, among others, for "sustained excellence in teaching and learning, research and strategic engagement with communities that is mutually beneficial and promotes social, economic and educational development".

Action Plan: Community Engagement

The following action steps are envisaged:

- (a) Incorporating service learning efficiently and effectively into the curricula of at least 10% of all academic programmes by 2020, from the current base of 4%.
- (b) Increasingly recognising and implementing CE as UJ's third core academic function.

- (c) Developing a CE Strategy. An important component in developing the CE Strategy is to align it with the Corporate Social Investment opportunities that exist in South Africa.
- (d) Taking staff participation in CE activities into account in staff performance evaluation for promotion purposes.
- (e) Providing funding for institutional CE activities from the Capital Reserve Fund and the CE Sustainability Fund, which is managed by the CE Advisory Board.

9. SUMMARY

9. Summary

The various action plans are summarised in the grid below. It provides the dates of finalisation for each action plan, as well as an indication of the responsible MEC member and Executive Director(s). The purpose is firstly, to provide an overview of all the action plans, and, secondly, to serve as a check-list for the development of internal annual progress reports, as well as the UJ progress report to the HEQC.

A SUMMARY OF THE UJ QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PLANS

FOCUS AREA AND RELEVANT RECOMMENDATIONS	THE UJ ACTION PLANS	DATE OF FINALISATION	RESPONSIBLE MEC MEMBER(S) AND/OR EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR(S)
PLANNING AND GOVERNANCE	Recommendation1 (i) Action Plan 1: The UJ vision, mission and goals (ii) Action Plan 2: Student experiences on all campuses (iii) Action Plan 3: Unit for Institutional Research and Decision Support (iv) Action Plan 4: Cultural Integration Project (v) Action Plan 5: Campus Directors	(i) December 2012 (ii) December 2015 (iii) December 2012 (iv) December 2013 (v) December 2013	 (i) DVC: HR and Institutional Planning (ii) ED: Student Affairs (iii) DVC: HR and Institutional Planning (iv) DVC: HR and Institutional Planning (v) ED: Operations
	Recommendation 4 Action Plan: Institutional Forum	2011, with some ongoing action steps	Registrar
	Recommendation 6 Action plan: Institutional surveys	2012, with ongoing	DVC: HR and Institutional

		surveys	Planning
HUMAN RESOURCES	Recommendation 2 (i) Action Plan 1: Functioning of the HR Division (ii) Action Plan 2: Attraction, appointment, promotion and retention (iii) Action Plan 3: ADS staff matters	(i) 2013 (ii) 2010 (iii) 2011	(i) – (iii) DVC: HR and Institutional Planning
TEACHING, LEARNING AND PROGRAMMES	Recommendation 7 (i) Action Plan 1: Large classes and underprepared students (ii) Action Plan 2: Teaching strategy and academic drift (iii) Action Plan 3: Work integrated learning (iv) Action Plan 4: Contact time	(i) 2011, with some ongoing aspects (ii) Ongoing (iii) 2010 (iv) 2012	(I) – (iii) DVC: Academic and the ED: ADS (iv) Registrar
	Recommendation 3 (i) Action Plan 1: Integration of foreign African students (ii) Action Plan 2: Racist, sexist and conservative attitudes among staff	(i) 2011, but ongoing (ii) December 2013	(i) ED: Student Affairs (ii) DVC: HR and Institutional Planning
	Recommendation 16 (i) Action Plan 1: Assessment policy and rules (ii) Action Plan 2: External moderation (iii) Action Plan 3: Student grievances and RPL	(i) Ongoing (ii) Ongoing (iii) Ongoing	(i) – (iii) DVC: Academic and the ED: ADS

