African Quality Rating Mechanism (AQRM)
Consolidated evaluation report
(Fifteen Higher Education Institutions)

October 2018

AFRICAN QUALITY RATING MECHANISM (AQRM) CONSOLIDATED EVALUATION REPORT

(Fifteen Higher Education Institutions)

More information about the HAQAA Initiative at:
https://haqaa.aau.org/

October 2018

TABLE OF CONTENT

Content   **Page**

PREFACE

African Quality Rating Mechanism (AQRM) Consolidated Evaluation Report

List of Tables

African Quality Rating Mechanism (AQRM) Consolidated Evaluation Report

Preface

For African Higher Education to meet the aspirations of the Africa's Agenda 2063, quality assurance is imperative. It is essential to establish quality assurance, as a systematic, structured and continuous attention to quality in terms of maintenance and improvement, while assuring responsiveness and relevance.

The African Quality Rating Mechanism (AQRM) was therefore developed as a tool to facilitate a culture of continuous quality improvement in African Higher Education Institutions through self-evaluation exercises and external validation. The AQRM supports the African system to evaluate the performance of Higher Education Institutions against a set of commonly agreed criteria. It was developed through extensive dialogue with the African Higher Education community, including the Association of African Universities (AAU). Utilizing common evaluation methodologies will establish a deepening commitment to quality across Higher Education systems and promte international competitiveness.

The AQRM not only encourages the advancement of internal quality assurance practices but offers a strong foundation for advancing harmonisation among African Higher Education Institutions and mutual recognition of academic qualifications for facilitating academic mobility across Africa. The AQRM goes hand-in hand with the African Standards and Guidelines for QA (ASG-QA), a meta-tool that provides standards for internal Quality Assurance, which the AQRM assists universities to assess, and external Quality Assurance, conducted by QA agencies and authorities external to the University. Both the AQRM and the ASG-QA are part of the politically endorsed Pan-Africa Quality Assurance and Accreditation Framework.

It is my pleasure to endorse this publication, which is the result of AQRM assessments and validations conducted in 15 African Universities in the second half of 2017 as part of the Harmonisation for Quality Assurance and Accreditation in African Higher Education (HAQAA) Initiative. I would like to thank the HAQAA implementing consortium that coordinated this exercise, and especially the Association of African Universities (AAU). I would also like to appreciate the Euroean Union, which has financed this endeavor under the Africa-EU Strategic Partnership. All of the quality assurance experts and others who contributed in various ways to the success of this report are duly acknowledged. A bouquet of thanks to the staff of HRST.

It is necessary for all African Higher Education Institutions to use the African Quality Rating Mechanism (AQRM) as a key instrument to assess their quality and support the development of institutional culture of quality. Regular reporting will help to inform needed interventions. National and regional quality management agencies are called upon to include the AQRM among their key instruments as a robust tool for following up on adherence of Higher Education Institutions to quality standards.

H.E. Prof. Sarah Anyang Agbor
Commissioner for Human Resources,
Science and Technology (HRST)
African Union Commission

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

Cognisant of the strategic role higher education can and should play in the transformational development of Africa, the African Union Commission (AUC) has decided to focus on the realisation of the Addis Ababa Convention, intra African academic mobility of staff and students of institutions of higher learning and the harmonisation of qualifications for mutual recognition across Member States.

Central to the effective and efficient realization of the above is the need to assure quality of the total academic environment of all the Institutions of higher learning in Africa to ensure comparability and seamless movement across the regions of Africa without any shade of doubt about standards and quality of institutions, programmes, courses and indeed products.

The AUC, in spearheading the development of an instrument, African Quality Rating mechanism (AQRM) for the sole purpose of institutional self-evaluation and the cultivation of institutional quality culture, collaborated with the Association of African Universities (AAU) in the implementation of this laudable project. The AAU, the lead implementing agency of the African Union on higher education in Africa, is the apex organization and forum for consultation, exchange of information and co-operation among higher education institutions in Africa.

Beginning with a pilot self-rating exercise conducted in 32 institutions in 2010, several iterations of the draft instrument and a validation exercise in 2014 carried out by a team of external validators in nine (9) institutions of higher learning spread across the five geographical regions of the continent. The expert reports, identified institutional strengths, areas of concerns and made recommendations for future consideration of the projects.

The final version of the instrument contained 49 specific indicators (Governance and Management; Infrastructure; Finances; Teaching and Learning; Research, Publication & Innovation; and Societal Engagement) for institutional quality review and 35 indicators (Programme Planning and Management; Curriculum Development; Teaching and Learning; Assessment; and Programme Results) for programme level review.

Based on the outcomes of the Pan African Quality Assurance and Accreditation Framework (PAQAF) Validation Workshop in July 2015 and the recommendations at the 7th International Conference and Workshops on Quality Assurance in Higher Education in Africa held in Abuja in September 2015, two major decisions emerged. They were to:

- Domesticate and vigorously implement the AQRM by African countries; and

- African universities should adopt AQRM as a key instrument to assess and improve quality in higher education and, for African institutions of higher learning to own AQRM and use it as 'a means of supporting continuous quality improvement and for enhancing internal quality assurance systems towards the development of institutional cultures of quality'.

The current evaluation report of review missions is a step towards the realisation of the decisions stated above.

The European Commission, in collaboration with the African Union Commission in the context of the Joint Africa-EU Strategy, provided funding for this exercise under the aegis of the Harmonization of the African Quality Assurance and Accreditation (HAQAA) Initiative. The current round of the AQRM Review Missions was to further promote ownership of the AQRM through the participation of 15 selected universities (both public and private) across the five regions of Africa.

The Review visit to the 15 self-selected Universities was preceded by a Technical Meeting held in Accra, Ghana from 28 to 29 March 2017 to prepare the selected institutions for the AQRM institutional evaluation.

The Technical Meeting was attended by three major groups: the African QA Experts; the European QA Experts; and the representatives of the 15 participating universities. The two-day meeting was essentially used to review the current status of QA globally, continentally and locally; to review the AQRM tool, discuss the role of the participation of the Universities and the QA experts; provide an avenue for the members of the Expert Teams to get to know themselves and plan with the various universities they have been assigned to visit including negotiating the appropriate and convenient time to visit their assigned universities; and discuss the logistical and administrative outlays for the visits.

The AQRM is not a ranking instrument and its does not promote the listing of institutions in a league table. Rather, the AQRM allows for classification of institutions and programmes into five categories:

0 = Poor Quality   1= Insufficient Quality   2 = Satisfactory Quality

3 = Good Quality   4 = Excellent Quality

The rating mechanism is basically an instrument of institutional self-assessment, with the purpose of promoting the improvement of the quality of higher education institutions in Africa.

This consolidated evaluation report is prepared based on the ratings submitted by the teams of quality experts. Identified institutional strengths, areas of concerns, and some recommendations for future consideration are also provided. The reported results are not intended to be used to make comparisons between institutions but may be useful for promoting critical discussions around the meaning and conduct of quality, and on what it takes to be seen to be providing quality education.

SECTION 2: INSTITUTIONS THAT PARTICIPATED IN THE AQRM VALIDATION EXERCISE

Based on the outcomes and recommendations of the Pan African Quality Assurance and Accreditation Framework (PAQAF) Validation Workshop in July 2015, and the 7th International Conference and Workshops on Quality Assurance in Higher Education in Africa in September 2015, the HAQAA Initiative consortium partners organized the 2017 round of the Review visit to the institutions presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Institutions that Participated in AQRM Validation Exercise

No.	Name of Institution	Initials	Country	Region
INSTITUTIONS THAT PARTICIPATED IN AQRM VALIDATION EXERCISE				
1.	Al-Azhar University	AZHAR	Egypt	Northern Africa
2.	Botho University	BOTHO	Lesotho	Southern Africa
3.	Catholic University of Eastern Africa	CUEA	Kenya	Eastern Africa
4.	Crawford University	CU	Nigeria	Western Africa
5.	Durban University of Technology	DUT	South Africa	Southern Africa
6.	Ecole Normale Supérieure Assia Djebar Constantine	ENSC	Algeria	Northern Africa
7.	Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology	KNUST	Ghana	Western Africa
8.	L'universite Des Sciences Et Techniques De Masuku, A Franceville	USTM	Gabon	Central Africa
9.	Ndejje University	NDU	Uganda	Eastern Africa
10.	Sudan University of Science and Technology	SUST	Sudan	Northern Africa
11.	Universite De Kisangani	UNIKIS	DRC	Central Africa
12.	Universite De Ouaga Ii	UO2	Burkina Faso	Western Africa
13.	University Eduardo Mondlane	UEM	Mozambique	Eastern Africa
14.	University Moulay Ismail	UMI	Morocco	Northern Africa
15.	Zimbabwe Open University	ZOU	Zimbabwe	Eastern Africa

BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE INSTITUTIONS

AL-AZHAR UNIVERSITY (EGYPT)

Al-Azhar University, a public university located in Cairo (Egypt), was established in 972 AD. In 1872, the first regulatory law for Al-Azhar was issued, stipulating the academic pattern to get the degree of "Alameya" and defining its subjects of study. In 1920, Law number 49 was issued to organize study in Al-Azhar, its institutes and faculties.

