

## Taught Postgraduate Program Review

### External Reviewers' Report

**Notes**

1. **Please ensure that your Report does not include reference to individual students or staff by name.**
2. Where External Reviewers review more than one cognate program, **please complete a separate form for each program reviewed.**
3. External Reviewers' comments are central to the University's quality assurance mechanisms. This Report will be forwarded to the Program Director and relevant Dean. The Program Director will incorporate your feedback into a Taught Postgraduate Program Review Report, which will be sent to the relevant Dean, via the responsible Department Head where appropriate, for consideration at School and Departmental levels. The Dean will incorporate the outcomes of Taught Postgraduate Program Review into the School Annual Report on Undergraduate and Postgraduate Education to the Committee on Teaching and Learning Quality (which reports to the Senate). Your Report also may be made available to other senior staff and Panels for the purposes of internal and/or external review/audit.
4. **This Report should be completed by the External Subject Specialist** in consultation with other Review Panel members, who should sign the form prior to submission.

<b>External Subject Specialist:</b>	
Job title and home institution:	
Email address:	

<b>Local Reviewer:</b>	
Job title and Employer:	
Email address:	

<b>HKUST Reviewer:</b>	
Job title and Department/Unit:	
Email address:	

<b>Title of Program Reviewed:</b>	
<b>HKUST School/Department:</b>	

External Reviewers will be asked to visit the University during the review period, as part of the periodic review of taught postgraduate programs, to review documentation and meet the Dean (and where appropriate, the Department Head), the Program Director, members of the Program Teaching Team and administrative staff, and a range of students and graduates.

**Please provide your comments on the following aspects of the program.**

**Please explain any negative responses in Section 5 below.**

1.	Nature of Engagement	Yes/No
1.1	The program was discussed with the Dean	Yes/No
1.2	The program was discussed with the responsible Department Head	Yes/No/NA
1.3	The program was discussed with the Program Director	Yes/No
1.4	The program was discussed with other members of the Program Teaching Team	Yes/No
1.5	The Panel met a range of current students	Yes/No
1.6	The Panel met other personnel [Please give details: .....]	Yes/No
1.7	The Panel met a group of alumni	Yes/No
1.8	The program and course documentation, assessments and student work were reviewed	Yes/No
1.9	The program's teaching facilities and learning resources were viewed	Yes/No
1.10	The self-evaluation document and plans for the program's development were discussed with the teaching team	Yes/No

1.11	The self-evaluation document was sufficiently self-critical and allowed the Panel to suggest areas for improvement	Yes/No
------	--	--------

<b>2.</b>	<b>Syllabus and Curriculum</b>	
2.1	The program aims and syllabus are up-to-date and appropriate	Yes/No
2.2	The program objectives are appropriate	Yes/No
2.3	The aims and syllabus of the program's constituent courses are up-to-date and, where appropriate, reflect recent advances in the subject	Yes/No
2.4	The objectives of the program's courses are appropriate	Yes/No
2.5	The required hours of notional student effort as required by the number of credits for the award are appropriate	Yes/No
2.6	The core curriculum as defined by the number and credit value of compulsory courses is appropriate	Yes/No
2.7	The constituent courses provide sufficient and appropriate opportunities for students to achieve the program's objectives	Yes/No
2.8	The facilities and materials for the successful delivery of courses are appropriate	Yes/No/NA

<b>3.</b>	<b>Assessment and Academic Standards</b>	
3.1	A selection of examination questions and other assessments was reviewed for each course and year of the review period, and allowed the Panel to form a judgment on the appropriateness of the assessment	Yes/No
3.2	The design, structure, balance and range of assessments for the program are appropriate	Yes/No
3.3	The following were reviewed for each course and year of the review period, and allowed the Panel to determine whether the marking was of an appropriate standard and consistent: a sufficient number and range of student scripts and other assessed work; grade descriptors; marking schemes and model answers; mark sheets; mark/grade distributions of courses and program awards	Yes/No
3.4	The academic standards set for the award and the program's constituent courses, by reference to the items reviewed in 3.1 and 3.3 above, are appropriate and internationally comparable with those of similar taught postgraduate programs or parts of programs in other higher education institutions with which we are familiar	Yes/No

<b>4.</b>	<b>Student and Graduate Support and Feedback</b>	
4.1	Students whom the Panel met were provided with timely and appropriate feedback on their assessments	Yes/No/NA
4.2	Students whom the Panel met generally were satisfied with the range of support available to them	Yes/No/NA
4.3	Students whom the Panel met generally were overall satisfied with the program	Yes/No/NA
4.4	Graduates whom the Panel met generally were satisfied with all aspects of their program	Yes/No/NA

<b>5.</b>	<b>Additional Information</b>	
5.1	If you answered "No" to any of the above questions, please provide further information below	
5.2	Are there any organisational or administrative practices (including quality assurance of the program) about which you would like to comment?	

<b>6.</b>	<b>Good practice</b>	
6.1	Did you identify any courses in which you would regard aspects of teaching and learning as 'Good Practice' (e.g. modes of assessment, delivery methods)?	Yes/No
6.2	If you have answered Yes to 6.1, please name the course(s) that these refer to and provide details below:	

<b>7.</b>	<b>Report</b> Please contribute to the review of the program and development of the curriculum by providing comments on the following areas, suggesting any improvements or modifications as deemed appropriate:
7.1	Program or course curriculum, aims, objectives, content and development
7.2	Teaching methods, arising from the review of the curriculum and assessed work
7.3	Teaching and learning standards, arising from the review of assessments and assessed work
7.4	The comprehensiveness of the assessment in regard to the program
7.5	How the program compares with similar ones offered by other institutions, indicating the basis and rationale for the comparison
7.6	Strengths and weaknesses of the program
7.7	Any other comments, including those on the self-evaluation document and the teaching teams proposed plans for developing the program

<b>8.</b>	<b>If Reviewers wish to add individual comments, please do so below and indicate the author</b>

<b>9.</b>	<b>Signatures</b>
Signed: (External Subject Specialist)	Date:
Signed: (Local Reviewer)	Date:
Signed: (HKUST Reviewer)	Date:

Please email the completed Report to [aptl@ust.hk](mailto:aptl@ust.hk) **within two weeks** of visiting the University