	Recommendation 8 Action plan: Extended programmes	Ongoing	DVC: Academic and the ED: ADS
	Recommendation 9 Action plan: Evaluation of modules and lecturers by students	2013, but ongoing	DVC: Academic and the ED: ADS
	Recommendation 10 Action plan: Academic planning	2014, but ongoing	DVC: Academic and the ED: ADS
	Recommendation 14 Action plan: Non-subsidised programmes	Ongoing	DVC: Academic and the ED: ADS
ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT	Recommendation 11 (i) Action Plan 1: Staff:student ratio (UJLIC) (ii) Action Plan 2: Book titles per student (iii) Action Plan 3: Library hours (iv) Action Plan 4: Student:PC ratio	(i) 2014 (ii) 2011, but ongoing (iii) 2011, but ongoing (iv) 2014	DVC: Research, Innovation and Advancement and the ED: UJLIC
	Recommendation 12 Action plan: ICT Strategy		

		2010	ED: Operations
	Recommendation 15 Action plan: Professional academic staff development	Ongoing	DVC: Academic and the ED: ADS
	Recommendation 13 Action plan: Certification	2012, but ongoing	Registrar
	Recommendation 17 Action plan: Security of student records and examination documentation	Ongoing	Registrar
RESEARCH AND SUPERVISION	Recommendation 18 (i) Action Plan 1: Young researchers (ii) Action Plan 2: Research foci (iii) Action Plan 3: Financial support	(i) – (iii) Ongoing	(i) – (iii) DVC: Research, Innovation and Advancement and the ED: Research and Innovation
	Recommendation 19 (i) Action Plan 1: Postgraduate supervision (ii) Action Plan 2: Postgraduate enrolment (iii) Action Plan 3: Postgraduate throughput		(i) – (iii) DVC: Research, Innovation and Advancement and the ED: Research and Innovation

QUALITY ASSURANCE	Recommendation 5 Action plan: Quality management	2016	DVC: HR and Institutional Planning
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT	Concerns Action plan: Community engagement	2020	DVC: Research, Innovation and Advancement

10. APPENDICES

Appendix A

UJ ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Α	
APB	Auckland Park Bunting Road Campus
APK	Auckland Park Kingsway Campus
В	
С	
CE	Community Engagement
CenTAL	Centre for Technology-Assisted Learning
CPASD	Centre for Professional Academic Staff Development
D	
DFC	Doornfontein Campus
DIPQP	Division for Institutional Planning and Quality Promotion
DHET	Department of Higher Education and Training
DVC	Deputy Vice-Chancellor
E	
ELG	Executive Leadership Group
F	
FADA	Faculty of Art, Design and Architecture
FE	Faculty of Education
FEBE	Faculty of Engineering and the Built Environment
FEFS	Faculty of Economic and Financial Sciences
FH	Faculty of Humanities (see HUM)
FHDC	Faculty Higher Degrees Committee

FHS	Faculty of Health Sciences
FL	Faculty of Law
FM	Faculty of Management
FQC	Faculty Quality Committee
FYE	First-Year Experience
FYEE	First-Year Employee Experience
G	
Н	
HE	Higher Education
HEMIS	Higher Education Management Information System
HEQC	Higher Education Quality Committee
HEQF	Higher Education Qualifications Framework
HESA	Higher Education South Africa
HR	Human Resources Division
I	
ITS	Integrated Tertiary Software
J	
KPAs	Key Performance Areas
L	
М	
MEC	Management Executive Committee
MECA	Management Executive Committee: Academic
MECO	Management Executive Committee: Operations
MIS	Management Information System
N	
NQF	National Qualifications Framework

NRF	National Research Foundation
0	
Р	
PQM	Programme Qualifications Mix
PsyCaD	Centre for Psychological Services and Career Development
PWG	Programme Working Group
Q	
QA	Quality Assurance
QPP	Quality Promotion Plan
R	
RPL	Recognition of Prior Learning
S	
SAQA	South African Qualifications Authority
SENEX	Senate Executive Committee
SQC	Senate Quality Committee
SRC	Student Representative Council
SSB	Student Services Bureau
SWC	Soweto Campus
Т	
TAL	Technology-Assisted Learning
U	
V	
VC	Vice-Chancellor
W	
WIL	Work Integrated Learning

