Chapter Seven

Guidelines and Procedures for Five-year Programme Review

7.1 Purpose/Aim

7.1.1 An existing programme is subject to a rigorous programme review after the validated/revalidated programme has been put to implementation for 4 years, in addition to the annual programme report. Thereafter, the programme will be subject to a rigorous programme review every 5 years so as to have a complete picture of a student cohort as Lingnan undergraduate programmes are of 4 years' duration. Programme modifications/developments as a result of the review will be put to effect in the next academic year.

[Note: CEAL/CLEAC courses, the Core Curriculum and courses with Service-Learning elements shall undergo reviews with reference to a separate set of guidelines customised for them respectively.]

7.1.2 The five-year programme review serves to ensure that the programme undergoes a **rigorous review** at a reasonable interval to ascertain its satisfactory operation and development.

The general aim of a five-year programme review is to assure the academic validity and standard of the programme. In more specific terms, the review will consider and make observation and recommendations regarding the following:

(a) whether the programme standards are consistent with those articulated for the University;
(b) whether the programme has been successfully implemented and attained the required standard at the relevant level in the Hong Kong Qualifications Framework (HKQF);
(c) whether the programme has met its identified aims and achieved the intended learning outcomes;
(d) whether and how the views/problems raised by relevant parties/reflected by statistics have been addressed/solved;
(e) whether the programme has been developed and managed appropriately; and
(f) whether the proposed modifications/developments are appropriate and can be effectively implemented.

7.2 Content and Documentation

7.2.1 Following 4 years of implementation, operation and development, a **critical**, **thorough** and **comprehensive review** of a programme in various aspects **based on feedback/comments** from various sources has to be conducted by the Programme and Curriculum Committee (PCC)/Undergraduate Business Programmes Committee (UBPC)/Department Board (for BA programmes offered by departments under the Faculty of Arts) concerned. The review should cover all aspects of the programme, including student admission, programme aims and learning outcomes, curriculum, content (including the issue of proliferation of courses and overlapping of course contents), teaching/learning activities, switches of language of instruction (if any), assessment methods/results and regulations, employment opportunities, the overall intellectual level of the programme, the intellectual demands it places on students, and staffing resources.

7.2.2 The Programme Director/Head of Department (for BA programmes offered by departments under the Faculty of Arts and the LEO Dr David P. Chan BSc Data Science programme) has

to ensure that a brief review document is drawn up. It should provide some basic information about the programme, including its aims and learning outcomes, student numbers, entrance requirements and student admission, programme design, structure and curriculum, programme operation, management, quality assurance and enhancement, learning and teaching, examination and assessment, employment opportunities, staffing resources, a brief up-to-date syllabus of each course, etc. Apart from giving figures or statistics on such aspects as student admission, examination and assessment, and employment, the document should give an **analysis of the data showing the trends and development and an evaluation if the programme meets the manpower needs of the society**.

Most important of all, the document should
(a) give a **critical analysis** and **commentary** on the programme during the review period highlighting how and to what extent the aims and learning outcomes at programme level (and individual course level if deemed appropriate) are achieved and the programme standards are consistent with those articulated for the University; and
(b) include the **proposed programme/course modifications and developments**, giving clear justifications and spelling out the differences from the existing programme. (Please refer to the Appendix for more details.)

7.2.3 The five-year programme review documentation will not require such details as summary of developments since last re/validation or five-year review, professional recognition, resource support (accommodation, equipment, general expenses, library support, computing support, etc.), University-wide assessment regulations, etc. Instead, information on these items will be made optional and be included when deemed necessary.

7.2.4 In the context of a 5-year review of an undergraduate programme, while the focus of the document is on the programme itself, the review document shall contain a section or sections concerning the Minor programme(s) offered or co-ordinated also by the academic unit, if any. The document shall provide general information about the curricular requirements, student enrolment, operations of the Minor programme(s), if any, and give an evidence-based evaluation as well as propose ways of improvement/development.

7.2.5 In line with the spirit that measurement of learning outcomes should be **evidence-based**, the review document should draw upon evidence and information from the following sources:

(a) Statistical data (provided by the Registrar for most programmes) on student admissions, examination results and other academic related aspects for the past 4 intakes/years. These include: take-up rate, admission ratio, qualifications of admittees, average admission score, distribution of assessment grades, honours classification, attrition rate, cohort success rate, statistics related to academic performance of year 2 or above undergraduate admittees, etc. The statistics provide the factual basis for the programme review.
(b) Employment statistics for graduates in recent years (e.g. in the last 4 years) from the Office of Student Affairs (for undergraduate programmes).
(c) Comments and suggestions contained in the reports of External Academic Advisers, relevant records of discussion of the comments and suggestions, response made to the External Academic Advisers as well as agreed action taken/to be taken (if any).
(d) Comments and suggestions from the Advisory Board concerned.
(e) The views of students obtained through various means, such as Course Teaching and Learning Evaluation, questionnaires, surveys, Staff-Student Consultation Committee meetings, informal meetings with students, views expressed by ex-students where appropriate, etc.
(f) The views of graduates and alumni obtained through means such as surveys and informal

meetings, etc.

(g) The views of staff teaching on the programme.

(h) The time-series data on various aspects of the programme developed by the academic unit itself, or, where necessary, with assistance from the Teaching and Learning Centre.

(i) Stock-taking of learning and teaching activities, and assessment methods.

7.3 Reviewers and Review Meeting

7.3.1 A senior academic of Associate Professor or above in rank inside the University but outside the programme shall be appointed as the Convener of the review meeting. Two or more external members, outside the University, of Associate Professor or Senior Lecturer or above in rank and with expertise in the relevant disciplines shall also be appointed by the Academic Quality Assurance Committee (AQAC) (for undergraduate programmes) or the Postgraduate Studies Committee (PSC) (for taught postgraduate programmes). One external member should be non-local and, where possible, selected from one of the benchmarking institutions of the University[1] or the programme.

7.3.2 Generally, at least two external members are to be appointed for a non-integrated/single disciplinary programme while three external members are to be appointed for an integrated/multi-disciplinary/cross-disciplinary programme (e.g. BA Cultural Studies, BBA, BSocSc). Nominations for appointment as Convener and external members shall be made by the relevant programme. A greater number of nominations (with preference order) should be submitted to the AQAC/PSC for its consideration and choice (e.g. 4 to 5 nominations for appointment of 2 external members).

7.3.3 Academic units shall not nominate those who have a close connection to them, for instance, current Chairman or members of the Advisory Board of the relevant programme/department, those who are currently serving or served as External Academic Advisers of the relevant programme in recent years (at least a lapse of three years after their term of service), unless there are compelling circumstances to do so.

7.3.4 The Registry/School of Graduate Studies (GS) will co-ordinate the appointment procedures and forward to the appointed reviewers a copy of the review documentation endorsed by the PCC/UBPC/DB and subsequently by the Faculty Board/the School of Interdisciplinary Studies Management Board (SISMB) of the respective Faculty/School/Board of Graduate Studies (BGS) (for programmes housed under the GS) and approved by AQAC/PSC.

7.3.5 External Academic Advisers of the programme shall be invited to join the review as far as practicable so that their views/advice can be sought. Relevant academic unit shall communicate with the External Academic Advisers at the early stage of their terms of service the planned period during which the next Five-year Programme Review will take place so as to facilitate planning of the External Academic Advisers to take part in the review as far as practicable.

7.3.6 The External Academic Advisers joining the review is/are not part of the review panel and shall participate in the Programme Review as expert witness(es) and meet with reviewers separately from the PCC/UBPC/DB.

7.3.7 If a non-local reviewer cannot join the review meetings on campus, video conference will be arranged as far as practicable. Considering that the reviewers can be from different time zones,

---

[1] International Christian University of Japan, Yale-NUS College of Singapore, Sun Yat-sen University of China, and Williams College and Oberlin College and Conservatory of USA

and therefore operational difficulties may be encountered for arranging video conference for review meetings which last for a whole day, the reviewers can take part in some, not all, of the meetings. When a non-local reviewer is unable to come to the University and a video conference cannot be arranged or he/she can only join part of the event, paper assessment in areas specified under 7.1.2 above shall be provided by him/her prior to the meeting.

7.3.8 The appointed reviewers will meet with the PCC/UBPC/DB to discuss matters of concern especially the proposed modifications/developments. In essence, the review takes the form of PCC/UBPC/DB meeting with external input. Reviewers can suggest having a separate session to meet with junior academic staff, if deemed necessary. This peer review format has the advantage of encouraging freer flow of views. The review is expected to be a one-day exercise to facilitate more thorough and in depth discussion. The appointed reviewers may also meet with relevant graduates and students. The programme review document (except sensitive data) should be provided to them.

7.3.9 The reviewers are responsible for assessing the academic standard of the programme, and evaluating how the programme has performed in the six areas detailed in Section 7.1.2 based on the review documentation and other information submitted, as well as their discussions with the PCC/UBPC/DB, other staff as appropriate, students and graduates, etc. In reviewing the programme, the reviewers have to make reference to data and statistical evidences. The reviewers are not required to recommend approval of the programme. Instead, they give comments/recommendations in any aspect of the programme. Their report shall also articulate their evaluation of the programme and the basis on which they arrive at the evaluation. The external members will also provide written feedback/recommendations which form the basis of the written report.

7.3.10 The Registry/GS will work with the PCC/UBPC/DB secretary on logistics of the review meeting and prepare the report.

7.3.11 For a visit of a non-local external member, the visit shall be up to four days. The package will include a return air ticket of economy class (with a ceiling rate based on point-to-point direct full-fare economy ticket rate), accommodation expenses of up to HK$1,500 per night^ and a per diem allowance at HK$900 per day.
^ up to HK$1,700 per night from 2024-25

7.3.12 An honorarium* will be paid to an external member who has completed his/her duties. (*HK$3,500 from 2021-22 to 2023-24, and HK$4,500 from 2024-25)

7.4 After the Review Meeting

7.4.1 After the review meeting, the PCC/UBPC/DB shall follow up the comments/recommendations of the reviewers, write up a response, and finalise a brief summary setting out proposed modifications/developments (with justifications and implementation details) taking into account the external input, for submission to the Faculty Management Board (FMB)[2]/SISMB of the respective Faculty/School/BGS for endorsement and then to AQAC/PSC for consideration and approval as appropriate. In the response, the PCC/UBPC/DB should provide a plan of action as far as practicable to follow up comments/recommendations which involve a longer term development and implementation. A copy of the report of the review meeting (and any follow-up meeting(s)), part of the review documentation with significant revisions (if any), and any other documents where deemed necessary should also be submitted. The AQAC's/PSC's decision and comments, if any, the approved PCC/UBPC/DB's response

---

[2] The role of the FMB in the Faculty of Arts is taken up by the Executive Committee in Arts.

to comments/recommendations of reviewers and the brief summary on proposed modifications/developments[3] will be submitted to the Senate for its information and possible comments.

7.5   Timing

7.5.1 The five-year programme review should take place in the academic year after a validated/revalidated/reviewed programme has been implemented for 4 years. As a general guideline, the review documentation should be ready for consideration of the AQAC/PSC in October/November for review meetings to be held in January/February, or in December/January for review meetings to be held in March/April/May, before dispatching to the appointed reviewers. The response and brief summary together with other documents (detailed above) should be submitted to the AQAC/PSC meeting around March/April for review meetings held in January/February, or around May/June for review meetings held in March/April, or in September/October for review meetings held in May.

---

[3] In case proposed major modifications to the programme/courses include those significant ones that Senate has not delegated its authority of approval to AQAC/PSC, Senate approval will be sought.