Al-Azhar University offers undergraduate, postgraduate and graduate study programs and has 79 faculties, 9 Institutes, 359 academic Departments, 42 Centres, 6 University hospitals and 27 General administration units. The main thematic foci areas of Al-Azhar University are Science and Technology, Management and Business Administration, Arts, Languages and Humanities, Agriculture, Dentistry and Medicine.

The total number of full-time and part-time students in the 2016/2017 academic year was 313,565, including 133,160 female students. Full-time (194,860) and part-time (101,284) undergraduate students represent the biggest part of students.

The university is mainly publicly funded and local students are paying rather small tuition fees (around 9 USD for undergraduate students and 75-100 USD for postgraduate students). The tuition fees for international students are higher and range from 1,500 – 8,000 USD. The university offers full and partial scholarships to the students, combining Government sources and endowments. The criteria for student's admission to Al-Azhar University is based on standardized tests and cumulative high school grade average.

BOTHO UNIVERSITY (BOTSWANA)

Botho University, Gaborone, which is the first private University in Botswana, began as a computing training institute in 1997 and became a University in 2013. It has its main campus at Gaborone and currently offers programmes through six faculties namely Faculty of Business & Accounting, Faculty of Computing, Faculty of Engineering and Applied Sciences, Faculty of Health and Education, Faculty of Hospitality and Sustainable Tourism and Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research.

In December 2014 the University established a campus in Lesotho. The Maseru, Lesotho campus was accredited in March 2016 and currently has three faculties namely Faculty of Computing, Faculty of Business & Accounting and Faculty of Health and Education.

The schools 2016/17 faculty statistics revealed that, while the main campus had 6,000 students with about 500 staff, the University in Maseru had 321 students with a total of 38 staff, 19 of which were academic staff. Out of the 19 academic staff, there were two with Ph.D. and 12 with Master degrees. There were also one Assistant Professor, 3 Fellows and 7 Senior Lecturers.

As a private, for-profit institution, its governance structure is somewhat different from the conventional public universities. Generally, the Board of Directors is responsible for the governance of the institution and wields more power than the University Governing (Advisory) Council. The Board of Directors, through the Managing Directors and other Executive Directors, seeks advice on all key matters from the Advisory Council.

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF EASTERN AFRICA (KENYA)

The Catholic University of Eastern Africa (CUEA) was established in 1984 and was formally accredited in November 1992. It is a private non-profit university organised in 5 faculties with 23 departments, one school and three institutes. The thematic foci for the university are Science and Technology, Management and Business Administration, Arts. Languages and Humanities, Theology and Law. The University's main campus is at Langata, 25 km from the city center of Nairobi. There are also campuses in Eldoret, Kisumu, and Nairobi.

Programmes are offered at all levels: Bachelor, Master and Doctorate. In 2016, the number of bachelor students was 3,614 (out of which 56% women), of master students 530 (51% women), of doctoral students 133 (37% women). The academic staff comprises 247 persons with 6 full professors (1 woman), 15

associate professors (20% women), 38 senior lecturers (42% women), 126 lecturers (34% women) and 62 teaching assistants (45% women).

The university is legally regulated by the Ministry of Education, Kenya and by the Pontificate in Rome. The general management of CUEA is by the following in descending order of authority: Association of Member Episcopal Conferences in Eastern Africa (AMECEA); the University Trustees; the Chancellor; the University Council; the Vice Chancellor; and the Senate.   The University Council has an executive committee, a finance and planning committee, a staffing committee and an audit and risk management committee.

CRAWFORD UNIVERSITY (NIGERIA)

Crawford University is a private University established by the Apostolic Faith Mission of Nigeria. The university received its operating license from the Federal Government of Nigeria on the 9th June 2005 and admitted its first batch of 235 students on the 30th September 2005. Since 2009 Crawford University has graduated 8 sets of graduates in its various disciplines.

The University is located in Faith City in Igbesa, Ogun state. Igbesa is in a rural agricultural setting within 50 km radius to highly urbanized Lagos satellite cities like Sango, Ota and Ifo. The site is also close to Agbara town housing industrial estates that host several manufacturing companies.

Crawford University has two Colleges, namely the College of Business and Social Sciences and the College of Natural and Applied Sciences. There are 17 Academic Programmes accredited by the National University Commission and relevant professional bodies.

The vision of Crawford University is "To be a Centre of Excellence, producing graduates with balanced education" and the mission is "To be an International Institution of higher learning with enviable standards of teaching and research, training the mind, body and spirit into a total personality to serve God and humanity".

DURBAN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY (SOUTH AFRICA)

The Durban University of Technology (DUT) is a public university located in the province of KwaZulu Natal in South Africa. It operates from two main sites, one in Durban and the other in Pietermaritzburg. DUT is the result of the merger in 2002 of two Technikons, the Technikon Natal and the ML Sultan Technikon. It was first named Durban Institute of Technology and later Durban University of Technology when universities of technology were created in South Africa. It has 6 Faculties, 62 Departments and 2 Research Institutes, one for Systems Science and the other for Water & Wastewater Technology.

The DUT is governed by a Council appointed according to the Higher Education Act 101 of 1997 of South Africa. The Council comprises 30 members, 19 of whom (63%) are external members. The Council appoints its Vice-Chancellor and Principal through an open competitive process. A new Vice-Chancellor and Principal, Professor Thandwa Mthembu, was appointed in October 2016.

The DUT runs full-time and part-time Certificate, Diploma, Bachelor's, master's and Doctorate programmes. The programmes cover almost all subjects, except Agriculture and Medicine. In 2016, the students' population of DUT was about 28,000, most of whom (84%) were full-time students. Of these,

about 70% were registered on Diploma/Certificate programmes, 26% on Bachelor's, 3% on Master's and 1% on Doctorate. A total of 629 academic staff, with equal number of male and female staff were employed at DUT in 2016.

According to DUT's Strategic Plan 2015-2019, its vision is to be "A preferred University for developing leadership in technology and productive citizenship". Its four strategic foci areas are: building sustainable student communities of living and learning, building research and innovation for development, building a learning organisation, and building a sustainable university.

ECOLE NORMALE SUPÉRIEURE ASSIA DJEBAR CONSTANTINE (ALGERIA)

Until 2017, the school has adopted the classical system, two doctoral schools have been established namely; graduation in magisterium in English and doctoral school of mathematics where the course includes a Degree (4 or 5 year), a magisterium and a doctorate science, however, it recently graduated in 2017, a course of Master and Doctorate in Mathematics.

It has 6514 students (90% women), 243 teachers and 215 administrative, technical and maintenance staff.

The institution is chaired by a school director, appointed by presidential decree who is assisted by three Assistant Deputy Directors appointed by ministerial decree of (1) Postgraduate and Scientific Research, (2) Graduation Studies and Diplomas, (3) Continuing Education and External Relations.

The administration also has a secretary general appointed by ministerial decree to deal with the administrative and financial aspects.

In addition, eight (8) heads of department are in charge of the section of pedagogical affairs and students training from the various fields. Each head of department is assisted by a deputy. At the level of each department sit two (2) committees, the first is responsible for educational affairs while the second is concerned with scientific affairs.

KWAME NKRUMAH UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (GHANA)

The Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology (KNUST) began as the Kumasi College of Technology in 1951 and gained the University status in 1961. The university has since then undergone major changes, including the adoption of the collegiate system that gave birth to all Faculties being grouped six colleges: Agriculture & Natural Resources; Architecture & Planning; Art & Social Sciences; Engineering; Health Sciences; and the College of Science.

Officially accredited and recognised by the National Accreditation Board of Ghana, KNUST is a large co-educational higher education institution which offers courses and programmes leading to degrees such as pre-bachelor's degrees (i.e. certificates, diplomas, and associate or foundation degrees), bachelor's degrees, master degrees, doctorate degrees in several areas of study. In 2016, there were 4,100 undergraduates, 4,500 post graduate students. A total of 1, 021 academic staff (847 men, 174 women) were employed by the University in 2016.

The University runs a governance and management system similar to most government-funded universities. It has a Governing Council, an Academic Board (Senate) and several committees of Council and Academic Board. The University has several policies in place in the running of the institution ranging from Research to Sexual harassment. But it is yet to institute a policy on Partnership with Industry and Gender Issues.

UNIVERSITÉ DES SCIENCES ET TECHNIQUES DE MASUKU (GABON)

Masuku University of Science and Technology (USTM) is a public institution of higher education, located in Franceville in the province of Haut-Ogooué, south-east of Gabon. It was established in October 1986, by the transfer of Libreville to Franceville, the Faculty of Sciences and the National School of Engineers of Libreville (ENSIL), which became the Masuku Polytechnic School (EPM).