Annexure B

UJ's STRATEGIC THRUSTS: 2011 - 2020

(May 2011)

PREAMBLE

The University of Johannesburg is a modern African city University - vibrant and cosmopolitan in character; liberal, progressive, transformative and assertive of academic freedom in the values it espouses - that provides education that is

- accessible and affordable,
- challenging, imaginative and innovative,
- for a just, responsible and sustainable society,

through the excellence and relevance of its comprehensive programmes and its research, and by cultivating students with integrity, who are knowledgeable, well-balanced, ethical leaders and confident global citizens¹.

THE STRATEGIC THRUSTS

Strategic Thrust 1

Sustained excellence of academic programmes, research and community engagement in

- the quality provision of intellectually challenging and scholarly relevant academic programmes;
- the conduct of scholarly relevant, intellectually challenging and internationally recognized research;
- teaching and learning, research and strategic engagement with communities that is mutually beneficial and promotes social, economic and educational development.

Key indicators for Thrust 1:

Employees, who are:

appropriately qualified,

¹ See Appendix A for an analysis of the core elements of the Preamble

- appropriately capacitated in respect of curriculum design and delivery across the range of three tracks of UJ programmes (i.e. general formative, professional and career-specific),
- adequately remunerated and incentivized, and
- appropriately supported with respect to relevant UJ services and resources.

Students, who:

- are no more than 50 000 in terms of total headcount,
- display an enrolment profile aligned to UJ's Enrolment Plan,
- are recruited in a focused manner via early (school-level) interventions, if / where appropriate,
- are provided with professional guidance and counselling prior to admission to ensure appropriate placement, aimed at optimal academic success and to reduce the drop-out rate for the whole university from the current 19% to 16% by 2020,
- all participate in a well-grounded and faculty-specific First Year Experience (FYE) programme, the value of which is annually monitored,
- are recruited for post-graduate studies to attain a 16%:84% PG/UG profile by 2020 (current profile 13%:87%),
- in respect of 25% of first-time entering first years by 2020, display an APS score of 35 and higher,
- in the case of 1 000 first-time entering first-year by 2020, are from schools serving the poorest communities (nationally defined and determined), yet are compliant with minimum admission requirements,
- are appropriately prepared for the world of work and for responsible citizenship, to ensure a graduate employability rate of at least 80%.

Teaching and Learning, which:

- is reflective, self-conscious and geared towards producing well-rounded graduandi and diplomandi,
- formally recognizes and integrates the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning,
- integrates Academic Development and Support (ADS) for sustained above-thenorm success rates of 80% (from the current average base of 77%) and 11 000 graduates by 2020, from the current 10 300,
- actively promotes and incentivizes teaching and learning excellence and innovation and
- ensures that all permanent academic staff have a masters qualification and 50% have a doctoral qualification (from the current base of 32%), by 2020.

An Institutional Research Profile, which:

- consistently places UJ in the top 6 residential universities in South Africa, in terms of aggregate research output and scholarly impact,
- achieves aggregate research output of 700 accredited output units by 2020,
- achieves 112 PhD (current 70) and 672 Masters graduates (current 320) annually by 2020,
- increasingly enables innovation and technology transfer,
- incorporates at least 25 productive and mainly self-funded research centres, including centres driven by technological innovation, and
- has at least 15% of academics recognized as rated researchers, from the current base of 5%.

Community Engagement:

- where at least 10% of all academic programmes incorporate service learning efficiently and cost-effectively in their curricula by 2020, from the current base of 4%,
- that increasingly recognise and implement CE as UJ's third core academic function and
- that addresses the developmental needs of communities by providing them with access to the University's intellectual capital.

Academic Programme strategies that will:

- improve the depth, stature, relevance and quality of academic programmes²,
- by 2015 be reviewed to determine their continued strategic significance to the core academic mandate of UJ,
- enable technology-enriched learning in support of the UJ Teaching and Learning Strategy,
- ensure rigorous application of minimum quality standards and/or criteria,
- enhance and sustain existing 'strong' programmes, and
- promote internal differentiation³ to position faculties in ways that capitalise on their unique strengths.