Content of a Five-year Programme Review Documentation

Part I: General Information on Current Programme

1. **Summary Information**

Title of the programme, normal duration, QF level, programme starting date, current student numbers (total and in each year of studies), planned future intakes/numbers (if different from current numbers), host and contributing departments, dates of previous validation/revalidation/five-year review.

2. **Aims and Learning Outcomes of the Programme**

The educational and relevant aims and intended learning outcomes of the programme, expressed, as appropriate, to reflect relevant knowledge, attitude and skills (e.g. analytical and communication skills), the intellectual and imaginative development of the student. Particular emphasis be placed on what students are expected to learn. Illustrate briefly the mapping between the learning outcomes of the programme and Lingnan's Ideal Graduate Attributes to show how the programme contributes to the achievement of some or all of Lingnan's Ideal Graduate Attributes. Include a mapping table between the learning outcomes of the programme and Lingnan's Ideal Graduate Attributes following the table shown in Annex 1.

Include also a mapping between the learning outcomes of the programme and the relevant generic level descriptors of the HKQF. For relevant Generic Level Descriptors (GLDs) of undergraduate and postgraduate programmes (i.e. QF levels 5, 6 and 7) and the templates to be completed, please refer to Annexes 2 and 3 respectively.

3. **Consistency between Programme Standards and those Articulated for the University**

A statement on how the programme standards are consistent with those articulated for the University. The overarching statement of the University about its academic standards is given in Annex 4.

4. **Entrance Requirements and Student Admission**

A complete statement of minimum entrance requirements, with any special conditions for direct entry to higher years of the programme and for exemptions. Highlights of admission figures as indicators of performance, if deemed necessary. An analysis of the data showing the trends and development should be included. Detailed figures of past 4 intakes can be appended.

5. **Programme Design and Structure**

Design philosophy and academic structure of the programme in detail. The inter-relationships between courses should be identified and any streaming of the programme clearly presented. How the components in the programme align with the programme aims and may lead to achievement of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes. A mapping table of learning outcomes of the programme and the full list of courses in the Major(s) of an undergraduate programme/a postgraduate programme should be included. In a programme where the student is given a substantial degree of choice, the permitted programmes of study should be identified with a clear indication of compulsory courses and with regulations for the

choice of Majors (in undergraduate programmes)/streams (in taught postgraduate programmes) and elective courses. The conditions for the award in terms of credit accumulation should be defined.

6. **Programme Operation, Management Quality Assurance and Enhancement**

Details of programme operation, management, quality assurance and enhancement, including constitution and terms of reference of the PCC/UBPC/DB and other committee(s) responsible for programme management, quality assurance and enhancement, e.g. Faculty Board/Faculty Management Board concerned/SISMB/BGS.

Responsibilities of the Programme Director and/or Head of Department. Other programme responsibilities as appropriate – admission/year/Major/stream tutors, course coordinators, etc.

A copy of the annual reports from External Academic Advisers in the past 4 years shall be appended.

7. **Teaching/Learning Methods and Projects (if any)**

General description of the teaching and learning methods/activities including balance and rationale of the proposed teaching/learning methods/activities.

If there are courses switched to be taught in Chinese, the switches should be reported and the reasons for the switches should be addressed to reflect that those switches are anomalies.

Project work should be explained in detail, typical examples given and the organisation and assessment methods described.

8. **Examination and Assessment**

What are the general strategy and methods in assessing students for the programme. There may be some highlights or examples on assessment methods specifically for certain courses used to measure certain learning outcomes.

Highlights of statistics on examination results as indicators of performance, if deemed necessary.

For undergraduate programmes, in particular, statistics showing the performance and progress of year 2 or above admittees throughout their periods of studies (with comparison with year 1 admittees) should be highlighted. Report on actions taken to address the issues or problems associated with student performance and progress as identified in the annual programme reports (if any) and progress made should be included.

An analysis of the data showing the trends and development should be included. Detailed figures of past 4 years/intakes can be appended.

9. **Employment Opportunities**

For undergraduate programmes, a general statement on career prospect of students and some statistics on graduate employment in past 4 years. An analysis of the data showing the trends and development should be included.

For taught postgraduate programmes, some data on the effect or benefits of the study programme to the employment or work prospect of graduates should be included.

10. Staff Resources for the Programme or Majors (in undergraduate programmes)/Streams (in taught postgraduate programmes)

The staff resources which are used to support the programme or Majors (in undergraduate programmes)/streams (in taught postgraduate programmes) and any expected/proposed addition/deduction should be specified according to the headings (a) to (b) below. A distinction should be made between those resources in place, and those still to be obtained. [Request for resources should be separately submitted to relevant Committees, e.g. University Administrative and Planning Committee.]

(a) *Overall Staff Support*
   Present establishment and grades of teaching, technical and general staff in the host department(s).

(b) *Academic Staff*
   i) Listing of academic staff who are involved in the programme/Majors (in undergraduate programmes)/streams (in taught postgraduate programmes), with rank, qualifications, teaching and/or other programme responsibilities, staff research interest/specialty, courses taught, etc.;
   ii) rank and subject area of additional posts, those previously agreed and any now requested, with justifications, if any;
   iii) expected staff deduction, if any;

11. Minor Programme(s) (if any)

General information about the curricula requirements, student enrolment, operations of the Minor programme(s) also offered or co-ordinated by the academic unit should be provided.

[Notes:
1. The five-year programme review documentation does not require such details as summary of developments since last re/validation or five-year review, professional recognition, resource support (accommodation, equipment, general expenses, library support, computing support, etc.), University-wide assessment regulations, etc. Instead, information on these items will be made optional and be included when deemed necessary.
2. A budget showing annual income and expenses is needed for a self-financed programme.]

Part II: Critical Appraisal and Programme Development

A. Critical Appraisal

1. A **critical analysis** and **commentary** in various aspects of the programme, including student admission, programme aims and learning outcomes, curriculum, content (including the issue of proliferation of courses and overlapping of course contents), teaching/learning activities, assessment methods/results and regulations (with emphasis on effectiveness and variety of teaching/learning activities and assessment methods for achieving programme/course learning outcomes), employment opportunities, the overall intellectual level of the programme, the intellectual demands it places on students, and staffing resources.

   The document shall **critically evaluate** how and to what extent the aims and learning outcomes at programme level (and individual course level if deemed appropriate) are achieved. It shall

give details on the actions taken to achieve and measure learning outcomes as well as the evidence for the evaluation (as detailed under section 7.2.5 of the guidelines). These shall include collection and handling of results of Course Teaching and Learning Evaluation, views and suggestions from External Academic Advisers, Advisory Board, and Staff-Student Consultation Committee, students/graduates surveys, alumni survey, employers survey, etc. It is expected that there is an **extensive analysis of some time-series data** indicating the performance of the programme and students on the programme including those admitted to year 1 and those admitted directly to year 2 or above, if any. In particular, in evaluating the performance and progress of year 2 or above admittees, the analysis should be made on their performance throughout their periods of studies, not only for the year of admission, based on such data as Term/Overall GPAs, graduation rate, etc.

This shall be an evaluation of the programme addressing the aims of the review:
  (a)   whether the programme standards are consistent with those articulated for the University as given in the overarching statement in Annex 3;
  (b)   whether the programme has been successfully implemented and attained the required standard at relevant level in HKQF;
  (c)   whether the programme has met its identified aims and achieved intended learning outcomes;
  (d)   whether and how the views/problems raised by relevant parties/reflected by statistics have been addressed/solved#; and
  (e)   whether the programme has been developed and managed appropriately.

There should be elaboration on views/suggestions received from External Academic Advisers during the years under review and discussion/response made as well as action taken/to be taken.

2.   The document shall contain an **evidence-based evaluation on whether the programme has met and will continue to meet the manpower needs of the society in the near future**, including information/data on student demand and manpower demand, etc. Possible sources of information include past admission figures and trend analysis, results of surveys, Government projections for manpower requirements, employment projections, graduate employment, etc. The evaluation shall take into account similar programmes offered by other local institutions and the uniqueness of the programme.

3.   There shall be a separate section to evaluate the efforts made in and the progress on following up recommendations given by the last 5-year programme review panel.

4.   Developments in recent years as implementation of the action plans set out in the annual programme reports of last four years shall also be evaluated.

5.   **External benchmarking** at programme level should be conducted to look at and learn from international best practices of other institutions including performance indicators at the programme, such as
  •   Admission strategies;
  •   contributions to curriculum development;
  •   curriculum innovations – evidence of innovative teaching materials, programme structure and course contents;
  •   delivery of teaching – number and nature of subjects taught; evidence of innovative teaching pedagogies; course teaching and learning evaluation scores;
  •   interaction with students, including nature and load of supervision of students;
  •   assessment standards;
  •   awards and prizes for teaching; and/or

- teaching leadership.

With regard to performance indicators, benchmarking is preferably made with reference to the Sector-wide Performance Indicators and those specific to Lingnan University contained in the University Accountability Agreement (UAA) [Note].

Note: Sector-wide Performance Measures under 'The quality of the student experience of learning and teaching' domain in the UAA include 1) (a) undergraduate satisfaction with the quality and value gained from their teaching and learning experience; and (b) undergraduate satisfaction with their overall learning environment, 2) undergraduate employment success rate, and 3) learning experience outside classroom – (a) Service-Learning; and (b) internship experience; 4) satisfaction of students with special educational needs; while the Key Performance Indicators specific for Lingnan University include 1) percentage of graduates having research training through capstone projects/supervised individual/group research, 2) percentage of students attending leadership training, 3) percentage of students participating in diversified whole-person development co-curriculum learning experience, and 4) percentage of students participating in educational activities that enhance moral education and social citizenship.

The PCC/UBPC/DB has the discretion regarding the details of benchmarking for each exercise, including what are to be benchmarked, with which institutions and how to evaluate the data collected. The approved external benchmarking plan of an undergraduate programme shall be followed as far as practicable. The institutions to be benchmarked in the 5-year programme review exercise are preferably to come from but not limited to those chosen for benchmarking at the institutional level. A brief self-reflection with reference to the benchmarking performed in the review period with emphasis on the results or findings that lead to development or improvement to the programme/courses should be included in the review document.

6. In the review document of an undergraduate programme, an evidence-based evaluation should be provided for Minor programme(s) offered or co-ordinated also by the academic unit, if any.

B. Proposed Programme/Course Modifications and Developments

Details of proposed programme/course modifications and developments for the postgraduate/undergraduate programme, with justifications including whether such will be conducive to achievement of learning outcomes (where appropriate), views of stakeholders, meeting manpower needs of the society, etc., and implementation details. In case substantial modifications are proposed, the revised programme structure has to be set out and the difference from the existing programme has to be spelt out. If the modifications require approval of other programmes, please state whether the approval has been sought.

In the review document of an undergraduate programme, details of proposed programme/course modifications and developments for Minor programme(s) offered or co-ordinated by the academic unit, if any, should be provided.

Part III: Syllabus of Each Course

An updated syllabus of each course for offering after the programme review: course title and code, teaching hours and mode, prerequisite/co-requisite/exclusion (if any), exemption requirements (if any), brief course descriptions, aims, learning outcomes*, teaching method, measurement of learning outcomes*, assessment methodology, and any other items deemed necessary. The standard format of a course syllabus and sample syllabuses are shown in Annexes 5 to 7 to Appendix C of Chapter 1 Initiation of New Programmes, Validation and Approval for Undergraduate Programmes. An interactive Course Syllabus Generation Tool is available at http://tlc.ln.edu.hk/SyllabusTool/ which provides step by step guidelines to develop

course syllabus meeting the standard format.