Its organization chart is composed of a Board of Directors, a University Council, a Rector, assisted by two Vice-Rectors (the first in charge of pedagogical questions and research, and the second in charge of teaching and research, administration and inter-university relations). The vice-rector responsible for teaching and research is assisted by a Secretary General, who is in charge of schooling, the central library, ICT and maintenance services.

The missions of the Masuku University of Science and Technology include: Middle and senior management training (Engineers and Doctors); the development of executives in activity; Research training; and Development support.

The USTM is now composed of three institutions namely:

- Faculty of Sciences including Departments of Biology, Chemistry, Geology, Mathematics and Computer Science, Physics and Languages and Communications. The number of teachers is 77 including 3 Full Professors, 22 Master Lecturers, 31 Master Assistants and 21 Assistants for a staff of 1415 student.
- The Polytechnic School of Masuku (EPM) encompassing the Departments of General Engineering Sciences, Electromechanics, Civil Engineering, Industrial Maintenance, Computing and Electronics, Computer Science and Automation with 35 teachers including 1 Senior Lecturer, 8 Master Assistants, 26 Assistants and 511 students.
- The National Institute of Agronomy and Biotechnology (INSAB) having the Departments of Basic Sciences of the Engineer, Agro-economy, Phytotechnology and Zoo-technology with 37 teachers including 2 Professors Titular, 2 Masters of conferences, 9 Masters Assistants, 24 Assistants and 224 students.

The USTM delivered only short cycle courses (DEUG and DUT) until 2007/2008 academic year when the changeover to the LMD system took place. The university then progressively set up Bachelor, Master and PhD courses.

NDEJJE UNIVERSITY (UGANDA)

Established in 1992, Ndejje University (NDU) is the oldest private university in Uganda. In 1995, the university gained its status under the ownership of the Anglican Diocese of Luweero. Later in 2002, the ownership base was expanded to include all six Churches of Uganda Diocese in Buganda Region in what became known as "Ndejje University Foundation Consortium." The Consortium is registered as a Company

Limited by Guarantee, not having share capital. It is responsible for appointing the Chancellor, the Vice Chancellor, and Chairperson of the Council including members of the University Council.

In 2009 the University was chartered by the National Council for Higher Education (NCHE) of Uganda meaning that all certificates awarded at the University are nationally and internationally recognized. Also, all courses offered in the university were accredited by the same body. The University subscribes to the Inter University Council for East Africa and Association of African universities.

Ndejje University, through its multiple programs (Day, Evening, Weekend and Distance Learning) offers and awards certificates in both undergraduate and postgraduate courses to a student population of about 8,000 both Ugandan and foreign. The University has a steady growth rate each academic year, with two intakes each year, that is, January and August.

SUDAN UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (SUDAN)

SUST originates from a technical school established at the beginning of the 20th Century. It was accredited in 1990 and is now the major institution for engineering in Sudan. It is a public university organised in 24 colleges with 102 departments and three institutes. The thematic foci for the university are Science and Technology, Management and Business Administration, Arts, Languages and Humanities, Agriculture, Medicine. Programmes are offered at all levels: Bachelor, Master and Doctorate. The university also offers diploma and certificate studies.

In 2017, the university had a student population of 86,564 and 1,404 academic staff. The students' demographics comprised 36,720 bachelor students (out of which 44% were women), 8,216 master students (52% women), 2,913 doctoral students (34% women), 27,687 diploma students (35% women) and 11,028 higher diplomas students (49% women). Regarding academic staff, the university had 90 full professors (out of which 11% were women), 211 associate professors (19% women), 419 senior lecturers (38% women), 558 lecturers (47% women) and 126 teaching assistants (38% women).

The university is legally regulated by the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research of Sudan. The University Council is the highest overseeing and legislative body, comprising university and lay members. It carries the ultimate responsibility for the overall strategic direction and for the management of finances, properties and affairs generally for the university. The Vice Chancellor (who is appointed by the government) is a representative of the University Council and carries all its authorities.

UNIVERSITY OF KISANGANI (DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO)

The University of Kisangani is located in the eastern part of the Democratic Republic of Congo, in the Province of Tshopo. Built on an area of approximately 132 hectares, Kisangani University is one kilometre from the city centre on the west side and one hundred meters north of the Congo River. It is considered as the third university of the country after the University of Kinshasa and Lubumbashi.

Established under the initiative of the protestant missionaries in 1963, the University of Kisangani was initially referred to as the Free University of the Congo. Since its inception, the University has gone through three major historical evolutions: The period when it was known as the Free University of Congo (ULC)

from 1963 to 1971; the period when it was known as f the National University of Zaire (UNAZA) from 1971 to 1981; and the period when it was known as Kisangani University (UNIKIS) from 1981 to present.

According to article 5 of Ordinance No. 81/025 of 03/10/1981, which determines the university's governing structure and functions, the management of the University of Kisangani is as follows: The university council; the management committee; the faculty council; and the council of departments.

THE UNIVERSITY OF OUAGADOUGOU II (BURKINA FASO)

The University of Ouagadougou II (or briefly Ouaga II), was established by decree no. 2007-834 / PRES / PM / MESSRS / MEF on 12th December 2007 and officially became a public scientific, cultural and technical institution (PSCTI) by decree no. 2008-442 / PRES / PM / MESSRS / MEF of 12/12/2007 on July 15, 2008. It is also by Decree No. 2008-516 / PRES / PM / MESSRS / MEF of August 28, 2008 that the statutes of the University of Ouaga II were adopted. These results define the missions, the organization and the functioning of the university.

At inception, Ouaga II had two existing faculties from the University of Ouagadougou to reduce the high number of students at the university. Its main objective is to help solve issues Burkina Faso face as regards training and research, particularly in the areas of law, economics and management, and ultimately Science and Technology.

Ouaga II consists of two training and research departments, two institutes and a graduate school. These include, among others, the Training and Research department in Economics and Management, the Training and Research department in Law and Political Sciences (UFR / SJP), the University Institute of Initial and In-Service Training, Open Distance Learning Institute (IFOAD) and the joint graduate school in Science and Technology).

UNIVERSITY EDUARDO MONDLANE (MOZAMBIQUE)

The University Eduardo Mondlane (UEM) is the oldest higher education institution in Mozambique, created in August 21 1962 by Decree-Law no. 44530 under the name of General University Studies of Mozambique. In 1968, it was given university status, being then designated as the University of Lourenço Marques. On May 1, 1976, President Samora Machel attributed to this institution the name Eduardo Mondlane University.

UEM is a public institution and has 11 faculties, 6 Schools, 41 research/extension centres and 2 Museums, and 1 teaching hospital, organized according to different academic areas. Each of these units is managed by a Director or Dean, assisted by Deputy-Deans and Heads of Academic and/or Administrative Departments. UEM enjoys relative academic and administrative autonomy to establish, manage and extinguish academic programmes, as well as to undertake research and to mobilise funds.

UEM is governed by the following collegial boards: University Council, Academic Council and Council of Deans. These boards are chaired by the Rector. In addition, each Faculty has a Faculty Council which is chaired by the Dean. UEM is also steered by a number of central offices which perform mainly

administrative and academic functions in different areas: pedagogic, academic registration, research, cooperation, planning, and administration of human, physical and material resources.

UEM's vision is to be a university of reference at national, regional and international level regarding the production and dissemination of scientific knowledge and innovation, highlighting research as the foundation of the teaching and learning and outreach activities.

UNIVERSITY MOULAY ISMAIL (MOROCCO)

The Université Moulay Ismail (UMI) is one of the 12 public universities in Morocco. It is located in Meknès,Khénifra and Errachidia, in the Region of Meknès-Tafilalet Morocco. It was established in 1989.

UMI is a public university, where students do not pay tuition fees. The thematic foci of the University is on Science and Technology, Management and Business Administration & Arts, Languages and Humanities. It contains 4 faculties and 5 selective schools.

As of 2016/17, the University had a total number of 58,517 students of which 27,738 were females. 78% of the students were within the age range of 18-25 years. The total number of academic and administrative in the year of review was 1,433, out of which 374 (representing 26%) were females.

Moulay Ismail University's governance structure is composed of a number of authoritative bodies, some of which include president, vice-presidents and deans. The Governance Office is located within the Presidency of UMI.

At the top, the University's Board (Conseil de l'Université) is UMI's governing body. It carries the ultimate responsibility for overall strategic direction and for the management of finances, property and affairs generally, including annual planning, budgeting, performance evaluation, annual revisions, the employment arrangements for all staff, pedagogic issues, scientific and innovation strategies, etc.

ZIMBABWE OPEN UNIVERSITY (ZIMBABWE)

The origin of Zimbabwe Open University (ZOU) dates back to the creation, in 1993, of the Centre for Distance Learning at the University of Zimbabwe in order to provide continuing education to the adult population. In 1996, the Centre became the University College of Distance Education and, in 1999, it was upgraded to a public university through the promulgation of the Zimbabwe Open University Act (the ZOU Act), with a clear mandate to provide tertiary education through Open and Distance Learning (ODL).