_

² See <u>Appendix B</u> in respect of a deeper analysis of academic programmes

³ See Appendix C for a deeper understanding of "differentiation."

A reputation as a comprehensive institution with a unique identity in the higher education sector because of the stature and quality of its scientific and technology-rich programmes and its scientific and technology-driven research, innovation and technology transfer.

Key indicators for Thrust 2:

Scientific and Technology Programmes, which:

- have been identified as technology programmes⁴ for focused developmental trajectories,
- have a prestige that attracts top performing students,
- comprehensively span across the three programme tracks (general formative; professional; career and occupation-specific),
- integrate high-level technologies,
- are intellectually challenging and expansive,
- are mostly interdisciplinary and empower students to design solutions to problems through innovative thinking,
- are offered via innovative teaching and learning approaches (e.g., problem-solving, multidisciplinary teams, studio training),
- provide clear articulation pathways into degree and/or postgraduate studies,
- incorporate robust training in appropriate first year core modules (e.g., maths, physics, chemistry, languages, ICT),
- reflect an appropriate CESM mix: SET (32% currently 29%); Business/ Management (38% currently 41.5%); Education (9% currently 9%); Other Humanities (21% currently 20.5%).

Academic Employees,

- with a critical mass of appropriate expertise,
- who are highly qualified, and
- who are innovative.

Top performing undergraduate students, who are:

- entrepreneurial,
- innovative,
- active participants in technology innovation, and
- a source for a critical mass of postgraduate students.

Strategic partnerships, which:

⁴ See <u>Appendix D</u> in respect of a deeper analysis of technology programmes

- involve policy-makers, industry, professional boards, government and the private sector to enable collaboration, commercialization and innovation,
- involve international partners aimed at cutting edge training, innovation and teaching and learning collaboration, and
- enable the establishment of a co-funded Technology Innovation Fund and Technology Innovation Centre to support technology transfer.

A unique programme profile for each UJ campus, equivalence of resource provision and stature, with a dedicated focus on the **Soweto Campus (SWC)** and the **Doornfontein Campus (DFC)** for the next three years.

Key indicators for Thrust 3:

A programme profile for SWC that:

- focuses mainly on Education and Leadership Development,
- reflects the comprehensive nature of UJ by offering a good mix of degree and diploma programmes at undergraduate and postgraduate levels,
- encourages strong research activity,
- enhances strong community engagement,
- provides high quality of infrastructure, service and human resource capacity,
- offers programmes in the anchor faculties of Education, Humanities, Financial and Economic Sciences and Management, and
- develops a marketing message and campaign that positions SWC as a premier and first choice study destination for education studies.

A programme profile for DFC that:

- focuses mainly on Health Sciences and Engineering and the Built Environment,
- reflects a comprehensive range of professional, career-specific and technologyrich programmes, at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels,
- embodies a strong research activity,
- incorporates strong community engagement activities,
- establishes a strong work-integrated learning capacity that closely replicates a pressurized working environment,
- functions with a high quality infrastructure, service and human resource capacity, and
- is underpinned by a marketing message and campaign that positions DFC as the first choice study destination for appropriate health and engineering studies.

An **international profile** of students, employees, scholarly output and institutional reputation.

Key indicators for Thrust 4:

An International Office. that:

- is well- resourced, and
- implements the Strategy to Enhance the International Profile of UJ.

Study Abroad Programme, that:

- presents specially structured seminar programmes,
- focuses on US, Europe and China,
- is aligned with US and other grade structures to enable credit transfer,
- encourages internships through semester research credits,
- makes use of special recruitment agencies,
- charges market related fees, and
- aims for 400 students annually by 2020.