* Reference materials on writing of "Learning Outcomes" and "Measurement of Learning Outcomes" and other useful information featuring Outcome-based Approaches to Teaching and Learning (OBATL) are available from TLC's webpage << https://ln.edu.hk/tlc/support-for-staff/outcomes-based-approaches-to-teaching-and-learning/obatl-resource >>.

Mapping of the Programme Intended Learning Outcomes (PILOs) to Lingnan's Graduate Attributes for Undergraduate Programmes

Programme Intended Learning Outcomes (PILOs)	Graduate Attributes for Undergraduates								
	Scholarly and Interdisciplinary[1]	Digitally Literate[2]	Skilled Communicator[3]	Critical and Analytical[4]	Creative and Entrepreneurial[5]	Committed to Service[6]	Glocally Minded[7]	Personally and Socially Responsible[8]	Committed to Life-long Learning[9]
PILO 1									
PILO 2									
PILO 3									
etc.									

Notes:
1. LU graduates will have a secure grounding in a chosen academic field(s) and cross-disciplinary applications.
2. LU graduates will have proficiency in technology.
3. LU graduates will have excellent communication skills, including oral and written English and Chinese (Putonghua as well as Cantonese) skills.
4. LU graduates will demonstrate independent critical thinking and strong analytic competence.
5. LU graduates will be creative problem-solvers and be capable planners, and entrepreneurs.
6. LU graduates will have a commitment to service to the community.
7. LU graduates will have a global and local (a Glocal) outlook with the ability to understand various cultural perspectives.
8. LU graduates will have tolerance, integrity, civility and a sense of responsibility.
9. LU graduates will have a desire for life-long learning.

Mapping of the Programme Intended Learning Outcomes (PILOs) to Lingnan's Graduate Attributes for Taught Postgraduate Programmes:

Programme Intended Learning Outcomes (PILOs)	Graduate Attributes for Taught Postgraduates				
	Independent and Critical Scholar[1]	Advanced Professional Problem-solver[2]	Critical and Creative[3]	Skilled Communicator[4]	Ethically and Socially Responsible Researcher/Professional[5]
PILO 1					
PILO 2					
PILO 3					
etc.					

Notes:
1. LU graduates will possess in-depth discipline specific knowledge as well as a diverse range of professional and scholarship skills.
2. LU graduates will have a deep understanding of discipline knowledge to creatively solve complex problems and provide innovative solutions.
3. LU graduates will be critically analytical and have a creative perspective and outlook in their research areas / professional discipline.
4. LU graduates will be advanced communicators and be able to articulate clearly and coherently in written, digital and oral forms.
5. LU graduates will be reflective, ethical and socially responsible in conducting their research / professional practice.

Generic Level Descriptors (GLDs) for HKQF - Level 5
(for undergraduate programmes)

Knowledge and Intellectual Skills

- Demonstrate and/or work with in-depth specialised technical or theoretical knowledge of a field of work or study

- Use a wide range of specialised intellectual skills in support of established practices in a subject/discipline/ sector

- Critically analyse, evaluate and/or synthesise concepts, information and issues drawn from a wide range of sources to generate ideas

Processes

- Apply knowledge and skills in a range of technical, professional or management activities

- Identify and analyse both routine and abstract technical/ professional problems and issues, and formulate evidence-based responses

- Exercise appropriate judgement in planning, design, technical and/or management functions related to products, services, operations or processes

Autonomy and Accountability

- Accept responsibility and accountability, within broad parameters, for determining and achieving personal and/or group outcomes

- Work under the mentoring of senior qualified practitioners

- Deal with ethical issues, seeking guidance of others where appropriate

Communication, ICT and Numeracy

- Use some advanced and specialised skills in support of established practices in a subject/discipline/ sector

- Participate constructively in group discussions and make formal and informal presentations to a range of audiences on standard/mainstream topics in a subject/ discipline/sector

- Use some advanced features of ICT applications to support and enhance work

- Interpret, use and evaluate numerical and graphical data to set and achieve goals/ targets

Retrieved from:
https://www.hkqf.gov.hk/filemanager/en/content_13/The%20revised%20GLD%20and%20the%20Explanatory%20Notes_Eng_April_2018.pdf

HKQF - Level 6 (for postgraduate programmes)
Level 6

Knowledge and Intellectual Skills	Processes	Autonomy and Accountability	Communication, ICT and Numeracy
- Demonstrate command of a systematic, coherent body of knowledge, some of which is at the forefront of a field of study or professional practice - Utilise highly specialised technical, research or scholastic skills across an area of study - Critically review, consolidate and extend knowledge, skills, practices and thinking in a subject/discipline/sector	- Apply knowledge and skills in a broad range of specialised technical, professional or management activities - Utilise diagnostic and creative skills to carry out complex planning, design, technical and/or management functions related to products, services, operations or processes, including resourcing and evaluation - Design and apply appropriate methodologies to conduct research and/or advanced technical or professional activity - Critically evaluate new information, concepts and evidence from a range of sources and develop creative responses to routine and abstract professional problems and issues - Deal with complex issues and make informed judgements in the absence of complete or consistent data/information	- Exercise significant autonomy in determining and achieving personal and/or group outcomes - Accept accountability in decision making relating to the achievement of outcomes - Demonstrate leadership and make an identifiable contribution to change and development - Deal with complex ethical and professional issues	- Use advanced and specialised skills to support academic and professional work in a subject/ discipline/sector - Communicate, using appropriate methods, to a range of audiences including peers, senior colleagues and specialists - Use advanced features of ICT applications to support and enhance work and identify refinements and/or new requirements to increase effectiveness - Undertake critical evaluations of numerical and graphical data in support of decision-making

Level 7

Knowledge and Intellectual Skills	Processes	Autonomy and Accountability	Communication, ICT and Numeracy
- Demonstrate a critical overview of a substantial body of knowledge and its related theories and concepts at the forefront of a field of study or professional practice, including an evaluative understanding of its broad relationship with other disciplines - Make a significant and original contribution to a specialised field of inquiry, or to broader interdisciplinary relationships - Identify, conceptualise and offer original and creative insights into new, complex and abstract ideas and information	- Apply knowledge and skills in a broad range of complex activities in highly specialised technical, professional or management contexts - Demonstrate command of research and methodological issues and engage in critical dialogue - Produce creative and original responses to problems and issues in the context of new circumstances - Deal with very complex and/or new issues and make informed judgements in the absence of complete or consistent data/information	- Assume a high degree of autonomy, with full accountability for own work, and significant responsibility for others - Demonstrate leadership and originality in responding to new and unforeseen circumstances and accept accountability in related decision making - Deal with very complex ethical and professional issues	- Use advanced and specialised skills to support academic and professional work that is at the forefront of a subject/discipline/ sector - Strategically use communication skills, at the standard of published academic work and/or critical dialogue, adapting content and purpose to a range of audiences and contexts - Use advanced features of ICT applications and specify requirements in anticipation of future needs - Undertake critical evaluations of numerical and graphical data and employ such data extensively in support of the creation of new knowledge and innovative

Notes:

1. This version of the GLDs is as of **April 2018** which is retrieved from the HKQF website:
https://www.hkqf.gov.hk/en/KeyFeatures/levels/index.html
2. Programmes should always refer to the HKQF website for the latest version of GLDs to be adopted in the programme proposal.

Mapping of Programme Intended Learning Outcomes (PILOs) against the Generic Level Descriptors (GLDs) of the Hong Kong Qualifications Framework (HKQF) – Level 5 (for undergraduate programmes)

GLD Domain	GLDs (HKQF – Level 5)												
	K			P			A			C			
PILO	K1	K2	K3	P1	P2	P3	A1	A2	A3	C1	C2	C3	C4
1.													
2.													
3.													
4.													
5.													
6.													

Information Technology Fluency (ITF) Programme												✓	✓

Notes:

1. Please do the mapping by ticking appropriate boxes. It is not necessary for having a full match between PILOs and GLDs (i.e. not all boxes in the template need to be ticked).
2. The PILOs shall have included the contribution of the Core Curriculum and language enhancement courses in the 120-credit curriculum.
3. The mapping shall count also the ITF programme which is required for all UG students, although it is not part of the 120-credit curriculum.

K - Knowledge and Intellectual Skills	P - Processes	A - Autonomy and Accountability	C - Communication, ICT and Numeracy
K1 - Demonstrate and/or work with in-depth specialised technical or theoretical knowledge of a field of work or study K2 - Use a wide range of specialised intellectual skills in support of established practices in a subject/discipline/ sector K3 - Critically analyse, evaluate and/or synthesise concepts, information and issues drawn from a wide range of sources to generate ideas	P1 - Apply knowledge and skills in a range of technical, professional or management activities P2 - Identify and analyse both routine and abstract technical/ professional problems and issues, and formulate evidence-based responses P3 - Exercise appropriate judgement in planning, design, technical and/or management functions related to products, services, operations or processes	A1 - Accept responsibility and accountability, within broad parameters, for determining and achieving personal and/or group outcomes A2 - Work under the mentoring of senior qualified practitioners A3 - Deal with ethical issues, seeking guidance of others where appropriate.	C1 - Use some advanced and specialised skills in support of established practices in a subject/discipline/sector, C2 - Participate constructively in group discussions and make formal and informal presentations to a range of audiences on standard/mainstream topics in a subject/discipline/sector C3 - Use some advanced features of ICT applications to support and enhance work C4 - Interpret, use and evaluate numerical and graphical data to achieve goals/targets.

1. The above table is retrieved from: https://www.hkqf.gov.hk/filemanager/en/content_13/The%20revised%20GLD%20and%20the%20Explanatory%20Notes_Eng_April_2018.pdf
2. Programmes should always refer to the HKQF website for the latest version of GLDs to be adopted in the programme proposal.

Template for Mapping of Programme Intended Learning Outcomes (PILOs) against the Generic Level Descriptors (GLDs) of the Hong Kong Qualification Framework (HKQF) – Levels 6 *(for postgraduate certificate/diploma and taught master's programmes)* **and 7** *(for taught doctoral programmes)*

PILO / GLD Domain	GLDs (HKQF - Level 6)															
	K			**P**					**A**				**C**			
	K1	K2	K3	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	A1	A2	A3	A4	C1	C2	C3	C4
1.																
2.																
3.																
4.																
5.																
6.																

Notes:
1. Please do the mapping by ticking appropriate boxes. It is not necessary for having a full match between PILOs and GLDs (i.e. not all boxes in the template need to be ticked).