ZOU's vision is "to become a world class open and distance learning university" and its mission is "to empower people through lifelong learning, thereby enabling them to realise their full potential in an affordable and flexible manner while executing their endeavours". It has six faculties (Commerce & Law, Agriculture, Science & Technology, Applied Social Sciences, Arts & Education, and Information Technology & Multimedia Communication), each headed by a Dean, 21 Departments, a Higher Degrees Directorate and a Centre for Research and Innovation. ZOU operates through 10 Regional Campuses, one in each of the country's 10 Provinces.

In 2016, there were 12,410 students enrolled on Certificate, Diploma, Bachelor's, Master's, and Doctorate programmes. Of these, 67% were registered on bachelor's programmes, 28% on the Postgraduate Diploma in Education and 5% on Master's programmes. 50% of the students were in the age range of 26-35 years, 29% in the range 36-50 years and 19% in the range 18-25 years. Also, 59% of the students were female. About 8% of the students were from outside Zimbabwe, almost all of whom from the SADC region. ZOU had a complement of 212 full-time academic staff, giving a staff: student ratio of 1:58. Of these, only 25% were female and 27% had a PhD.

ZOU is governed by a Council constituted in accordance with the ZOU Act. The Council is made up of some 34 members, about half of whom are appointed by the Minister of Higher Education. The Council is, officially, chaired by the Chancellor, who is the President of the Republic of Zimbabwe. In practice, however, the Chancellor does not attend, and the Council elects a chair from its membership. For the appointment of the Vice-Chancellor, the Council advertises the post and prepares a shortlist of three candidates, which is then submitted to the Minister and the Chancellor for selecting the final candidate.

SECTION 3: RATING CRITERIA USED FOR AQRM

The African Quality Rating Mechanism (AQRM) employs specific quality criteria on different focus areas against which the quality of higher education institutions can be rated through a self-evaluation exercise and external validation. The AQRM focuses on both programme and institution level, with major focus areas shown in Table 2.

Table 2. AQRM Criteria

Major Areas at the institutional level	Major Areas at the programme level
I. **Governance and management** II. **Infrastructure** III. **Finances** IV. **Teaching and Learning** V. **Research, Publication & Innovation** VI. **Societal Engagement**	I. Programme Planning and Management; II. Curriculum Development III. Teaching and Learning IV. Assessment V. Programme Results

For each of the areas, the AQRM includes specific standards against which institutions can assess their own quality levels. The institutional level involves 49 specific indicators while the programme level rating mechanism comprises of 35 specific indicators.

The AQRM is not a raking tool and does not promote the listing of institutions in a league table. The AQRM allows for classification of institutions and programme into five categories: Poor quality, insufficient quality, satisfactory quality, good quality and excellent quality, but no comparisons between institutions or programme is conducted. The rating mechanism is basically an instrument with the purpose of promoting the quality of higher education institutions in Africa.

Each criteria of AQRM will be rated by assigning the values (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4)

Based on the institutional information submitted, a score is given from 0 to 4 for each criteria.

The scores are then submitted up to provide a subtotal for each category of criteria assigned as shown in Table 3 below. The rating of institutions or programme is determined according to the overall average of the total score.

Table 3. Specification of Quality Rating

Rating score less than 1.0	Poor Quality
Rating score between 1.0 and 1.99	Insufficient Quality
Rating score between 2.0 to 2.79	Satisfactory Quality
Rating score between 2.8 to 3.5	Good Quality
Rating score greater the 3.5	Excellent Quality

SECTION 4: RESULTS AT THE INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL

This section draws from part 2 of the AQRM Questionnaire submitted by the 15 selected institutions. It covers the 6 focus areas mentioned earlier under section 1. Under each focus area, a table is presented showing the rating scores against the various standards for that focus area. This is followed by strengths, areas of concern and opportunities for improvement.

Table 4. Governance and Management Rating

No.	Standards for Quality Rating	AZHAR	BOTHO	CUEA	CU	DUT	ENSC	UNIKIS	KNUST	USTM	NDU	SUST	UO2	UEM	UMI	ZOU
	Governance and Management Rating															
1.1	The institution has a clearly stated vision, mission, and Ratings with specific goals and priorities.	3	4	3	3	4	3	3	4	2	3	4	3	4	3	4
1.2	The institution has specific strategies in place for monitoring achievement of institutional goals and identifying problem areas.	3	3	3	3	4	2	2	4	2	2	3	2	3.5	3	4
1.3	Clear accountability structures for responsible officers are in place.	3	4	3	2	4	3	3	4	3	2	4	3	3	3	3

1.4	Where appropriate, staff, students and external stakeholders are represented in governance structures. Governance structures are representative in terms of gender.	3	3	3	2	4	3	1	4	2	3	4	3	2	3	2
1.5	The institution has developed quality assurance policies and procedures.	4	4	4	3	4	2	2	3.5	1	3	4	3	4	2	4
1.6	Appropriate mechanisms are in place to evaluate staff in line with performance agreements with relevant authorities.	4	2	4	4	1	4	1	3.5	2	3	4	2	3	2	3
1.7	The institution has put a management information system in place to manage student and staff data, and to track student performance.	4	4	3	3	4	3	2	4	1	3	3	3	3	3	3

1.8	The institution has specific policies in place to ensure and support diversity of staff and students, in particular representation of women and the disabled.	4	2	3	1	2	2	1	2	0	3	1	0	2	2	3
1.9	The institution has a policy and standard procedures in place to ensure staff and student welfare.	4	3	4	3	3	1	2	4	0	3	3	2	2	2	4
AVERAGE RATING		**3.56**	**3.22**	**3.3**	**2.67**	**3.3**	**2.56**	**1.89**	**3.67**	**1.44**	**2.78**	**3.33**	**2.33**	**2.94**	**2.55**	**3.33**

Table 5 shows an abstract of the identified strength, weaknesses and recommendations in the area of Governance and Management. This is based on the assessments of external evaluators across the 15 higher education institutions selected for the AQRM project. The aim of this sections is to highlight institutional strength, areas of concern and propose recommendations for improvement.

Table 5. Institutional strength, areas of concern and proposed recommendations on Governance and Management

Institutional Strength	Areas of Concern	Recommendations
♦ There is staff, students and external stakeholders' representation in governance structures. ♦ Clear mission and vision statements. ♦ Established and well developed and quality assurance policies and procedures. ♦ There is a management information system for data capturing.	♦ The strategic plan is not made known to the academic staff and students. ♦ The progress of strategic development is not systematically monitored. ♦ There is need to build strong reporting systems for quality assurance. ♦ There is the need to set-up clear accountability structures for university governance, academic and administrative officers. ♦ No clear policy on diversity of staff and students, representation of women and the disabled	♦ A systematic approach for developing an internal quality management system has to be in place, combining all quality assurance elements into a comprehensive quality management system. ♦ Develop separate administrative and academic organograms with clear accountability structures ♦ Publish strategic and action plans at least internally, to make it transparent to staff and students. ♦ Develop an institutional monitoring scheme to follow-up on the implementation of strategies and make changes in the implementation when need is discovered. ♦ Develop policies by taking into account diversity and minorities and see to it that necessary improvements are made. ♦ Improve career opportunities for women in the university ♦ Clearly formulate job description for all responsible officers and staff

Table 6 presents the summary results of external rating in the area of infrastructure.

Table 6. External Rating on Infrastructure

No.	Standards for Quality Rating	AZHAR	BOTHO	CUEA	CU	DUT	ENSC	UNIKIS	KNUST	USTM	NDU	SUST	UO2	UEM	UMI	ZOU
	Infrastructure Rating															
2.1	The institution has sufficient lecturing spaces to accommodate student numbers taking the institutional mode of delivery into account.	4	3	4	2	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	1	3	2	3
2.2	The institution provides sufficient learning/studying space for students including access to electronic learning resources, as required for the institutional mode of delivery.	4	2	4	3	3	3	1	2	1	1	3	1	3	2	3
2.3	Academic and Administrative Staff have access to computer resources and the internet.	3	4	4	3	3	1	2	4	1	3	4	1	3	3	3

2.4	Students have access to computer resources and the internet at a level appropriate to the demands of the institutional mode of delivery.	3	4	4	2	3	2	2	3	0	2	4	1	3	3	2
2.5	The institution has sufficient laboratory facilities to accommodate students in science programmes, taking institutional mode of delivery into account.	3	3	4	3	2	3	2	2	1	3	3	0	3	2	1
2.6	Laboratory equipment is up to date and well-maintained.	4	3	3	3	2	2	1	2.5	1	3	2	0	2	2	1
2.7	The institution invests in maintaining an up to date library to support academic learning and ensures that appropriate access mechanisms are available depending on the mode of delivery.	3	3	4	2	3	3	2	1	2	1	3	1	4	3	2

2.8	The institution makes provision for managing and maintaining utilities and ensuring that appropriate safety measures are in place.	3	3	4	2	2	3	2	3.5	0	2	2	2	2.5	2	3
	AVERAGE RATING	**3.38**	**3.13**	**3.88**	**2.5**	**2.63**	**2.63**	**1.88**	**2.63**	**1.13**	**2.25**	**3**	**0.87**	**2.94**	**2.38**	**2.25**

Table 7 shows an abstract of the identified strength, weaknesses and recommendations in the area of Infrastructure. This is based on the assessments of external evaluators across the 15 higher education institutions selected for the AQRM project. The aim of this sections is to highlight institutional strength, areas of concern and propose recommendations for improvement.