International UJ recruitment, that:

- results in 8% of all registered students being international students by 2020 (of whom two-thirds are undergraduate) from the current base of 4.6%,
- focuses on continental (African) students,
- utilises SA Embassies to assist with recruitment.
- undertakes research on the attractiveness of UJ to international students,
- capitalises on English language study,
- utilises professional recruiters, expo's and institutional sites, and
- develops relationships with local embassies and government departments.

International Postgraduate (PG) recruitment, that:

- results in 8% of all registered students being international students by 2020 (of which one-third are postgraduate (PG)) from the current base of 4.6%,
- uses institutions, rather than students, as first contact,
- utilises the same undergraduate strategies, if appropriate,
- utilises African staff at UJ to assist,
- uses faculties to market specific postgraduate programmes, and
- introduces "sandwich" programmes to facilitate articulation.

Partnerships, that:

 prioritizes Africa, but allows for Brazil, India and China as well as the USA and Europe, especially Germany to also be considered,

- secures sufficient funding from potential partners to sustain the partnerships,
- prioritizes agreements for resourcing,
- are reviewed every 3 to 5 years, and
- are considered by the International Advisory Board prior to approval.

International employee recruitment, that:

 aims for 10% of permanent academic employees to be foreign by 2020, from the current base of 9%.

Strategic Thrust 5

Establish a **brand for UJ** that identifies it with relevant, accessible and excellent higher education.

Key indicators for Thrust 5:

Transforming the UJ Brand Strategy:

- from a dynamic and "vibey" trendsetter to an established, first-choice university of stature,
- without loss of momentum,
- that uses scholars and their scholarly achievements as brand and market drivers, and
- which incorporates an internal brand campaign that highlights annual themes.

Targeted marketing messages, that:

- Integrate campaigns for different market segments reflecting this change in positioning, namely:
 - Undergraduates, to resonate with potential students, parents and teachers, with a focus on technology programmes and Science, Engineering and Technology (SET) programmes;
 - Postgraduates, to resonate with potential postgraduates and alumni;
 - **SWC**, to be positioned as a premier study destination and first choice destination for Education and Leadership studies;
 - DFC, to improve public perceptions of the location of the campus and position it as the Engineering / Health Sciences campus;
 - International, to support international marketing efforts; and
 - Internal, to ensure brand alignment with external messaging in the staff and student population and to continue the Brand Champion Programme launched in 2010.

Leadership that matters, in the institution and in civil society.

Key indicators for Thrust 6:

Leadership roles and responsibilities, which are:

- negotiated,
- defined,
- embedded in performance-managed leadership, and
- exhibited at all levels.

Virtual Leadership Academy, which builds capacity and empowers people to exhibit appropriate leadership qualities, such as:

- visionary thinking, strategy planning and formulation, conflict resolution, employee motivation, emotional intelligence and entrepreneurship, and
- enable staff to develop and plan for succession.

Student Leadership Development and Mentoring, to establish a tailor-made strategy for:

- current and future SRC's.
- house committees, and
- other student leadership structures.

Efficiency and Effectiveness, which:

- results from an institution-wide strategy, and
- applies to both academics and managers.

Increase Senior Academic Employees, in terms of the number of:

- Professors, by 5% from the current 13% of fulltime contract and permanent academics to 18%, and
- Associate Professors and Principal Lecturers, by 11% from the current 7% of fulltime contract and permanent academics to 18%.

Ensure the Seniority of HODs, HoSs and Vice-Deans:

 by 2020, to the levels of Associate Professors, Principal Lecturers or Professors respectively, unless exceptional circumstances dictate otherwise.

Environmental scanning, which:

- is periodical and formally coordinated, and
- enlightens the institutional knowledge base of people in leadership positions.

UJ Scholarship, which creates opportunities for participation by UJ scholars in public debate and dialogue, to:

- strengthen national democratic values,
- support and promote public causes, and
- disseminate scholarship widely / prominently in the public domain.

Institutional Culture, which promotes:

- collegiality,
- transparency,
- accountability, and
- ethical, values-driven behaviour.