GLDs for HKQF - Level 6

K - Knowledge and Intellectual Skills	P - Processes	A - Autonomy and Accountability	C - Communication, ICT and Numeracy
K1 - Demonstrate command of a systematic, coherent body of knowledge, some of which is at the forefront of a field of study or professional practice K2 - Utilise highly specialised technical, research or scholastic skills across an area of study K3 - Critically review, consolidate and extend knowledge, skills, practices and thinking in a subject/discipline/sector	P1 - Apply knowledge and skills in a broad range of specialised technical, professional or management activities P2 - Utilise diagnostic and creative skills to carry out complex planning, design, technical and/or management functions related to products, services, operations or processes, including resourcing and evaluation P3 - Design and apply appropriate methodologies to conduct research and/or advanced technical or professional activity P4 - Critically evaluate new information, concepts and evidence from a range of sources and develop creative responses to routine and abstract professional problems and issues P5 - Deal with complex issues and make informed judgements in the absence of complete or consistent data/information	A1 - Exercise significant autonomy in determining and achieving personal and/or group outcomes A2 - Accept accountability in decision making relating to the achievement of outcomes A3 - Demonstrate leadership and make an identifiable contribution to change and development A4 - Deal with complex ethical and professional issues	C1 - Use advanced and specialised skills to support academic and professional work in a subject/ discipline/sector C2 - Communicate, using appropriate methods, to a range of audiences including peers, senior colleagues, specialists C3 - Use advanced features of ICT applications to support and enhance work and identify refinements and/or new requirements to increase effectiveness C4 - Undertake critical evaluations of numerical and graphical data in support of decision making

GLDs for HKQF - Level 7

K - Knowledge and Intellectual Skills	P - Processes	A - Autonomy and Accountability	C - Communication, ICT and Numeracy
K1 - Demonstrate a critical overview of a substantial body of knowledge and its related theories and concepts at the forefront of a field of study or professional practice, including an evaluative understanding of its broad relationship with other disciplines K2 - Make a significant and original contribution to a specialised field of inquiry, or to broader interdisciplinary relationships K3 - Identify, conceptualise and offer original and creative insights into new, complex and abstract ideas and information	P1 - Apply knowledge and skills in a broad range of complex activities in highly specialised technical, professional or management contexts P2 - Demonstrate command of research and methodological issues and engage in critical dialogue P3 - Produce creative and original responses to problems and issues in the context of new circumstances P4 - Deal with very complex and/or new issues and make informed judgements in the absence of complete or consistent data/information	A1 - Assume a high degree of autonomy, with full accountability for own work, and significant responsibility for others A2 - Demonstrate leadership and originality in responding to new and unforeseen circumstances and accept accountability in related decision making A3 - Deal with very complex ethical and professional issues	C1 - Use advanced and specialised skills to support academic and professional work that is at the forefront of a subject/discipline/ sector C2 - Strategically use communication skills, at the standard of published academic work and/or critical dialogue, adapting content and purpose to a range of audiences and contexts C3 - Use advanced features of ICT applications and specify requirements in anticipation of future needs C4 - Undertake critical evaluations of numerical and graphical data and employ such data extensively in support of the creation of new knowledge and innovative

Notes:

1. This version of the GLDs is as of **April 2018** which is retrieved from HKQF website: https://www.hkqf.gov.hk/en/KeyFeatures/levels/index.html
2. Programmes should always refer to the HKQF website for the latest version of GLDs to be adopted in the programme proposal.

Academic Standards of Lingnan University

Lingnan University academic standards are realised by means of benchmarking, review and assessment. In terms of benchmarking, the Lingnan ideal graduate attributes have been developed so as to reflect the parameters of Hong Kong Qualification Framework (HKQF) while not losing the distinctive nature of the liberal arts education provided by the University. Accordingly, new and existing programmes are developed with reference to both the Lingnan graduates attributes and the relevant generic level descriptors contained within the HKQF. Similarly, new programme validation and programme review exercises are conducted with the Lingnan ideal graduate attributes and the relevant HKQF parameters in view.

The emphasis on benchmarking is also reflected in the fact that in programme validation and review exercises and the External Academic Advisers system, wherever possible, the relevant panels and External Academic Advisers of a programme include at least one senior academic from one of the University's approved benchmark partners.

Given this emphasis on benchmarking in the process of programme development, review and quality assurance and enhancement, the University is well placed to emphasise the Outcome-Based Approach to Teaching and Learning (OBATL). This means that all course outlines clearly reflect one or more of the programme level outcomes to the extent that all the programme level outcomes are addressed by the programme curriculum overall.

In each of the courses, assessment tasks are then clearly designated as measuring the attainment of one or more course learning outcomes such that all who graduate from a particular programme have been measured against course learning outcomes and the relevant programme learning outcomes that they reflect.

Generic and/or analytical rubrics have been developed for all courses in the Lingnan programme portfolio which means that the academic achievement of students is measured directly against the academic standards established for the relevant programmes and courses and not against artificially imposed grading norms.

**Guidelines and Procedures for Five-year Review of
Centre for English and Additional Languages (CEAL)/Chinese Language Education and
Assessment Centre (CLEAC) Courses**

7.1 Purpose/Aim

7.1.1 As part of the quality assurance and enhancement mechanism of the University, course offerings of CEAL/CLEAC are subject to a rigorous review at an interval of 5 years. Any modifications/developments as a result of the review will be put to effect in the next academic year, where applicable.

7.1.2 The five-year review serves to ensure that the courses of CEAL/CLEAC undergo a **rigorous review** at a reasonable interval to ascertain their satisfactory operation and development.

The general aim of a five-year review is to assure the academic validity and standard of the CEAL/CLEAC courses. In more specific terms, the review will consider:

(a) whether the courses have been properly connected and successfully implemented to achieve the overall aims and intended learning outcomes of CEAL/CLEAC course offerings;
(b) whether individual courses have met their identified aims and achieved the intended learning outcomes;
(c) whether and how the views/problems raised by relevant parties/reflected by statistics have been addressed/solved;
(d) whether the courses have been developed and managed appropriately; and
(e) whether the proposed modifications/developments in course offerings are appropriate and can be effectively implemented.

7.2 Content and Documentation

7.2.1 Following 4 years of implementation, operation and development, a **critical**, **thorough** and **comprehensive review** of CEAL/CLEAC courses in various aspects **based on feedback/comments** from various sources has to be conducted by the Board of CEAL/CLEAC. The review should cover all aspects of CEAL/CLEAC course offerings, including student enrollment, overall aims and learning outcomes of CEAL/CLEAC course offerings, aims and learning outcomes of individual courses, course content (including the issue of overlapping of course contents, if any), teaching/learning activities, assessment methods/results and regulations, the intellectual level of the courses, the intellectual demands they place on students, and staffing resources.

7.2.2 The Head of CEAL/CLEAC has to ensure that a brief review document is drawn up. It should provide some basic information about the CEAL/CLEAC course offerings, including overall aims and learning outcomes, connection among courses, student numbers, courses offerings design and structure, course operations, management, quality assurance and enhancement, learning and teaching, examination and assessment, staffing resources, a brief up-to-date syllabus of each course, etc. Apart from giving figures or statistics on such aspects as student enrollment, examination and assessment, the document should give **an analysis of the data showing the trends and development**.

Most important of all, the document should
(a) give a critical analysis and commentary on course offerings during the review period highlighting how and to what extent the overall aims and learning outcomes for the course

offerings and those for individual courses are achieved; and

    (b) include the proposed modifications and developments, giving clear justifications and spelling out the differences from the existing course offerings. (Please refer to the Appendix for more details.)

7.2.3 The five-year review documentation will not require such details as summary of developments since last four or five-year review, professional recognition, resource support (accommodation, equipment, general expenses, library support, computing support, etc.), University-wide assessment regulations, etc. Instead, information on these items will be made optional and be included when deemed necessary.

7.2.4 In line with the spirit that measurement of learning outcomes should be **evidence-based**, the review document should draw upon evidence and information from the following sources:

    (a) Statistical data on student numbers and examination results for the past 4 years, such as student demand, distribution of assessment grades, attrition rate, etc. The statistics provide the factual basis for the review.

    (b) Comments and suggestions contained in the reports of External Academic Advisers, relevant records of discussion of the comments and suggestions, response made to the External Academic Advisers as well as agreed action taken/to be taken (if any).

    (c) Comments and suggestions from the Advisory Board concerned.

    (d) The views of students obtained through various means, such as Course Teaching and Learning Evaluation, questionnaires, surveys, Staff-Student Consultation Committee meetings, informal meetings with students, views expressed by ex-students where appropriate, etc.

    (e) The views of graduates, alumni and employers obtained through means such as surveys and informal meetings, if any.

    (f) The views of staff teaching CEAL/CLEAC courses.

    (g) The time-series data on various aspects of, the course offerings with assistance from the Teaching and Learning Centre, where necessary.

    (h) Stock-taking of learning and teaching activities, and assessment methods.

7.3 Reviewers and Review Meeting

7.3.1 A senior academic of Associate Professor or above in rank inside the University but outside CEAL/CLEAC shall be appointed as the Convener of the review meeting. Two external members, outside the University, of Associate Professor or Senior Lecturer or above in rank and with expertise in the relevant disciplines shall also be appointed by the Academic Quality Assurance Committee (AQAC). One external member should be non-local and, where possible, selected from one of the benchmarking institutions of the University[1] or the CEAL/CLEAC, if any.

7.3.2 Nominations for appointment as Convener and external members shall be made by CEAL/CLEAC. A greater number of nominations (with preference order) should be submitted to the AQAC for its consideration and choice (e.g. 4 to 5 nominations for appointment of 2 external members).

7.3.3 CEAL/CLEAC shall not nominate those who have a close connection to them, for instance, current Chairman or members of the Advisory Board, those who are currently serving or

---

[1] International Christian University of Japan, Yale-NUS College of Singapore, Sun Yat-sen University, and Williams College and Oberlin College and Conservatory of USA

served as External Academic Advisers in recent years (at least a lapse of three years after their term of service), unless there are compelling circumstances to do so.

7.3.4   The External Academic Adviser(s) shall be invited to join the review as far as practicable so that their views/advice can be sought. CEAL/CLEAC shall communicate with the External Academic Adviser(s) at the early stage of their terms of service the planned period during which the next Five-year Review will take place so as to facilitate planning of the External Academic Adviser(s) to take part in the review as far as practicable.

7.3.5   The External Academic Adviser(s) joining the review is/are not part of the review panel and shall participate in the Review as expert witness(es) and meet with reviewers separately from the Board of CEAL/CLEAC.

7.3.6   If a non-local reviewer cannot join the review meetings on campus, video conference will be arranged as far as practicable. Considering that the reviewers can be from different time zones, and therefore operational difficulties may be encountered for arranging video conference for review meetings which last for a whole day, the reviewers can take part in some, not all, of the meetings. When a non-local reviewer is unable to come to the University and a video conference cannot be arranged or he/she can only join part of the event, paper assessment in areas specified under 7.1.2 above shall be provided by him/her prior to the meeting.

7.3.7   The Registry will co-ordinate the appointment procedures and forward to the appointed reviewers a copy of the review documentation endorsed by the Board of CEAL/CLEAC and subsequently by the Faculty Board of Arts and approved by AQAC.

7.3.8   The appointed reviewers will meet with the Board of CEAL/CLEAC to discuss matters of concern especially the proposed modifications/developments. In essence, the review takes the form of Board of CEAL/CLEAC meeting with external input. Reviewers can suggest having a separate session to meet with junior academic staff, if deemed necessary. This peer review format has the advantage of encouraging freer flow of views. The review is expected to be a one-day exercise to facilitate more thorough and in depth discussion.

7.3.9   The appointed reviewers may also meet with relevant graduates and students. The review document (except sensitive data) should be provided to them.

7.3.10 The reviewers are responsible for assessing the academic standard of the CEAL/CLEAC course offerings, and evaluating how the CEAL/CLEAC course offerings has performed in the five areas detailed in Section 7.1.2 based on the review documentation and other information submitted, as well as their discussions with the Board of CEAL/CLEAC, other staff as appropriate, students and graduates, etc. In reviewing the CEAL/CLEAC course offerings, the reviewers have to make reference to data and statistical evidences. The reviewers will give comments/recommendations in any aspect of the CEAL/CLEAC course offerings. Their report shall also articulate their evaluation of the CEAL/CLEAC course offerings and the basis on which they arrive at the evaluation. The external members will also provide written feedback/recommendations which form the basis of the written report.