Table 7. Institutional strength, areas of concern and proposed recommendations on Infrastructure

Institutional Strength	Areas of Concern	Recommendations
♦ Well-resourced library facilities for both staff and students. ♦ Sufficient lecture rooms and reading spaces ♦ Classrooms are well equipped with projectors, sound systems and internet. ♦ Good and well-maintained laboratories for teaching and for research. ♦ Good sports grounds for student and staff recreation	♦ Equipment in most laboratories are out of date or not functional. ♦ The staff offices are inadequate or insufficient ♦ Poor access to internet ♦ students claim for better food provision services within the campus and outside campus ♦ Insufficient walkways and storm drainage ♦ Frequent power outages ♦ Poor access for the physically challenged ♦ Insufficient student housing ♦ Poor medical and ambulance services for students and staff ♦ Inadequate fire safety facilities such as fire extinguishers	♦ Efforts should be made to improve staff offices. ♦ More funds should be allocated for maintenance and repairs. ♦ Improve internet access and use of information technologies ♦ Increase the number and diversity of books in the libraries ♦ Improve access to toilet facilities and maintain hygiene ♦ Construct walkways leading to all buildings in the institution ♦ Build storm drainage systems in the university to clear rain water ♦ Provide access to the physically challenged in the university buildings. ♦ Up-date teaching laboratories with more and new equipment ♦ Improve health care services on campus ♦ Upgrade fire safety facilities such as fire extinguishers.

Table 8 presents the summary results of external rating in the area of finance.

Table 8. External Rating on finance

No.	Standards for Quality Rating	AZHAR	BOTHO	CUEA	CU	DUT	ENSC	UNIKIS	KNUST	USTM	NDU	SUST	UO2	UEM	UMI	ZOU
	Finance – Rating of external evaluators															
3.1	The institution has access to sufficient financial resources to achieve its goals in line with its budget and student unit cost.	3	3	2	3	2	3	1	3	1	3	3	1	2	2	2
3.2	The institution has procedures in place to attract funding, including from industry and the corporate sector.	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	1	2	1	1
3.3	Clearly specified budgetary procedures are in place to ensure allocation of resources reflects the vision, mission and goals of the institution.	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	2	3	4	3	3	3	4
3.4	The institution provides financial support to deserving students	4	2	3	1	2	N/A	1	2.5	0	1	3	0	3	1	1

	(institutional bursaries and/or scholarships).															
3.5	Information about financial aid and criteria for its allocation is provided to students and other stakeholders.	4	3	3	2	3	N/A	0	4	1	1	4	0	3	2	**1**
3.6	The institution publishes income and expenditure statements.	4	4	3	2	4	N/A	3	4	2	1	0	4	4	3	**4**
AVERAGE RATING		**3.5**	**2.83**	**2.83**	**2.16**	**2.67**	**2.6**	**2**	**3.25**	**1**	**1.83**	**2.67**	**1.5**	**2.94**	**2**	**2.17**

Table 9 shows an abstract of the identified strength, weaknesses and recommendations in the area of finance. This is based on the assessments of external evaluators across the 15 higher education institutions selected for the AQRM project. The aim of this sections is to highlight institutional strength, areas of concern and propose recommendations for improvement.

Table 9. Institutional strength, areas of concern and proposed recommendations on Finance

Institutional Strength	Areas of Concern	Recommendations
♦ well planned financial management structures and procedures ♦ Highly qualified staff in the Finance Office ♦ Transparency in the publication of the university income and expenditure reports. ♦ Reliable computerised accounting system for maintenance of books of accounts, Payroll, and Asset management.	♦ Heavy reliance on tuition fees and government funding as the only main funding sources. ♦ There is the need for a more intensive fundraising effort ♦ Inadequate funding for research and community projects ♦ Bureaucracy in the procurement processes ♦ Inadequate support deserving students financially.	♦ Identify alternative ways to diversify university funding sources ♦ The University should diversify its sources of funding; ♦ A fund-raising strategy with a strong marketing plan for the university is recommended ♦ Alumni could be engaged to support resource mobilization for the university ♦ A visibility strategy for research outputs could be used to enhance the university resource mobilization strategy ♦ Ensure that part of any increased revenue can be used to boost the financial incentives for excellence in teaching and research.

Table 10. External Rating on Teaching and Learning

		Teaching and Learning Rating														
No.	Standards for Quality Rating	AZHAR	BOTHO	CUEA	CU	DUT	ENSC	UNIKIS	KNUST	USTM	NDU	SUST	UO2	UEM	UMI	ZOU
4.1	The institution encourages and rewards teaching and learning innovation.	2	2	3	2	3	1	3	4	0	2	3	2	3		1
4.2	The institution has procedures in place to support the induction to teaching, pedagogy, counselling and the upgrading of staff teaching and learning skills through continuing education and lifelong learning.	4	2	3	2	3	2	2	4	0	2	3	3	3	1	2
4.3	Students have sufficient opportunity to engage with staff members in small groups, individually or via electronic platforms.	2	2	3	3	3	2	1	3	2	3	3	2	2	1	3

4.4	Student: staff ratios and academic staff average workloads are in line with acceptable norms for the particular mode of delivery and are such that the necessary student feedback can be provided.	4	2	3	3	2	3	3	2	1	3	2	1	2	2	2
4.5	The institution has policies/procedures in place to inform the development, implementation and assessment of programmes offered by the institution and these policies take account the contribution of higher education to socio-economic development.	4	3	3	3	3	2	2	4	1	3	3	2	3	1	3
4.6	The institution has developed a policy or criteria for staff recruitment, deployment, development, succession planning and a	4	2	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	2	4	1	3	2	3

	system of mentorship and/or apprenticeship.														
4.7	Student support services, including academic support and required counselling services are provided, in line with the institutional mode of delivery.	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	4	0	4	3	0	3	3	3
4.8	The institution has mechanisms in place to support students to become independent learners, in line with the institutional mode of delivery.	4	3	3	3	3	3	1	3	1	2	1	2	2	2	3
4.9	The institution has a devoted office to promote international cooperation and enhance Intra-Africa mobility of students and staff.	4	3	3	2	3	2	3	4	1	4	3	3	3	2	1
AVERAGE RATING		**3.44**	**2.33**	**3**	**2.67**	**2.89**	**2.3**	**2**	**3.44**	**1**	**2.78**	**2.78**	**1.78**	**2.67**	**1.89**	**2.33**

Table 11 shows an abstract of the identified strength, weaknesses and recommendations in the area of Teaching and Learning. This is based on the assessments of external evaluators across the 15 higher education institutions selected for the AQRM project. The aim of this sections is to highlight institutional strength, areas of concern and propose recommendations for improvement.

Table 11. Institutional strength, areas of concern and proposed recommendations on Teaching and Learning

Institutional Strength	Areas of Concern	Recommendations
◆ Comprehensive human resources policy for recruitment and appointment of staff. ◆ clear academic and pedagogical procedures and systems in place ◆ The teaching classrooms meet the minimum required standards ◆ The university is actively engaging industry to provide learning and internship opportunities for the students ◆ Strong Academic Quality Management process. ◆ Adequate teaching and learning resources for lecturers and students. ◆ Well established International Office	◆ High student dropout rates ◆ The proportion of academic staff having a PhD is quite low and this has an impact on the quality of teaching and learning. ◆ The workload of academic staff is quite high. ◆ The current staff: student ratio is too high and well above the national average. ◆ Poor intra-African staff and student mobility. ◆ Poor student engagement with academic staff ◆ Learning outcomes are not clearly spelt out ◆ There appeared to be limited knowledge of harmonized curricula and qualifications to promote continental mobility ◆ There is not enough feedback between students and teachers. ◆ Inadequate evaluation of programs' outcomes nor annual report on courses and program evaluation	◆ Enhance international cooperation and intra-African mobility of staff and students ◆ Encourage and reward innovative teaching and learning. ◆ Academic staff should be encouraged to upgrade their qualification to PhD. ◆ Develop a mechanism for staff recruitment, deployment, development, retention, succession planning and mentorship. ◆ Develop the systems for supporting students to become more independent learners ◆ Review of learning outcomes articulated in the program curriculum documents; ◆ Explore new ways of assessing the effectiveness of learning to test learning outcomes; ◆ Explore the use of technology to fully support the teaching and learning process through e-learning implementation ◆ Measuring students' feedback ◆ Develop policies for staff development and progression.