Internal monitoring of employee experience, that measures:

- leadership credibility,
- effectiveness, and
- impact.

Strategic Thrust 7

Alumni that are supportive and engaged and contribute actively to the institution's reputation and its resource base.

Key indicators for Thrust 7:

Campaigns targeted at:

- UJ graduates since 2005,
- alumni from legacy institutions established in their careers, and
- high-income, influential alumni.

Social Networking Community, that:

- is vibrant and interactive,
- uses modern / cutting-edge ICTs,
- strives for continuous relationship with UJ, and
- promotes lifelong learning.

Affinity Groups, that are developed and expanded to:

- faculties / disciplines,
- sport groups, and
- residences.

Alumni Database, that is:

- extensive, to enable lifecycle management,
- continually updated,
- sustainable, and
- valuable.

Loyalty, secured through:

- positive student experiences, and
- benefits programmes.

Staff Alumni, who are:

aligned to the relevant alumni campaigns and are faculty-based.

Strategic Thrust 8

Generate, cultivate and sustain resources and structures that:

- Enable the University's fitness for purpose,
- Support achievement of primary strategic thrusts, and
- Facilitate a responsible and responsive institutional citizenship.

Key indicators for Thrust 8:

Human resource capability, that:

supports the achievement of the primary strategic thrusts.

Employees, who:

- are provided with opportunities for professional and personal development,
- participate in a performance management system that is developmental and rewards both individual and collective effort,
- are increasingly demographically representative (inclusive of disability) and culturally sensitive,
- reflect a Black academic staff complement of at least 40%,
- are provided with institutional support for optimal functioning, and
- respect human dignity and embrace diversity.

Students, who:

- are increasingly demographically representative (inclusive of disability),
- are observant of UJ rules and policies, and responsible and accountable for their decisions and their actions,
- are provided with opportunities for their holistic development,

- increasingly participate actively in leadership, cultural and sporting structures, and
- respect human dignity and embrace diversity.

Infrastructure, which:

- supports the teaching and learning, research and innovation strategy of the University,
- is equivalent on all campuses,
- is environmentally sustainable, and
- provides a conducive working and studying environment for people with disabilities.

Information and Communication Technology, which:

- supports teaching and learning that is open and ubiquitous,
- supports research that fulfils the demands of "supercomputing" required for advanced scientific and technological research,
- enables the effective management of information and communication and of institutional business intelligence (MIS), and
- enhances the effective and efficient operation of administrative and support systems and of institutional governance.

Organisational Design and Ethos, which:

- cultivates its employees and students as responsible citizens,
- is responsive to the challenges of a sustainable environment,
- commits the institution to efficient and effective stakeholder service,
- provides an accessible and welcoming environment for its students,
- ensures operational systems that are capacitated, agile and responsive,
- submits systems and structures to regular review to ensure strategic alignment,
- cultivates a culture of appreciation and acknowledgment among employees and students,
- develops an inclusive and barrier-free working and learning environment for people with disabilities,
- actively supports the fight against HIV/AIDS, by striving for an HCT uptake of 35% of employees and 25% of students by 2020, and implementing an effective Workplace Programme for affected employees, and
- makes UJ the destination of choice for cutting-edge education and scholarship.

Finance, which:

 ensures sustainable and efficient allocation of resources to achieve the UJ vision, mission and goals.

Risk Management, which:

 ensures sustainability, efficiency and effectiveness, and inherent quality in resource allocation.

Quality Culture, that:

sustains an increasingly responsive institution-wide quality ethos.

IN SUMMARY

UJ in the next decade will position itself as a modern African city university, which is cosmopolitan in character and espouses liberal, progressive and transformative values. It will provide education that is affordable and accessible, that is challenging, imaginative and innovative and contributes to a just, responsible and sustainable society. It will offer a comprehensive range of excellent programmes and will cultivate students with integrity, who are knowledgeable, well balanced and ethical and confident global citizens.