7.3.11 The Registry will work with CEAL/CLEAC on logistics of the review meeting and prepare the report.

7.3.12 For a visit of a non-local external member, the visit shall be up to four days. The package will include a return air ticket of economy class (with a ceiling rate based on point-to-point direct full-fare economy ticket rate), accommodation expenses of up to HK$1,500 per night^ and a

per diem allowance at HK$900 per day.
^ up to HK$1,700 per night from 2024-25

7.3.13 An honorarium* will be paid to an external member who has completed his/her duties. (*HK$3,500 from 2021-22 to 2023-24, and HK$4,500 from 2024-25)

7.4   After the Review Meeting

7.4.1 After the review meeting, the Board of CEAL/CLEAC shall follow up the comments/recommendations of the reviewers, write up a response, and finalise a brief summary setting out proposed modifications/developments (with justifications and implementation details) taking into account the external input, for submission to the Executive Committee in Arts for endorsement and then to AQAC for consideration and approval as appropriate. In the response, the Board of CEAL/CLEAC should provide a plan of action as far as practicable to follow up comments/recommendations which involve a longer term development and implementation. A copy of the report of the review meeting (and any follow-up meeting(s)), part of the review documentation with significant revisions (if any), and any other documents where deemed necessary should also be submitted. The AQAC's decision and comments, if any, the approved Board's response to comments/ recommendations of reviewers and the brief summary on proposed modifications/developments[2] will be submitted to the Senate for its information and possible comments.

7.5   Timing

7.5.1 As a general guideline, the review documentation should be ready for consideration of the AQAC in October/November for review meetings to be held in January/February, or in December/January for review meetings to be held in March/April/May, before dispatching to the appointed reviewers. The response and brief summary together with other documents (detailed above) should be submitted to the AQAC meeting around March/April for review meetings held in January/February, or around May/June for review meetings held in March/April, or in September/October for review meetings held in May.

---

[2] In case proposed major modifications to the programme/courses include those significant ones that Senate has not delegated its authority of approval to AQAC, Senate approval will be sought.

**Content of a Five-year Review of
CEAL/CLEAC Courses**

Part I: General Information on Current CEAL/CLEAC Course Offerings

1.   **Summary Information**

Number and categories of courses, title of courses, dates of previous five-year review (if any).

2.   **Aims and Learning Outcomes of CEAL/CLEAC Course Offerings**

The overall educational and relevant aims and intended learning outcomes of CEAL/CLEAC course offerings, expressed, as appropriate, to reflect relevant knowledge, attitude and skills (e.g. analytical and communication skills), the intellectual and imaginative development of the student. Particular emphasis be placed on what students are expected to learn. If there are categories of courses, these can be specified by categories.

3.   **Student Numbers**

Student numbers of each course in past 4 years. Highlights of student figures as indicators of performance, if deemed necessary. An analysis of the data showing the trends and development should be included.

4.   **Course Offerings Design and Structure**

Design philosophy and academic structure of course offerings in detail. The inter-relationships between courses should be identified and any categorisation of the courses clearly presented. How the components in CEAL/CLEAC course offerings align with the overall aims and intended learning outcomes of CEAL/CLEAC course offerings and may lead to achievement of them. A mapping table of learning outcomes of the course offerings and the full list of courses should be included.

5.   **Operation, Management, Quality Assurance and Enhancement**

Details of course operation, management, quality assurance and enhancement, including constitution and terms of reference of the Board of CEAL/CLEAC and other committee(s) responsible for CEAL/CLEAC course management, quality assurance and enhancement, e.g. Faculty Board/Faculty Management Board concerned.

Responsibilities of the Head of CEAL/CLEAC, and other CEAL/CLEAC staff as appropriate.

\# A copy of the annual reports from External Academic Advisers in the past 4 years shall be appended.

6.   **Teaching/Learning Methods**

General description of the teaching and learning methods/activities including balance and rationale of the teaching/learning methods/activities.

7.   **Examination and Assessment**

What are the general strategy and methods in assessing students for courses. There may be some highlights or examples on assessment methods specifically for certain courses used to

measure certain learning outcomes.

Highlights of statistics on examination results as indicators of performance, if deemed necessary. An analysis of the data showing the trends and development should be included. Detailed figures of past 4 years can be appended.

8. **Staff Resources for CEAL/CLEAC**

    The staff resources which are used to support course offerings and any expected/proposed addition/deduction should be specified according to the headings (a) to (b) below. A distinction should be made between those resources in place, and those still to be obtained. [Request for resources should be separately submitted to relevant Committees, e.g. University Administrative and Planning Committee.]

    (a) *Overall Staff Support*
        Present establishment and grades of teaching, technical and general staff in CEAL/CLEAC.

    (b) *Academic Staff*
        i)   Listing of academic staff who are involved in the course offerings, with rank, qualifications, teaching and/or other responsibilities, courses taught, etc.;
        ii) rank and subject area of additional posts, those previously agreed and any now requested, with justifications, if any;
        iii) expected staff deduction, if any;

[Note: The five-year review documentation does not require such details as summary of developments since last five-year review, professional recognition, resource support (accommodation, equipment, general expenses, library support, computing support, etc.), University-wide assessment regulations, etc. Instead, information on these items will be made optional and be included when deemed necessary.]

Part II: Critical Appraisal and CEAL/CLEAC Courses Development

A. Critical Appraisal

1. A **critical analysis** and **commentary** in various aspects of CEAL/CLEAC course offerings, including student enrollment, overall aims and learning outcomes and those for individual courses, course content (including the issue of overlapping of course contents), teaching/learning activities, assessment methods/results and regulations (with emphasis on effectiveness and variety of teaching/learning activities and assessment methods for achieving course learning outcomes), the intellectual level of courses, the intellectual demands they place on students, and staffing resources.

    The document shall **critically evaluate** how and to what extent the overall aims and learning outcomes for the course offerings and those for individual courses are achieved. It shall give details on the actions taken to achieve and measure learning outcomes as well as the evidence for the evaluation (as detailed under section 7.2.4 of the guidelines). These shall include collection and handling of results of Course Teaching and Learning Evaluation, views and suggestions from External Academic Advisers, Advisory Board, and Staff-Student Consultation Committee, students/graduates surveys, alumni survey, employers survey, etc. It is expected that there is an **extensive analysis of some time-series data** indicating the standard of the course offerings.

    This shall be an evaluation of CEAL/CLEAC course offerings addressing the aims of the review:

(a)   whether the courses have been properly connected and successfully implemented to achieve the overall aims and intended learning outcomes of CEAL/CLEAC course offerings;

(b)   whether individual courses have met their identified aims and achieved the intended learning outcomes;

(c)   whether and how the views/problems raised by relevant parties/reflected by statistics have been addressed/solved[#]; and

(d)   whether the courses have been developed and managed appropriately.

[#]   There should be elaboration on views/suggestions received from External Academic Advisers during the years under review and discussion/response made as well as action taken/to be taken.

2.   There shall be a separate section to evaluate the efforts made in and the progress on following up recommendations given by the last 5-year review panel.

3.   Developments in recent years as implementation of the action plans set out in the annual reports of last four years shall also be evaluated.

4.   **External benchmarking** at programme/course level should be conducted to look at and learn from international best practices of other institutions including performance indicators at the programme, such as
   - contributions to curriculum development;
   - curriculum innovations – evidence of innovative teaching materials, programme structure and course contents;
   - delivery of teaching – number and nature of subjects taught; evidence of innovative teaching pedagogies; course teaching and learning evaluation scores;
   - interaction with students;
   - assessment standards;
   - awards and prizes for teaching; and/or
   - teaching leadership.

With regard to performance indicators, benchmarking is preferably made with reference to the Sector-wide Performance Indicators and those specific to Lingnan University contained in the University Accountability Agreement (UAA) [Note].

Note: Sector-wide Performance Measures under 'The quality of the student experience of learning and teaching' domain in the UAA include 1) (a) undergraduate satisfaction with the quality and value which they have gained from their teaching and learning experience, (b) undergraduate satisfaction with their overall learning environment, 2) undergraduate employment success rate, 3) learning experience outside classroom – (a) Service-Learning; (b) internships experience, 4) satisfaction of students with special educational needs; while the Key Performance Indicators specific for Lingnan University include 1) percentage of graduates having research training through capstone projects/supervised individual/group research, 2) percentage of students attending leadership training, 3) percentage of students participating in diversified whole-person development co-curriculum learning experience, and 4) percentage of students participating in educational activities that enhance moral education and social responsible citizenship.

While the Board of CEAL/CLEAC has the discretion regarding the details of benchmarking for each exercise, including what are to be benchmarked, with which institutions and how to evaluate the data collected, the approved external benchmarking plan of CEAL/CLEAC should be followed as far as practicable. The institutions to be benchmarked in the 5-year programme review exercise are preferably to come from but not limited to those chosen for benchmarking

at the institutional level. A brief self-reflection with reference to the benchmarking performed in the review period with emphasis on the results or findings that lead to development or improvement to the programme/courses should be included in the review document.

B.   Proposed Modifications and Developments

Details of proposed modifications and developments, with justifications including whether such will be conducive to achievement of learning outcomes (where appropriate), views of stakeholders and implementation details.   If the modifications require approval of other academic units, please state whether the approval has been sought.

Part III: Syllabus of Each Course

An updated syllabus of each course for offering after the review: course title and code, teaching hours and mode, prerequisite/co-requisite/exclusion (if any), exemption requirements (if any), brief course descriptions, aims, learning outcomes*, teaching method, measurement of learning outcomes*, assessment methodology, and any other items deemed necessary. The standard format of a course syllabus and sample syllabuses are shown in Annexes 5 to 7 to Appendix C of Chapter 1 Initiation of New Programmes, Validation and Approval for Undergraduate Programmes. An interactive Course Syllabus Generation Tool is available at http://tlc.ln.edu.hk/SyllabusTool/ which provides step by step guidelines to develop course syllabus meeting the standard format.

*   Reference materials on writing of "Learning Outcomes" and "Measurement of Learning Outcomes" and other useful information featuring Outcome-based Approaches to Teaching and Learning (OBATL) are available from TLC's webpage <https://ln.edu.hk/tlc/support-for-staff/outcomes-based-approaches-to-teaching-and-learning/obatl-resource>.

Guidelines and Procedures for Five-year Review of Core Curriculum

7.1 Purpose/Aim

7.1.1 As part of the quality assurance and enhancement mechanism of the University, the Core Curriculum (CC) is subject to a rigorous review at an interval of 5 years. Any modifications/developments as a result of the review will be put to effect in the next academic year, where applicable.

7.1.2 The five-year review serves to ensure that the CC undergoes a **rigorous review** at a reasonable interval to ascertain its satisfactory operation and development.

The general aim of a five-year review is to assure the academic validity and standard of the CC. In more specific terms, the review will consider:

(a) whether the CC has been successfully implemented and attained the appropriate standard;

(b) whether the CC has met its identified aims and achieved the intended learning outcomes, in particular how the courses on the CC have been connected to achieve the aims/outcomes;

(c) whether and how the views/problems raised by relevant parties/reflected by statistics have been addressed/solved;

(d) whether the CC has been developed and managed appropriately; and

(e) whether the proposed modifications/developments are appropriate and can be effectively implemented.

7.2 Content and Documentation

7.2.1 Following 4 years of implementation, operation and development, **a critical**, **thorough** and **comprehensive review** of the CC in various aspects **based on feedback/comments** from various sources has to be conducted by the Core Curriculum Committee (CCC). The review should cover all aspects of the CC, including student enrolment, aims and learning outcomes, curriculum, content (including the issue of proliferation of courses and overlapping of course contents), teaching/learning activities, switches of language of instruction (if any), assessment methods/results, the overall intellectual level of the CC, the intellectual demands it places on students, and staffing resources.