Table 12. External Rating on Research, Publication and Innovation

No.	Standards for Quality Rating	AZHAR	BOTHO	CUEA	CU	DUT	ENSC	UNIKIS	KNUST	USTM	NDU	SUST	UO2	UEM	UMI	ZOU
	Research, Publication and Innovation Rating															
5.1	The Institution has a research policy and publications policy, strategy and agenda. The research policy includes a focus on research supporting African socio-economic development, among others.	2	2	4	3	3	3	2	4	3	2	3	2	4	3	**3**
5.2	The institution has a policy and/or strategy on Innovation, Intellectual Property Ownership and Technology Foresight.	1	1	2	1	3	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	1	1	**2**
5.3	The institution has demonstrated success in attracting research grants from national or international sources and in partnership with industry.	3	0	4	1	4	2	2	3	2	1	2	2	3	2	**0**
5.4	The institution has procedures in place to support academic staff to develop and enhance their research skills, including collaborative research and publication.	3	0	4	3	3	3	2	4	0	2	3	2	2.5	3	**2**
5.5	Staff and students publish their research in accredited academic journals and apply for patents (where relevant).	3	1	3	3	3	1	2	3	2	1	3	3	1.5	3	**2**
5.6	Researchers are encouraged and supported to present	4	0	4	3	4	3	3	4	2	2	3	2	2	4	**2**

	their research at national and international conferences.															
5.7	Researchers are encouraged and facilitated, using Research and Development budget, to engage in research relevant to the resolution of African problems and the creation of economic and development opportunities.	3	0	3	2	3	2	2	4	2	2	3	2	2	2	**0**
5.8	The institution encourages, and rewards research whose results are used by society	3	0	4	1	2	0	2	2	0	1	3	0	2	2	**2**
5.9	The institution has a mechanism for partnership with industry, including attracting resources from industry. The institution receives requests from industry for specific research and training support.	3	1	2	3	3	N/A	1	2	2	1	4	1	2.5	1	**1**
5.10	The institution has established linkages to promote international joint research and publications	3	1	3	1	3	2	2	4	2	2	3	1	2	3	**1**
	AVERAGE RATING	**2.8**	**0.6**	**3.3**	**2.1**	**3.1**	**2**	**2.1**	**3.3**	**1.7**	**1.6**	**2.9**	**1.7**	**2.25**	**2.4**	**1.5**

Table 13 shows an abstract of the identified strength, weaknesses and recommendations in the area of finance. This is based on the assessments of external evaluators across the 15 higher education institutions selected for the AQRM project. The aim of this sections is to highlight institutional strength, areas of concern and propose recommendations for improvement.

Table 13. Institutional strength, areas of concern and proposed recommendations on Finance

Institutional Strength	Areas of Concern	Recommendations
♦ Well-equipped physical and virtual library to facilitate research ♦ Polices guiding undergraduate and postgraduate research developed ♦ The University supports and encourages staff to present their research in national conferences ♦ Well established research department to promote research ♦ Annual budget allocation for research ♦ Efforts to attract research grants from both national and international sources. ♦ Research and Innovations Policy developed with implementation plans	♦ Academic staff do not communicate their research findings to the larger community ♦ Heavy workload for some academic staff in teaching and supervision negatively affects research ♦ Absence of policy on Innovation, Intellectual Property Ownership and Technology Foresight ♦ There is no structured programme for developing and enhancing research skills of academic staff ♦ Inadequate resource for research ♦ Poor relation with industry in the fields of research, training & financial support. ♦ Non-existence of a research policy	♦ There is need to increase opportunities for staff exchange with other universities ♦ Publish in accredited academic journals and apply for patents ♦ Design and implement an institutional digital repository of knowledge generated in the University; ♦ Develop a policy and strategy on innovation, intellectual property ownership and technology foresight. ♦ Formalization of the research policy ♦ Strengthen the public-private partnership for funding research, ♦ Diversify financial resources for funding research, ♦ Strengthen academic exchanges in research.

Table 14. External Rating on Community/Societal Engagement

		Community/Societal Engagement Rating														
No.	Standards for Quality Rating	AZHAR	BOTHO	CUEA	CU	DUT	ENSC	UNIKIS	KNUST	USTM	NDU	SUST	UO2	UEM	UMI	ZOU
6.1	The institution has a policy and procedure in place for engaging with the local community or society in general. The community often requests the institution for specific academic/research assistance	4	2	3	2	1	3	1	2	1	3	3	1	2	3	3
6.2	The institution encourages departments and staff to develop and implement strategies for community engagement.	4	1	4	3	2	2	2	3	1	3	4	0	2	3	3
6.3	Students are required to engage with communities through their academic work.	4	1	3	2	2	2	1	3	2	3	4	0	2	2	3
6.4	The institution has forged partnerships with other education sub-sectors to enhance the quality of education in the country and region.	3	2	4	2	2	3	1	3	2	3	4	0	2	3	2
6.5	The Institution disseminates	4	1	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	4	1	2	3	0

	information on its community engagement activities to the local community.															
6.6	The institution offers relevant short courses to the community/broader society based on identified needs and supporting identified economic opportunities.	4	1	3	1	4	1	1	3	2	4	4	3	2	4	3
6.7	The institution makes its facilities available (where possible) to the local community in support of community and socio-economic development activities.	4	1	3	4	3	1	1	4	3	4	4	0	3	2	1
	AVERAGE RATING	**3.86**	**1.29**	**3.1**	**2.29**	**2.29**	**2**	**1.43**	**3**	**1.86**	**3.29**	**3.86**	**0.71**	**2.14**	**2.86**	**2.14**

Table 15 shows an abstract of the identified strength, weaknesses and recommendations in the area of Community/Societal Engagement. This is based on the assessments of external evaluators across the 15 higher education institutions selected for the AQRM project. The aim of this sections is to highlight institutional strength, areas of concern and propose recommendations for improvement.

Table 15. Institutional strength, areas of concern and proposed recommendations on Community/Societal Engagement.

Institutional Strength	Areas of Concern	Recommendations
♦ University facilities are made available for community use ♦ There exist good relationship and partnership with the community ♦ The University engages with community through projects ♦ Final year projects are geared towards the need of the community ♦ The university offers special semester modules on community engagement for students	♦ No written policy on community engagement activities ♦ There are no institutional funds allocated for engagement with the community ♦ Dissemination of community engagement activities is not extensive ♦ No written policy on community engagement activities ♦ Dissemination of community engagement activities is not extensive	♦ Develop and implement a policy on community engagement; ♦ An office or even directorate for community engagement should be established and adequate funds provided to it. ♦ Community engagement should be made an explicit/implicit part of every programme ♦ Develop and implement relevant short courses for the community ♦ Document and disseminate community engagement activities ♦ Create alumni league for more engagement with the community ♦ Involve more staff and student in community engagement ♦ Formalise information delivery to the community ♦ Conduct research for community development

Table 16. External Rating Summary at Institutional Level

No.	Standards for Quality Rating	AZHAR	BOTHO	CUEA	CU	DUT	ENSC	UNIKIS	KNUST	USTM	NDU	SUST	UO2	UEM	UMI	ZOU
	EXTERNAL RATING SUMMARY AT INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL															
1	Governance and Management	3.56	3.22	3.3	2.67	3.33	2.56	1.89	3.67	1.44	2.78	3.33	2.33	2.94	2.55	3.33
2	Infrastructure	3.38	3.13	3.88	2.5	2.63	2.63	1.88	2.63	1.13	2.25	3	0.87	2.94	2.38	2.25
3	Finances	3.5	2.83	2.83	2.16	2.67	2.6	2	3.25	1.00	1.83	2.67	1.5	2.83	2	2.17
4	Teaching and Learning	3.44	2.33	3	2.67	2.89	2.3	2	3.4	1.00	2.78	2.78	1.78	2.67	1.89	2.33
5	Research, Publication and Innovation	2.8	0.60	3.3	2.1	3.1	2	2.10	3.3	1.70	1.6	2.9	1.7	2.25	2.4	1.5
6	Community/Societal Engagement	3.86	1.29	3.1	2.29	2.29	2	1.43	3	1.86	3.29	3.86	0.71	2.14	2.86	2.14
	AGREGATED AVERAGE	**3.42**	**2.23**	**3.24**	**2.40**	**2.82**	**2.35**	**1.88**	**3.21**	**1.36**	**2.42**	**3.09**	**1.48**	**2.63**	**2.35**	**2.29**

SECTION 5: RESULTS AT THE PROGRAMME LEVEL

This section draws from part 3 of the AQRM questionnaire submitted by the 15 selected institutions. It covers the five focus areas mentioned earlier under section 1. Under each focus area, a Table is presented showing the rating scores against the various standards for that focus area. This is followed by strengths, areas of concern and opportunities for improvement.