It will achieve this vision by means of the dedicated implementation of the following eight strategic thrusts:

- <u>Thrust 1</u>: Sustained excellence of academic programmes, research and community engagement.
- <u>Thrust 2</u>: A comprehensive institution recognized for the stature and quality of its scientific and technology programmes and its scientific and technologydriven research, innovation and technology transfer.
- <u>Thrust 3</u>: Equivalence of all campuses, with dedicated initial focus on SWC and DFC.
- <u>Thrust 4</u>: An international profile of employees, students, scholarly output and institutional reputation.
- <u>Thrust 5</u>: A brand that identifies UJ with relevant, accessible and excellent higher education.
- Thrust 6: Leadership that matters, in the institution and in civil society.
- <u>Thrust 7</u>: Supportive and engaged alumni that contribute to UJ's reputation and resource base.
- <u>Thrust 8</u>: Resources that enable UJ's fitness for purpose, support the achievement of the primary thrusts and facilitate a responsible and responsive institutional citizenship.

Appendix A

Core Elements of the Preamble

1. Dimensions of an "African" university

- a scholarly and cultural orientation; geographic location,
- strategic partnerships, staff and student networking that imply preferential resource allocation,
- international staff and student recruiting: African focus,
- academic curricula and research activities that lead to material relevant to Africa,
- regular showcasing of "African" academic activities.

2. Dimensions of a "cosmopolitan" character

- UJ embedded in economic capital of Africa,
- UJ reflects the vibrancy and social, ethnic and class diversity of the Jhb metropolis,
- active nurturing of cultural and social diversity as an institutional strength,
- programme content responsive to demands of business, finance, manufacturing, industry and technology,
- students prepared for leadership roles in the corporate headquarters and civic society,
- cosmopolitan character reflected in programme profile (CESM mix) and cultural activities.

3. Dimensions of "liberal, progressive and transformative" values

- promotion of academic freedom as primary value,
- promotion of collegiality as primary driver of academic ethos,
- pluralities of academic, social and political discourse,
- demographic diversity (inclusive of disability) of employees and students,
- campus equivalence: resources and stature,
- curricular transformation evident in teaching and learning development and support, in citizenship modules, application of Teaching and Learning philosophy, educational ICT, NGS,
- research opportunities for all to flourish,
- implementation of Language Policy,
- naming strategy.

4. Dimensions of "accessible and affordable" education

challenging but fair admission requirements,

- dedicated attention to the recognition and nurturing of academic potential,
- institutional responsiveness to the academic, social and emotional challenges of student under-preparedness,
- adequate contact time for teaching and learning,
- financial and other resource support for under-resourced students,
- establish pathway for poor students to PG studies,
- accessible education for students with identified disabilities.

5. Dimensions of "comprehensivity"

- maintenance of programme mix between professional, vocational and general formative programmes (no "academic drift" allowed),
- stature, scholarly relevance, depth and quality of technology programmes,
- teaching-focused career pathways for academics,
- Senate composition reflective of comprehensive academic employee complement.

6. Qualities of a UJ graduate

- knowledgeable,
- healthy,
- well-balanced,
- responsive to the demands of the workplace,
- broadminded,
- smart/alert/agile,
- confident,
- empathetic/civic-minded,
- ethical,
- skilled communicator,
- global citizen,
- leader able to exert positive influence.

Appendix B

Academic Programmes

1. Unpacking the terms

- a) **Depth:** The opportunities and curriculum offers to a student for **deep learning.**
- b) **Stature:** Positioning of a programme in relation to **similar programmes** in and outside South Africa.
- c) **Quality:** Features of a programme through which it is deemed to be excellent.
- d) **Relevance:** A function of a programme's relationship; field of practice; social and economic.