7.2.2 The Director of CC has to ensure that a brief review document is drawn up. It should provide some basic information about the CC, including its aims and learning outcomes, student enrolment numbers, programme design, structure and curriculum, programme operation, management, quality assurance and enhancement, learning and teaching, examination and assessment, staffing resources, a brief up-to-date syllabus of each course, etc. Apart from giving figures or statistics on such aspects as student enrolment, and examination and assessment, the document should give **an analysis of the data showing the trends and development**.

Most important of all, the document should

(a) give a **critical analysis** and **commentary** on the CC during the review period highlighting how and to what extent the aims and learning outcomes at CC level (and individual course level if deemed appropriate) are achieved; and

(b) include the **proposed modifications and developments for the CC and its courses,**

giving clear justifications. (Please refer to the <u>Appendix</u> for more details.)

7.2.3 The five-year review documentation will not require such details as summary of developments since last interim review or five-year review, professional recognition, resource support (accommodation, equipment, general expenses, library support, computing support, etc.), University-wide assessment regulations, etc. Instead, information on these items will be made optional and be included when deemed necessary.

7.2.4 In line with the spirit that measurement of learning outcomes should be **evidence-based**, the review document should draw upon evidence and information from the following sources:

(a) Statistical data on student numbers and examination results for the past 4 years between reviews, such as student demand, distribution of assessment grades, attrition rate, etc. The statistics provide the factual basis for the review.

(b) Comments and suggestions contained in the reports of External Academic Advisers, relevant records of discussion of the comments and suggestions, response made to the External Academic Advisers as well as agreed action taken/to be taken (if any).

(c) Comments and suggestions from the Advisory Board concerned.

(d) The views of students obtained through various means, such as Course Teaching and Learning Evaluation, questionnaires, surveys, Staff-Student Consultation Committee meetings, informal meetings with students, views expressed by ex-students where appropriate, etc.

(e) The views of graduates and alumni obtained through means such as surveys and informal meetings, etc.

(f) The views of staff teaching on the courses of the CC.

(g) The time-series data on various aspects of the CC developed by the OCC, or, where necessary, with assistance from the Teaching and Learning Centre.

(h) Stock-taking of learning and teaching activities, and assessment methods.

7.3 Reviewers and Review Meeting

7.3.1 A senior academic of Associate Professor or above in rank inside the University and has not taught in the CC programme for 2 years shall be appointed as the Convener of the review meeting. Three external members, outside the University, of Associate Professor or Senior Lecturer or above in rank and with expertise in the relevant disciplines shall also be appointed by the AQAC. One external member should be non-local and, where possible, selected from one of the benchmarking institutions of the University[1] or the programme.

7.3.2 Nominations for appointment as Convener and external members shall be made by the CCC. A greater number of nominations (with preference order) should be submitted to the AQAC for its consideration and choice (e.g. 6 to 7 nominations for appointment of 3 external members).

7.3.3 CCC shall not nominate those who have a close connection to the OCC/CC, for instance, current Chairman or members of the Advisory Board of the CC programme, unless there are compelling circumstances to do so.

7.3.4 If a non-local reviewer cannot join the review meetings on campus, video conference will be arranged as far as practicable. Considering that the reviewers can be from different time zones,

---

[1] International Christian University of Japan, Yale-NUS College of Singapore, Sun Yat-sen University of China, and Williams College and Oberlin College and Conservatory of USA

and therefore operational difficulties may be encountered for arranging video conference for review meetings which last for a whole day, the reviewers can take part in some, not all, of the meetings. When a non-local reviewer is unable to come to the University and a video conference cannot be arranged or he/she can only join part of the event, paper assessment in areas specified under 7.1.2 above shall be provided by him/her prior to the meeting.

7.3.5 The Registry will co-ordinate the appointment procedures and forward to the appointed reviewers a copy of the review documentation endorsed by the SISMB and CCC and approved by AQAC.

7.3.6 The appointed reviewers will meet with the CCC to discuss matters of concern especially the proposed modifications/developments. In essence, the review takes the form of CCC meeting with external input from reviewers. This peer review format has the advantage of encouraging freer flow of views. The review is expected to be a one-day exercise to facilitate more thorough and in depth discussion. The appointed reviewers may also meet with relevant graduates and students. The CC review document (except sensitive data) should be provided to them.

7.3.7 The reviewers are responsible for assessing the academic standard of the CC, and evaluating how the CC has performed in the five areas detailed in Section 7.1.2 based on the review documentation and other information submitted, as well as their discussions with the CCC, other staff as appropriate, students and graduates, etc. In reviewing the CC, the reviewers have to make reference to data and statistical evidences. The reviewers are not required to recommend approval of the CC. Instead, they give comments/recommendations in any aspect of the CC. Their report shall also articulate their evaluation of the CC and the basis on which they arrive at the evaluation. The external members will also provide written feedback/recommendations which form the basis of the written report.

7.3.8 The Registry will work with the CCC Secretary on logistics of the review meeting and prepare the report.

7.3.9 For a visit of a non-local external member, the visit shall be up to four days. The package will include a return air ticket of economy class (with a ceiling rate based on point-to-point direct full-fare economy ticket rate), accommodation expenses of up to HK$1,500 per night^ and a per diem allowance at HK$900 per day.
^ up to HK$1,700 per night from 2024-25

7.3.10 An honorarium* will be paid to an external member who has completed his/her duties.
(*HK$3,500 from 2021-22 to 2023-24, and HK$4,500 from 2024-25)

7.4. After the Review Meeting

7.4.1 After the review meeting, the OCC shall follow up the comments/recommendations of the reviewers, write up a response, and finalise a brief summary setting out proposed modifications/developments (with justifications and implementation details) taking into account the external input from reviewers, for submission to the SISMB and CCC for endorsement and then to the AQAC for consideration and approval as appropriate. In the response, the CCC should provide a plan of action as far as practicable to follow up comments/recommendations which involve a longer term development and implementation. A copy of the report of the review meeting (and any follow-up meeting(s)), part of the review documentation with significant revisions (if any), and any other documents where deemed necessary should also be submitted. The AQAC's decision and comments, if any, the approved CCC response to comments/recommendations of reviewers and the brief summary

on proposed modifications/developments[2] will be submitted to the Senate for its information and possible comments.

7.5 Timing

7.5.1 Generally, the review should take place 5 years after the previous CC review. As a general guideline, the review documentation should be ready for consideration of the AQAC in October/November for review meetings to be held in January/February, or in December/January for review meetings to be held in March/April/May, before dispatching to the appointed reviewers. The response and brief summary together with other documents (detailed above) should be submitted to the AQAC meeting around March/April for review meetings held in January/February, or around May/June for review meetings held in March/April, or in September/October for review meetings held in May.

.

---

[2] In case proposed major modifications to the programme/courses include those significant ones that Senate has not delegated its authority of approval to AQAC, Senate approval will be sought.

Content of a Five-year Review Documentation
for Core Curriculum

Part I: General Information on CC

1. Summary Information

Number and categories of courses, title of courses, contributing departments, dates of previous interim/five-year review (if any).

2. Aims and Learning Outcomes

The educational aims and intended learning outcomes of the CC, expressed, as appropriate, to reflect relevant knowledge, attitude and skills (e.g. analytical and communication skills), the intellectual and imaginative development of the student. Particular emphasis be placed on what students are expected to learn. Illustrate briefly the mapping between the learning outcomes of the programme and Lingnan's Ideal Graduate Attributes to show how the programme contributes to the achievement of some or all of Lingnan's Ideal Graduate Attributes. Include a mapping table between the learning outcomes of the programme and Lingnan's Ideal Graduate Attributes following the table shown in Annex 1.

3. Student Numbers

Student numbers of each course in past 4 years. Highlights of student figures as indicators of performance, if deemed necessary. An analysis of the data showing the trends and development should be included.

4. Design and Structure

Design philosophy and academic structure of course offerings in detail. The inter-relationships between courses should be identified and any categorisation of the courses clearly presented. How the components in the CC align with the overall aims and intended learning outcomes of the CC and may lead to achievement of them. A mapping table of learning outcomes of the programme and the full list of courses should be included.

5. Operation, Management, Quality Assurance and Enhancement

Details of course operation, management, quality assurance and enhancement, including constitution and terms of reference of the CCC and other committee(s) responsible for the CC course management, quality assurance and enhancement, e.g. SISMB.

Responsibilities of the Director of CC. Other CC responsibilities as appropriate – Associate Director of CC, supporting staff, etc.

6. Teaching/Learning Methods and Projects (if any)

General description of the teaching and learning methods/activities including balance of and rationale of the proposed teaching/learning methods/activities.

If there are courses switched to be taught in Chinese, the switches should be reported and the

reasons for the switches should be addressed to reflect that those switches are anomalies.

Project work (if any) should be explained in detail, typical examples given and the organisation and assessment methods described.

7. Examination and Assessment

What are the general strategy and methods in assessing students for the CC. There may be some highlights or examples on assessment methods specifically for certain courses used to measure certain learning outcomes.

Highlights of statistics on examination results as indicators of performance, if deemed necessary. An analysis of the data showing the trends and development should be included. Detailed figures of past 4 years can be appended.

8. Staff Resources for the CC

The staff resources which are used to support the CC and any expected/proposed addition/deduction should be specified according to the headings (a) to (b) below. A distinction should be made between those resources in place, and those still to be obtained. [Request for resources should be separately submitted to relevant Committees, e.g. University Administrative and Planning Committee.]

(a) *Overall Staff Support*
   Present establishment and grades of teaching, general and administrative staff in the OCC.

(b) *Academic Staff*
   i) Listing of academic staff who are involved in teaching courses of the CC, with rank, qualifications, teaching and/or other responsibilities in the administration of the CC, staff research interest/specialty, courses taught, etc.;
   ii) rank and subject area of additional posts, those previously agreed and any now requested, with justifications, if any;
   iii) expected staff deduction, if any.

[Notes: The five-year review documentation does not require such details as summary of developments since last interim review or five-year review, professional recognition, resource support (accommodation, equipment, general expenses, library support, computing support, etc.), University-wide assessment regulations, etc. Instead, information on these items will be made optional and be included when deemed necessary.]

Part II: Critical Appraisal and Development for the CC and its Courses

A. Critical Appraisal

1. A **critical analysis** and **commentary** in various aspects of the CC, including student enrollment, aims and learning outcomes, curriculum, content (including the issue of proliferation of courses and overlapping of course contents), teaching/learning activities, assessment methods/results and regulations (with emphasis on effectiveness and variety of teaching/learning activities and assessment methods for achieving CC course learning outcomes), the overall intellectual level of the CC, the intellectual demands it places on students, and staffing resources.

The document shall **critically evaluate** how and to what extent the aims and learning outcomes at CC level (and individual course level if deemed appropriate) are achieved. It shall give details on the actions taken to achieve and measure learning outcomes as well as the evidence for the evaluation (as detailed under section 7.2.4 of the guidelines). These shall include collection and handling of results of Course Teaching and Learning Evaluation, views and suggestions from External Academic Advisers, Advisory Board, and Staff-Student Consultation Committee, student/graduates survey, alumni survey, employers survey, etc. It is expected that there is an **extensive analysis of some time-series data** indicating the performance of the CC.

