

Focus area 3

The four standards concentrate on the coherence and integration of the various components comprising the institutional quality management system and on how these work in concert to support the likelihood of student success and improve the quality of learning, teaching and research engagement, as well as accommodating the results of constructive integrated community engagement in accordance with the institution's mission.

Standard 9	Standard 10	Standard 11	Standard 12
An evidence-based coherent, reasonable, functional, and meaningfully structured relationship exists between all components of the institutional quality management system.	Evidence-based regular and dedicated governance and management oversight of the quality assurance system exists.	Planning and processes exist for the reasonable and functional allocation of resources to all components of the institutional quality management system.	The quality assurance system achieves its purpose efficiently and effectively.
Mature	Mature	Mature	Mature
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Academic departments and support services conduct self-evaluations according to a six-year cycle (including a two-year follow-up report). + Human resource work agreements and performance appraisal systems are well established and functioning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Clear lines of accountability for quality assurance in faculties and at the institutional level + Many examples of active sharing of good teaching and learning practice at institutional and faculty levels (T&L Hubs) + Regular forum meetings held by deans, vice-deans and faculty managers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Quality assurance is a shared responsibility and integrated in budgets and work agreements + Workload allocation is managed and approved at the academic departmental level in a fair and transparent manner 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Devolved manner of the management of quality management and assurance with budgeting happening at faculty and responsibility centre level + Scholarly approach to quality assurance is practiced

INTERIM IMPROVEMENT ACTIONS

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Further guidance required for faculties and support services to conduct effective self-evaluations - Capacity and time constraints on staff to engage in a self-evaluation process which can be mitigated by more online self-help resources - Tensions between the requirements of professional bodies and SU quality assurance arrangements - Quality assurance of inter-faculty programmes to be monitored and managed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Responsibility centres to also to identify, reflect on and share good practices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Buy-in of additional capacity for faculties and PASS environments to assist with self-evaluation activities during their 6-yearly reviews 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Greater formalisation of annual quality assurance and enhancement planning in faculties
--	---	---	---