2. <u>Implementation strategies:</u>

- a) Improve staff capacity in curriculum design and programme delivery.
- b) Profile existing strong programmes; Benchmark; Marketing; Build research enterprise.
- c) Attract high-level cadre of academic teaching staff and develop existing staff; extend SQP; international links.
- d) Deepen and extend student academic engagement:
 - Student counselling to ensure appropriate placement,
 - FYE programme extended to **whole Undergraduate** student body,
 - Expand tutorial programmes,
 - Enrich engagement with **citizenship**, **democracy and ethics** in all Undergraduate programmes.
- e) Follow a more **reflective** and **self-conscious** approach to Teaching and Learning.
- f) Produce **well-educated and trained graduates** for social and economical development.
- g) Enable students to **realise their full potential** in educational achievement, which will improve success rates and produce fewer dropouts.
- h) Academic programmes must be the **1**st **choice** for students.

APPENDIX C

Differentiation

1. Differentiation means that:

- a) Programme offerings across faculties range from a strong focus on technology-oriented and/or professional programmes to general formative knowledge domains.
- b) Faculties may be grouped according to the dominant programme type offered:
 - General formative programmes: Humanities; Science,
 - Professional programmes: FEFS; Health Sciences; Law; Education;
 Management,
 - Technological programmes: FADA; FEBE.

2. Implementation strategies to accomplish differentiation:

- Setting of targets to form the basis of annual performance management of faculties
- Ensure that faculties demonstrate their year-on-year incremental achievement towards the 10 year goals through specific targets that should inform strategies for:
 - annual enrolment planning,
 - enhancing teaching and learning,
 - increasing research output,
 - internationalisation,
 - · focus on enhancing staff qualifications,
 - resource allocation.
- On-going monitoring against agreed upon targets.

3. Net result in 10 years achieved through internal differentiation will be that:

- UJ will double its research output from a 8th to 6th position.
- UJ will expand its postgraduate base from 13% to 16%.
- all permanent academic staff will have masters qualification and 50% of permanent academic staff will have a PhD qualification - one of few universities to have such a highly qualified staff complement.
- UJ will have increased success rates and graduate outputs (a further 774 to 1663 graduates - one of the country's largest producers of university graduates).
- by increasing its intake in SET by 1000 UJ will be a major player in addressing the country's needs for skills in critical areas.

<u>APPENDIX D</u>

Technology Programmes

1. Defining 'Technology' Programmes

A **continuum** of programmes, which ranges from a **low dependence** on science and scientific understandings, to a **high-level interface** with science and emerging scientific knowledge.

- Intention: To focus in the main, not solely, on high-level technologies,
- Move away from a too narrow definition of technology as simply the offering of diploma programmes,
- Instead: Offering of both diploma and degree programmes, that are intellectually challenging and intellectually expansive, and as found at reputable international institutions,
- Incorporate design as a core component of critical thinking skills,
- To position the strong technology programmes as prestigious qualifications which attract applicants of top calibre.

2. Principles and criteria for selection

- Areas of existing strength; some areas of emerging strength.
- Themes, which speak to current and emerging national priorities.
- Well-developed linkages with policy-makers, industry, professional boards.
- Themes with a competitive advantage often a unique strength or position.
- Twin areas of focus: training of students (degrees and diplomas, UG and PG); and research, innovation, patents.
- Interdisciplinarity to enhance innovative thinking.
- A critical mass of well-qualified academic employees.
- Innovative student training: Problem-solving approaches, multidisciplinary teams, studio training etc.
- International linkages, which ensure cutting edge training and innovation.
- Robust training in first year core disciplines (maths, physics, chemistry, and language skills).
- A critical mass of PG students top applicants, and nurtured potential.

3. Areas of current strength

- Water science and materials technology.
- Energy and environment.
- Automation, instrumentation and control.

- Radiography.
- Logistics.
- Manufacturing.
- Mining technology.
- Cyber security.
- Telecommunications and signal processing.
- Design for social development.

4. Areas of potential and emerging strength

- Digital technology and the creative disciplines.
- Brewing and beverage engineering.
- Biomedical technology.
- High-pressure high temperature research facility.

---000----