This shall be an evaluation of the CC addressing the aims of the review:

(a)　whether the CC has been successfully implemented and attained the appropriate standard;

(b)　whether the CC has met its identified aims and achieved the intended learning outcomes, in particular how the courses on the CC have been connected to achieve the aims/outcomes;

(c)　whether and how the views/problems raised by relevant parties/reflected by statistics have been addressed/solved[#]; and

(d)　whether the CC has been developed and managed appropriately.

[#]　There should be elaboration on views/suggestions received from External Academic Advisers during the years under review and discussion/response made as well as action taken/to be taken.

2.　There shall be a separate section to evaluate the efforts made in and the progress on following up recommendations given by the last interim or 5-year review panel.

3.　Developments in recent years as implementation of the action plans set out in the annual reports of last four years shall also be evaluated.

4.　**External benchmarking** at programme level should be conducted to look at and learn from international best practices of other institutions including performance indicators at the programme, such as

- contributions to curriculum development;
- curriculum innovations – evidence of innovative teaching materials, programme structure and course contents;
- delivery of teaching – number and nature of subjects taught; evidence of innovative teaching pedagogies; course teaching and learning evaluation scores;
- interaction with students;
- assessment standards;
- awards and prizes for teaching; and/or
- teaching leadership.

With regard to performance indicators, benchmarking is preferably made with reference to the Sector-wide Performance Indicators and those specific to Lingnan University contained in the University Accountability Agreement (UAA) [Note].

Note: Sector-wide Performance Measures under 'The quality of the student experience of learning and teaching' domain in the UAA include 1) (a) undergraduate satisfaction with the quality and value gained from their teaching and learning experience; and (b) undergraduate satisfaction with their overall learning environment, 2) undergraduate employment success rate, and 3) learning experience outside classroom – (a) Service-Learning; and (b) internship experience; 4)

satisfaction of students with special educational needs; while the Key Performance Indicators specific for Lingnan University include 1) percentage of graduates having research training through capstone projects/supervised individual/group research, 2) percentage of students attending leadership training, 3) percentage of students participating in diversified whole-person development co-curriculum learning experience, and 4) percentage of students participating in educational activities that enhance moral education and social citizenship.

While the CCC has the discretion regarding the details of benchmarking for each exercise, including what are to be benchmarked, with which institutions and how to evaluate the data collected, the approved external benchmarking plan of the programme shall be followed as far as practicable. The institutions to be benchmarked in the 5-year programme review exercise are preferably to come from but not limited to those chosen for benchmarking at the institutional level. A brief self-reflection with reference to the benchmarking performed in the review period with emphasis on the results or findings that lead to development or improvement to the programme/courses should be included in the review document.

B. Proposed Modifications and Developments for the Core Curriculum and its Courses

Details of proposed modifications and developments, with justifications including whether such will be conducive to achievement of learning outcomes (where appropriate), views of stakeholders, and implementation details. In case substantial modifications are proposed, the revised structure has to be set out. If the modifications require approval of other programmes, please state whether the approval has been sought.

Part III: Brief Syllabus of Each Course

An updated brief syllabus of each course for offering after the review: course title and code, teaching hours and mode, prerequisite/co-requisite/exclusion (if any), exemption requirements (if any), brief course descriptions, aims, learning outcomes*, teaching method, measurement of learning outcomes*, assessment methodology, and any other items deemed necessary. The standard format of a course syllabus and sample syllabuses are shown in Annexes 5 to 7 to Appendix C of Chapter 1 Initiation of New Programmes, Validation and Approval for Undergraduate Programmes. An interactive Course Syllabus Generation Tool is available at http://tlc.ln.edu.hk/SyllabusTool/ which provides step by step guidelines to develop course syllabus meeting the standard format.

* Reference materials on writing of "Learning Outcomes" and "Measurement of Learning Outcomes" and other useful information featuring Outcome-based Approaches to Teaching and Learning (OBATL) are available from TLC's website <https://ln.edu.hk/tlc/support-for-staff/outcomes-based-approaches-to-teaching-and-learning/obatl-resource>.

Mapping of the Programme Intended Learning Outcomes (PILOs) to Lingnan's Graduate Attributes for Undergraduates Programmes

	Graduate Attributes for Undergraduates								
Programme Intended Learning Outcomes (PILOs)	Scholarly and Interdisciplinary[1]	Digitally Literate[2]	Skilled Communicator[3]	Critical and Analytical[4]	Creative and Entrepreneurial[5]	Committed to Service[6]	Glocally Minded[7]	Personally and Socially Responsible[8]	Committed to Life-long Learning[9]
PILO 1									
PILO 2									
PILO 3									
etc.									

Notes:
1. LU graduates will have a secure grounding in a chosen academic field(s) and cross-disciplinary applications.
2. LU graduates will have proficiency in technology.
3. LU graduates will have excellent communication skills, including oral and written English and Chinese (Putonghua as well as Cantonese) skills.
4. LU graduates will demonstrate independent critical thinking and strong analytic competence.
5. LU graduates will be creative problem-solvers and be capable planners, and entrepreneurs.
6. LU graduates will have a commitment to service to the community.
7. LU graduates will have a global and local (a Glocal) outlook with the ability to understand various cultural perspectives.
8. LU graduates will have tolerance, integrity, civility and a sense of responsibility.
9. LU graduates will have a desire for life-long learning.

**Guidelines and Procedures for Five-year Review of
Courses with Service-Learning Elements**

7.1 Purpose/Aim

7.1.1 As part of the quality assurance and enhancement mechanism of the University, credit-bearing courses with Service-Learning (S-L) elements offered by either the i) Departments, ii) the Office of Service-Learning (OSL) or iii) co-organised by departments and OSL are subject to a rigorous review at an interval of 5 years. Any modifications/developments as a result of the review will be put to effect in the next academic year, where applicable.

7.1.2 The five-year review serves to ensure that the courses with S-L elements undergo a **rigorous review** at a reasonable interval to ascertain their satisfactory operation and development.

7.1.3 The general aim of a five-year review is to assure the academic validity and standard of the S-L courses and projects. In more specific terms, the review will consider:

(a) whether the courses/projects have been properly connected and successfully implemented to achieve the overall aims and intended learning outcomes of Service-Learning;

(b) whether individual courses have met their identified aims and achieved the intended learning outcomes;

(c) whether and how the views/problems raised by relevant parties/reflected by statistics have been addressed/solved;

(d) whether the courses have been developed and managed appropriately; and

(e) whether the proposed modifications/developments in course offerings are appropriate and can be effectively implemented.

7.2 Content and Documentation

7.2.1 Following 4 years of implementation, operation and development, a **critical**, **thorough** and **comprehensive review** of courses with S-L elements in various aspects **based on feedback/comments** from various sources has to be conducted by the Service-Learning Programme Committee (SLPC). The review should cover all aspects of course with S-L elements, including student enrollment, overall aims and learning outcomes of S-L courses, course content (including the issue of overlapping of course contents, if any), teaching/learning activities, assessment methods/results and regulations, the intellectual level of the courses, the intellectual demands they place on students, and staffing resources.

7.2.2 The Director of OSL has to ensure that a brief review document is drawn up. It should provide some basic information about the course with S-L elements, including overall aims and learning outcomes, connection among courses, student numbers, S-L project design and structure, operations, management and quality assurance and enhancement, learning and teaching, assessment, staffing resources, a brief up-to-date syllabus of each course, etc. Apart from giving figures or statistics on such aspects as student enrollment, examination and assessment, the document should give an **analysis of the data showing the trends and development**.

Most important of all, the document should
(a) give a **critical analysis** and **commentary** on the courses with S-L elements during the review period highlighting how and to what extent the aims and learning outcomes for the course offerings with S-L element and S-L projects are achieved; and

(b) include **the proposed S-L modifications and developments**, giving clear justifications and spelling out the differences from the existing course offerings. (Please refer to the Appendix for more details.)

The five-year review documentation will not require such details as summary of developments since last five-year review, professional recognition, resource support (accommodation, equipment, general expenses, library support, computing support, etc.), University-wide assessment regulations, etc. Instead, information on these items will be made optional and be included when deemed necessary.

7.2.3 In line with the spirit that measurement of learning outcomes should be **evidence-based**, the review document should draw upon evidence and information from the following sources:

(a) Statistical data on student numbers and learning outcomes for the past 4 years, such as student demand, distribution of assessment grades, etc. The statistics provide the factual basis for the review.
(b) Comments and suggestions contained in the reports of External Academic Advisers, relevant records of discussion of the comments and suggestions, response made to the External Academic Advisers as well as agreed action taken/to be taken (if any).
(c) Comments and suggestions from the S-L Programme Committee concerned.
(d) The views of students obtained through various means, such as Course Teaching and Learning Evaluation (in S-L whole class approach), pre and post-test questionnaires, surveys, focus group meetings with students.
(e) The views of staff teaching courses with S-L elements.
(f) The views of community supervising courses with S-L elements.
(g) The time-series data on various aspects of the programme developed by the OSL, or, where necessary, with assistance from the Teaching and Learning Centre.
(h) Stock-taking of learning and teaching activities, and assessment methods.

7.3   Reviewers and Review Meeting

7.3.1   A senior academic of Associate Professor or above in rank inside the University but outside the OSL shall be appointed as the Convener of the review meeting. Two external members, outside the University, of Associate Professor or Senior Lecturer or above in rank and with expertise in the relevant disciplines shall also be appointed by the Academic Quality Assurance Committee (AQAC). One external member should be non-local and, where possible, selected from one of the benchmarking institutions of the Unviersity[1] or OSL.

7.3.2   Nominations for appointment as Convener and external members shall be made by the SLPC. A greater number of nominations (with preference order) should be submitted to the AQAC for its consideration and choice (e.g. 4 to 5 nominations for appointment of 2 external members).

7.3.3   The SLPC shall not nominate those who have a close connection to the OSL/S-L Programme, for instance, current Chairman or members of the Advisory Board, unless there are compelling circumstances to do so.

7.3.4   If a non-local reviewer cannot join the review meetings on campus, video conference will be arranged as far as practicable. Considering that the reviewers can be from different time

---

[1] International Christian University of Japan, Yale-NUS College of Singapore, Sun Yat-sen University, and Williams College and Oberlin College and Conservatory of USA

zones, and therefore operational difficulties may be encountered for arranging video conference for review meetings which last for a whole day, the reviewers can take part in some, not all, of the meetings. When a non-local reviewer is unable to come to the University and a video conference cannot be arranged or he/she can only join part of the event, paper assessment in areas specified under 1.2 above shall be provided by him/her prior to the meeting.

7.3.5   The Registry will co-ordinate the appointment procedures and forward to the appointed reviewers a copy of the review documentation endorsed by the SLPC and approved by AQAC.

7.3.6   The appointed reviewers will meet with the SLPC to discuss matters of concern especially the proposed modifications/developments. In essence, the review takes the form of SLPC meeting with external input. Reviewers can suggest having a separate session to meet with junior academic staff, if deemed necessary. This peer review format has the advantage of encouraging freer flow of views. The review is expected to be a one-day exercise to facilitate more thorough and in depth discussion.

7.3.7   The appointed reviewers may also meet with relevant graduates and students. The review document (except sensitive data) should be provided to them.

7.3.8   The reviewers are responsible for assessing the academic standard of the course offerings with S-L elements, and evaluating how the Service-Learning programme has performed in the five areas detailed in Section 7.1.3 based on the review documentation and other information submitted, as well as their discussions with the SLPC, other staff as appropriate, students and community partners, etc. In reviewing the course offerings with S-L elements, the reviewers have to make reference to data and statistical evidences. The reviewers will give comments/recommendations in any aspect of the Service-Learning programme. Their report shall also articulate their evaluation of the Service-Learning programme and the basis on which they arrive at the evaluation. The external members will also provide written feedback/recommendations which form the basis of the written report.