Table 17. External Rating on Programme Planning and Management

No.	Standards for Quality Rating	PROGRAMME PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT														
		AZHAR	BOTHO	CUEA	CU	DUT	ENSC	UNIKIS	KNUST	USTM	NDU	SUST	UO2	UEM	UMI	ZOU
7.1	The programme is aligned with the overall institutional mission and vision.	4	4	4	3	4	3	3	4	3	4	4	3	4	3	4
7.2	The programme meets national accreditation criteria.	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	3	3	3	4	4
7.3	The institution allocates sufficient resources to support the programme.	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	1	4	4	1	3	4	2
7.4	There is a programme coordinator(s) responsible for managing and ensuring quality of the programme.	4	4	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	4	3	2	4	3	4

7.5	The mode of delivery takes account of the needs and challenges of all targeted students.	3	3	4	4	4	2	2	3	2	3	4	2	2	4	2
7.6	Staff teaching on the programme have the appropriate type and level of qualification.	4	2	4	3	4	3	3	4	3	3	4	3	3	3	2
7.7	The programme is regularly subjected to internal and external review in a participatory manner to reflect developments in the area of study.	4	3	4	3	4	2	2	3	1	4	4	2	3	3	1
7.8	Programme planning includes a strategy for the use of technology in a manner appropriate to the programme, facilities available, and target students.	3	4	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	0	3	3	3
AVERAGE RATING		3.63	3.25	3.63	3.25	3.5	2.75	2.5	3.38	2.25	3.63	3.63	2	3.13	3.38	2.75

Table 18 shows an abstract of the identified strength, weaknesses and recommendations in the area of Programme Planning and Management. This is based on the assessments of external evaluators across the 15 higher education institutions selected for the AQRM project. The aim of this sections is to highlight institutional strength, areas of concern and propose recommendations for improvement.

Table 18. Institutional strength, areas of concern and proposed recommendations on Programme Planning and Management.

Institutional Strength	Areas of Concern	Recommendations
◆ The programmes incorporate work-integrated learning, which facilitates subsequent employment of the students. ◆ Programme is well-structured and aligns with the overall institutional mission and vision ◆ The programmes meet national accreditation criteria ◆ Strong academic staff with the requisite qualifications and rankings. ◆ Strong self, internal and external review of programmes	◆ There was need to enhance teaching and learning resources ◆ The improvement of professional skills for the academic staff was limited ◆ Drop-out rate is fairly high ◆ The proportion of academic staff having a PhD is quite low and this has an impact on the quality of teaching and learning	◆ Improve infrastructures, maintenance and repair of equipment ◆ Improve assessment of learning mechanisms ◆ Regularly monitor the performance of lecturers through performance management and review and feedback from students ◆ Improve student support services ◆ Encourage academic staff to obtain Ph.D. degree

Table 19. External Rating on Curriculum Development

No.	Standards for Quality Rating	AZHAR	BOTHO	CUEA	CU	DUT	ENSC	UNIKIS	KNUST	USTM	NDU	SUST	UO2	UEM	UMI	ZOU
	CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT															
8.1	The curriculum clearly specifies target learners and learning outcomes/competencies for each module/course and for the programme as a whole.	4	3	3	1	4	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3
8.2	The curriculum is regularly updated to take account of new knowledge and learning needs to support African development.	3	2	4	2	2	1	1	3	2	3	3	2	3	1	1
8.3	Modules/courses are coherently planned and provide a sequenced learning pathway for students towards attainment of a qualification.	4	3	4	4	4	3	3	4	2	4	3	3	3	3	3
8.4	The curriculum includes an appropriate balance of theoretical, practical and experiential knowledge and skills (where applicable) as well as core and elective areas	4	3	4	3	4	2	2	4	3	4	3	2	3	3	3

8.5	The curriculum has been developed to maximize student career pathways, opportunities for articulation with other relevant qualifications, and employment prospects.	4	3	4	3	4	4	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	3	2
8.6	Curriculum development has been informed by thorough research and consultation with relevant stakeholders including public sector planners, industry and other employers	3	3	3	3	4	2	1	3	2	3	3	1	2	2	1
8.7	The curriculum reflects positive African Ratings, gender sensitivity and the needs of society.	4	2	3	3	2	3	2	3	1	3	3	1	3	3	1
	AVERAGE RATING	**3.71**	**2.71**	**3.57**	**2.71**	**3.43**	**2.57**	**2**	**3.29**	**2.14**	**3.29**	**3**	**2**	**2.71**	**2.57**	**2**

Table 20 shows an abstract of the identified strength, weaknesses and recommendations in the area of Curriculum Development. This is based on the assessments of external evaluators across the 15 higher education institutions selected for the AQRM project. The aim of this sections is to highlight institutional strength, areas of concern and propose recommendations for improvement.

Table 20. Institutional strength, areas of concern and proposed recommendations on Curriculum Development.

Institutional Strength	Areas of Concern	Recommendations
♦ The curriculum provides opportunities for career pathways ♦ Theoretical, practical and experiential learning are balanced in the curriculum ♦ There is coherence of modules within the curriculum ♦ Curriculum developed in consultation with all relevant stakeholders ♦ Curriculum is designed in line with national needs	♦ There is insufficient feedback from employers of the graduates ♦ African values and gender sensitivity are not obvious in the curriculum ♦ Learning outcomes/competencies are not clearly specified in the curriculum ♦ There is the need to review and up-date curriculum periodically ♦ No Internship Exchange programs with other African Universities	♦ The Curriculum should be reviewed periodically ♦ Make explicit in the curricula the faculty's view on gender sensitivity ♦ Clearly define curriculum objectives and learning outcomes as well as how they are measured. ♦ Curriculum should include new knowledge and learnings needs to support African development ♦ Ensure wider stakeholder involvement in curriculum development ♦ Facilitate student exchange programs with other African Universities ♦ Follow up the international cooperation and diversify the partnership

Table 21. External Rating on Teaching and Learning

No.	Standards for Quality Rating	TEACHING AND LEARNING														
		AZHAR	BOTHO	CUEA	CU	DUT	ENSC	UNIKIS	KNUST	USTM	NDU	SUST	UO2	UEM	UMI	ZOU
9.1	Teaching and learning are based on explicit learning outcomes which are consistent with programme and course aims.	4	4	1	1	4	3	2	4	2	4	3	3	3	3	3
9.2	A clear strategy is in place to identify the learning materials needed to support programme delivery.	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	1	2	3	2	3	3	3
9.3	Learning materials have been clearly presented, include reference to the learning aims and outcomes and an indication of study time.	3	4	3	3	4	2	2	4	2	4	4	2	3	3	3
9.4	The learning materials have been designed with the purpose of engaging students both	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3

	intellectually, ethically and practically.															
9.5	Programme review procedures include materials review and improvement.	3	3	3	3	4	1	1	3	3	3	3	0	3	2	1
9.6	Innovative teaching and learning materials are provided for students.	2	2	3	3	3	1	2	3	1	2	1	1	2	2	3
	AVERAGE RATING	**3**	**3.17**	**3.17**	**2.67**	**3.5**	**2**	**1.83**	**3.33**	**2**	**3**	**2.83**	**1.83**	**2.67**	**2.67**	**2.67**

Table 22 shows an abstract of the identified strength, weaknesses and recommendations in the area of Teaching and Learning. This is based on the assessments of external evaluators across the 15 higher education institutions selected for the AQRM project. The aim of this sections is to highlight institutional strength, areas of concern and propose recommendations for improvement.

Table 22. Institutional strength, areas of concern and proposed recommendations on Teaching and Learning.

Institutional Strength	Areas of Concern	Recommendations
♦ Teaching and learning are based on explicit learning outcomes which are consistent with programme and course aims ♦ Clear module descriptors and session plans are shared with staff and students for teaching and learning. ♦ Adequate materials for teaching and learning are available and provided to make teaching and learning easy and effective ♦ There is training for teachers and students on research ♦ There is emphasis on transversal skills which builds student confidence for employment ♦ The academic staff is very engaged in teaching and give good support to the students	♦ Lack of innovative teaching and learning materials ♦ Tutors should be encouraging to engage the student in increasing student research output ♦ There is the need to ensure consistent and timely review of learning materials ♦ There is some mismatch between internship placements and subject discipline ♦ Lack of international focus ♦ Learning outcomes are not program-specific	♦ Develop a policy of innovative teaching and learning and involve more students in pedagogical issues ♦ Consider developing independent students learning through innovative teaching methods and learning materials ♦ Ensure consistent and timely review of learning materials ♦ Develop relationships with enterprises to ensure internships are in line with discipline outcome ♦ Develop an internationalization strategy that encompasses, amongst other issues; internationalization at home, staff and student mobility, recruitment of international students, international networking, trans national education, global employability skills

Table 23. External Rating on Assessment

No.	Standards for Quality Rating	ASSESSMENT														
		AZHAR	BOTHO	CUEA	CU	DUT	ENSC	UNIKIS	KNUST	USTM	NDU	SUST	UO2	UEM	UMI	ZOU
10.1	The institution has systems in place for external examiners.	3	3	3	4	4	0	1	4	2	4	4	0	1.5	2	1
10.2	Clear information about mode of assessment is provided for all courses/modules making up the programme.	4	3	4	2	4	4	2	3	2	4	4	3	3	3	4
10.3	Assessment is used as an integral part of the teaching and learning process and seeks to ensure that students have mastered specific outcomes.	4	4	3	3	4	3	2	4	3	4	3	3	1.5	3	3
10.4	The level of challenge of assessments is appropriate to the specific programme and targeted students.	3	3	4	3	3	3	2	4	2	4	3	1	2.5	3	4
10.5	A variety of assessment	4	3	4	3	3	3	2	3	3	4	3	2	2	3	3

	methods are used in the programme.															
10.6	Marking procedures ensure consistency and accuracy and the provision of feedback to students.	3	3	3	3	3	2	1	3	3	2	3	2	1.5	3	3
AVERAGE RATING		**3.5**	**3.17**	**3.5**	**3**	**3.5**	**2.5**	**1.67**	**3.50**	**2.5**	**3.67**	**3.33**	**1.83**	**2**	**2.83**	**3**

Table 24 shows an abstract of the identified strength, weaknesses and recommendations in the area of Assessment. This is based on the assessments of external evaluators across the 15 higher education institutions selected for the AQRM project. The aim of this sections is to highlight institutional strength, areas of concern and propose recommendations for improvement.