7.3.9   The Registry will work with the OSL on logistics of the review meeting and prepare the report.

7.3.10 For a visit of a non-local external member, the visit shall be up to four days. The package will include a return air ticket of economy class (with a ceiling rate based on point-to-point direct full-fare economy ticket rate), accommodation expenses of up to HK$1,500 per night^ and a per diem allowance at HK$900 per day.
^ up to HK$1,700 per night from 2024-25

7.3.11 An honorarium* will be paid to an external member who has completed his/her duties.
(*HK$3,500 from 2021-22 to 2023-24, and HK$4,500 from 2024-25)

7.4   After the Review Meeting

7.4.1   After the review meeting, the SLPC shall follow up the comments/recommendations of the reviewers, write up a response, and finalise a brief summary setting out proposed modifications/developments (with justifications and implementation details) taking into account the external input, for submission to the AQAC for consideration and approval as appropriate. In the response, the SLPC should provide a plan of action as far as practicable to follow up comments/recommendations which involve a longer term development and implementation. A copy of the report of the review meeting (and any follow-up meeting(s),

part of the review documentation with significant revisions (if any), and any other documents where deemed necessary should also be submitted. The AQAC's decision and comments, if any, the approved SLPC's response to comments/recommendations of reviewers and the brief summary on proposed modifications/developments[2] will be submitted to the Senate for its information and possible comments.

7.5 Timing

7.5.1 As a general guideline, the review documentation should be ready for consideration of the AQAC in October/November for review meetings to be held in January/February, or in December/January for review meetings to be held in March/April/May, before dispatching to the appointed reviewers. The response and the brief summary together with other documents (detailed above) should be submitted to the AQAC meeting around March/April for review meetings held in January/February, or around May/June for review meetings held in March/April, or in September/October for review meetings held in May.

---

[2] In case proposed major modifications to the programme/courses include those significant ones that Senate has not delegated its authority of approval to AQAC, Senate approval will be sought.

**Content of a Five-year Review
of Courses with Service-Learning Elements**

Part I: General Information on Current Courses Offerings with S-L elements

1. Summary Information

Number and categories of courses, S-L projects, dates of previous five-year review (if any).

2. Aims and Learning Outcomes of Courses with S-L elements

The educational aims and intended learning outcomes of courses with S-L elements, expressed, as appropriate, to reflect relevant knowledge, attitude and skills (e.g. research and communication skills), the intellectual and imaginative development of the student. Particular emphasis be placed on what students are expected to learn. Illustrate briefly the mapping between the learning outcomes of the S-L programme and Lingnan's Ideal Graduate Attributes. Include a mapping table between the learning outcomes of courses with S-L elements and Lingnan's Ideal Graduates Attributes following the table shown in Annex 1.

3. Student Numbers

Student numbers of each course in past 4 years. Highlights of student figures as indicators of performance, if deemed necessary. An analysis of the data showing the trends and development should be included.

4. S-L Programme Design and Structure

The inter-relationship between academic courses and S-L elements should be identified and any categorisation of the courses clearly presented. How the components in Service-Learning project align with the overall aims and intended learning outcomes of Service-Learning course offerings and may lead to achievement of them.

5. S-L Programme Operation, Management and Quality Assurance and Enhancement

Details of S-L programme operation and management with an aim of ensuring adequate courses for fulfillment of S-L graduation requirement, co-ordination and planning for courses with S-L elements offerings, quality assurance and enhancement, including terms of reference of the SLPC and other committee(s) responsible for the management of courses with S-L elements, quality assurance and enhancement.

Responsibilities of the Director of Service-Learning and other OSL staff as appropriate – Associate Director of Service-Learning, S-L coordinators and supporting staff, etc.

6. Teaching/Learning Methods and S-L Projects

General description of the teaching and learning methods/activities in S-L projects including balance and rationale of the teaching/learning methods/activities.

S-L Project (if any) should be explained in detail, typical examples given and the organization and assessment methods described.

7. **Assessment**

What are the general strategy and methods in assessing students for courses with S-L elements. There may be some highlights or examples on assessment methods specifically for certain courses used to measure certain learning outcomes.

Highlights of statistics on S-L learning outcomes and Graduate Attributes as indicators of performance, if deemed necessary. An analysis of the data showing the trends and development should be included. Detailed figures of past 4 years can be appended.

8. **Staff Resources for OSL**

The staff resources which are used to support course offerings and any expected/proposed addition/deduction should be specified according to the headings (a) to (b) below. A distinction should be made between those resources in place, and those still to be obtained. [Request for resources should be separately submitted to relevant Committees, e.g. University Administrative and Planning Committee.]

(a) *Overall Staff Support*
Present establishment and grades of teaching, technical and general staff in the OSL.

(b) *Academic/Administrative Staff*
   i) Listing of academic staff/ administrative who are involved in the S-L programme, with rank, qualifications, teaching and/or other responsibilities, courses taught, etc.;
   ii) rank and subject area of additional posts, those previously agreed and any now requested, with justifications, if any;
   iii) expected staff deduction, if any;

[Note: The five-year review documentation does not require such details as summary of developments since last five-year review, professional recognition, resource support (accommodation, equipment, general expenses, library support, computing support, etc.), University-wide assessment regulations, etc. Instead, information on these items will be made optional and be included when deemed necessary.]

Part II: Critical Appraisal and Courses with S-L Development

A. Critical Appraisal

1. A **critical analysis** and **commentary** in various aspects of courses with S-L elements, including number of student, aims and learning outcomes, curriculum, content (including the issue of proliferation of courses and overlapping of course contents), teaching/learning activities, assessment methods/results and regulations (with emphasis on effectiveness and variety of teaching/learning activities and assessment methods for achieving S-L course learning outcomes), the overall intellectual level of S-L, the intellectual demands its places on students and staffing resources.

The document shall **critically evaluate** how and to what extent the overall aims and learning outcomes for the course offerings and those for individual courses are achieved. It shall give details on the actions taken to achieve and measure learning outcomes as well as the evidence for the evaluation (as detailed under section 7.2.3 of the guidelines). These shall include collection and handling of results of evaluation, views and suggestions from External Academic Advisers, Advisory Board, students/graduates surveys, etc. It is expected that there is an **extensive analysis of some time-series data** indicating the standard of the course offerings. There shall be a separate section to evaluate the efforts made in and the progress on following up recommendations given by the 5-year programme review panel.

This shall be an evaluation of courses with S-L elements addressing the aims of the review:

(a) whether the courses have been properly connected and successfully implemented to achieve the overall aims and intended learning outcomes of courses with S-L elements;

(b) whether individual courses have met their identified aims and achieved the intended learning outcomes;

(c) whether and how the views/problems raised by relevant parties/reflected by statistics have been addressed/solved[#]; and

(d) whether the courses have been developed and managed appropriately.

[#] There should be elaboration on views/suggestions received from External Academic Advisers during the years under review and discussion/response made as well as action taken/to be taken.

2. Developments in recent years as implementation of the action plans set out in the annual programme reports of last four years shall also be evaluated.

3. **External benchmarking** at programme/course level should be conducted in the context of 5-year programme reviews. This is done to look at and learn from international best practices of other institutions including performance indicators at the programme, such as

- contributions to curriculum development;
- curriculum innovations – evidence of innovative teaching materials, programme structure and course contents;
- delivery of teaching – number and nature of subjects taught; evidence of innovative teaching pedagogies; course teaching and learning evaluation scores;
- interaction with students;
- assessment standards;
- awards and prizes for teaching; and/or
- teaching leadership.

With regard to performance indicators, benchmarking is preferably made with reference to the Sector-wide Performance Indicators and those specific to Lingnan University contained in the University Accountability Agreement (UAA) [Note].

Note: Sector-wide Performance Measures under 'The quality of the student experience of learning and teaching' domain in the UAA include 1) (a) undergraduate satisfaction with the quality and value gained from their teaching and learning experience; and (b) undergraduate satisfaction with their overall learning environment, 2) undergraduate employment success rate, and 3) learning experience outside classroom – (a) Service-Learning; and (b) internship experience; 4) satisfaction of students with special educational needs; while the Key Performance Indicators specific for Lingnan University include 1) percentage of graduates having research training through capstone projects/supervised individual/group research, 2) percentage of students attending leadership training, 3) percentage of students participating in diversified whole-person development co-curriculum learning experience, and 4) percentage of students participating in educational activities that enhance moral education and social citizenship.

While the SLPC has the discretion regarding the details of benchmarking for each exercise, including what are to be benchmarked, with which institutions and how to evaluate the data collected, the approved external benchmarking plan of the S-L Programme shall be followed as far as practicable. The institutions to be benchmarked in the 5-year programme review exercise are preferably to come from but not limited to those chosen for benchmarking at the institutional level. A brief self-reflection with reference to the benchmarking performed in the review period with emphasis on the results or findings that lead to development or improvement to the programme/courses should be included in the review document.

B.   Proposed Modifications and Developments

Details of proposed modifications and developments in S-L Programme, with justifications including whether such will be conducive to achievement of learning outcomes (where appropriate), views of stakeholders, and implementation details. If the modifications require approval of other academic units, please state whether the approval has been sought.

Part III: Syllabus of Each Course

An updated syllabus of each course for offering after the review: course title and code, teaching hours and mode, prerequisite/co-requisite/exclusion (if any), exemption requirements (if any), brief course descriptions, aims, learning outcomes*, teaching method, measurement of learning outcomes*, assessment methodology, and any other items deemed necessary. The standard format of a course syllabus and sample syllabuses are shown in Annexes 5 to 7 to Appendix C of Chapter 1 Initiation of New Programmes, Validation and Approval for Undergraduate Programmes. An interactive Course Syllabus Generation Tool is available at http://tlc.ln.edu.hk/SyllabusTool/ which provides step by step guidelines to develop course syllabus meeting the standard format.

*   Reference materials on writing of "Learning Outcomes" and "Measurement of Learning Outcomes" and other useful information featuring Outcome-based Approaches to Teaching and Learning (OBATL) are available from TLC's webpage <https://ln.edu.hk/tlc/support-for-staff/outcomes-based-approaches-to-teaching-and-learning/obatl-resource>.

Mapping of the Service-Learning Course Outcomes to Lingnan's Graduate Attributes for Undergraduates Programmes

Intended Learning Outcomes	Graduate Attributes for Undergraduates								
	Scholarly and Interdisciplinary[1]	Digitally Literate[2]	Skilled Communicator[3]	Critical and Analytical[4]	Creative and Entrepreneurial[5]	Committed to Service[6]	Glocally Minded[7]	Personally and Socially Responsible[8]	Committed to Life-long Learning[9]
1.									
2.									
3.									
etc.									

Notes:
1. LU graduates will have a secure grounding in a chosen academic field(s) and cross-disciplinary applications.
2. LU graduates will have proficiency in technology.
3. LU graduates will have excellent communication skills, including oral and written English and Chinese (Putonghua as well as Cantonese) skills.
4. LU graduates will demonstrate independent critical thinking and strong analytic competence.
5. LU graduates will be creative problem-solvers and be capable planners, and entrepreneurs.
6. LU graduates will have a commitment to service to the community.
7. LU graduates will have a global and local (a Glocal) outlook with the ability to understand various cultural perspectives.
8. LU graduates will have tolerance, integrity, civility and a sense of responsibility.
9. LU graduates will have a desire for life-long learning.