Table 24. Institutional strength, areas of concern and proposed recommendations on Assessment

Institutional Strength	Areas of Concern	Recommendations
♦ There are procedures for marking and feedback to students ♦ Clear information about mode of assessment is provided for all modules ♦ Well monitored and moderated assessments based on learning outcomes and level of learners. ♦ The assessment methods are of international standardized ♦ Different methods of assessment, incorporating both theory and practical, are used	♦ No system is in place for external examiners ♦ Feedback of assessment outcomes to students ♦ Assessment is traditional	♦ The assessment procedures must be clearly outlined and incorporated in the syllabus. ♦ Adequate feedback on assessment needs to be provided to students and on time ♦ Develop assessment methods to support independent learning by the students ♦ Diversifying evaluation methods at the level of training offers ♦ Publish students´ final marks and scores through online personalized and user-friendly systems instead of public boards ♦ Explore new ways of assessing the effectiveness of learning to test learning outcomes

Table 25. External Rating on Programme

No.	Standards for Quality Rating	PROGRAMME RESULTS														
		AZHAR	BOTHO	CUEA	CU	DUT	ENSC	UNIKIS	KNUST	USTM	NDU	SUST	UO2	UEM	UMI	ZOU
11.1	Student progress is monitored throughout the programme and early warning is provided for students at risk.	4	3	3	4	4	2	2	3	2	4	4	0	3	2	3
11.2	Completion rates per cohort conform to established norms for the subject area and mode of delivery and strategies to increase completion rates are in place.	3	3	3	3	3	4	2	3	3	0	3	3	2	3	1
11.3	Quality student feedback is provided.	4	3	3	3	4	0	1	3	3	4	3	0	1.5	1	3
11.4	Expert peers and/or professional bodies review the relevance and quality of learning achieved by students.	4	2	3	3	4	0	1	3	3	3	3	0	2	1	1

11.5	There is established linkage with potential employers that facilitate graduate employment.	4	2	4	2	3	4	1	3	2	3	3	0	4	3	2
11.6	Tracer studies of graduates and their employers are conducted to obtain feedback on achievement of graduates.	3	2	3	3	1	1	1	1	0	2	1	0	2	2	1
11.7	The programme has an effective research plan with suitable implementation, evaluation and feedback mechanisms.	3	1	3	3	4	2	2	2	2	4	3	1	2	3	2
11.8	Research and consultancy is undertaken in the subject area to solve industrial problems and support the social and economic development.	4	1	2	3	3	1	3	3	3	2	3	0	3	2	2
AVERAGE RATING		**3.63**	**2.13**	**3**	**3**	**3.25**	**1.75**	**1.65**	**2.63**	**2.25**	**2.75**	**2.88**	**0.5**	**2.44**	**2.13**	**1.88**

Table 26 shows an abstract of the identified strength, weaknesses and recommendations in the area of Programme. This is based on the assessments of external evaluators across the 15 higher education institutions selected for the AQRM project. The aim of this sections is to highlight institutional strength, areas of concern and propose recommendations for improvement.

Table 26. Institutional strength, areas of concern and proposed recommendations on Programme

Institutional Strength	Areas of Concern	Recommendations
♦ Good completion rates of students; ♦ Established processes for monitoring student progress and providing feedback ♦ Teaching is well connected with research ♦ Qualified and experienced teaching staff ♦ Good collaboration with industry and hospitals ♦ Established mechanisms for assisting weak students	♦ There is no comprehensive system for student's counselling services regarding academic support and career guidance. ♦ There is no comprehensive data system on employment of graduates. ♦ No evidence of Alumni Association to support the University ♦ No formal evidence of tracer studies of graduates undertaken by the University ♦ Visibility of research is poor ♦ Lack of feedback on the achievement of the graduates and their employers	♦ Develop system for student's counselling services on academic support and career guidance ♦ Create a digital the repository and profile the academic strength of the university on the website. ♦ Develop an active alumni association in connection with the mission of the university ♦ More research and consultancy should be encouraged and facilitated. ♦ Develop and institutionalize tracer studies of graduate professional work at regular intervals

Table 27. External Rating Summary at Programme Level

No.	Standards for Quality Rating	AZHAR	BOTHO	CUEA	CU	DUT	ENSC	UNIKIS	KNUST	USTM	NDU	SUST	UO2	UEM	UMI	ZOU
	EXTERNAL RATING SUMMARY AT PROGRAMME LEVEL															
7	Programme Planning and Management	3.63	3.25	3.63	3.38	3.5	2.75	2.5	3.38	2.25	3.63	3.63	2	3.13	3.38	2.75
8	Curriculum Development	3.71	2.71	3.57	2.71	3.43	2.57	2	3.29	2.14	3.29	3	2	2.71	2.57	2
9	Teaching and Learning	3	3.17	3.17	2.67	3.5	2	1.83	3.33	2	3	2.83	1.83	2.67	2.67	2.67
10	Assessment	3.5	3.17	3.5	3	3.5	2.5	1.67	3.50	2.5	3.67	3.33	1.83	2	2.83	3
11	Programme Results	3.63	2.13	3	3	3.25	1.75	1.65	2.63	2.25	2.75	2.88	0.5	2.44	2.13	1.88
	Overall Average	**3.494**	**2.886**	**3.374**	**2.95**	**3.27**	**2.314**	**1.93**	**3.226**	**2.228**	**3.268**	**3.134**	**1.632**	**2.59**	**2.716**	**2.46**

SECTION 6: INSTITUTIONS SELF-RATING VERSUS EXTERNAL EVALUATION

This section presents information on institutions self-ratings against the evaluation of experts. The information presented under this section covers the rating for all the 15 selected universities at both institutional and programme levels.

Table 28. Al-Azhar University (AZHAR): Self-rating versus External evaluation

AL-AZHAR UNIVERSITY (AZHAR): Self-rating versus External Evaluation		
Institutional Level		
Standards	**Self – rating**	**External – rating**
Governance and Management	3.89	3.56
Infrastructure	3.75	3.38
Finances	3.66	3.50
Teaching and Learning	3.67	3.44
Research, Publication and Innovation	3.10	2.80
Community/Societal Engagement	3.86	3.86
Aggregate rating score	**3.66**	**3.42**
Quality Rating	**Excellent Quality**	**Good Quality**
Programme Level		
Standards	**Self – rating**	**External – rating**
Programme Planning and Management	3.63	3.63
Curriculum Development	3.2	3.71
Teaching and Learning	3	3
Assessment	3.5	3.5
Programme Results	3.63	3.63
Aggregate rating score	**3.39**	**3.494**
Quality Rating	**Good Quality**	**Good Quality**

Comments, conclusion and recommendations from experts

Al-Azhar University, Cairo (Egypt), based on the African Quality Rating Mechanism approach is rated as GOOD QUALITY and demonstrates high-level commitment for quality improvement. Al-Azhar University has to be praised for the achievements made.

There is a room for further quality improvement based on systemic and systematic approach of quality assurance thus, strengthening the unique role of University in higher education and research sector nationally and internationally.

The team believes that the university has necessary resources both material and nonmaterial, support from internal and external stakeholders to continue its efforts in ensuring further quality improvement.

Table 29. Durban University of Technology (DUT): Self-rating versus External evaluation

Durban University Of Technology (DUT): Self-rating versus External evaluation		
Institutional Level		
Standards	**Self – rating**	**External – rating**
Governance and Management	3.22	3.33
Infrastructure	2.63	2.63
Finances	2.67	2.67
Teaching and Learning	2.89	2.89
Research, Publication and Innovation	3.1	3.1
Community/Societal Engagement	2.43	2.29
Aggregate rating score	**2.82**	**2.82**
Quality Rating	**Good Quality**	**Good Quality**
Programme Level		
Programme Planning and Management	3.5	3.5
Curriculum Development	3.57	3.43
Teaching and Learning	3.67	3.5
Assessment	3.5	3.5
Programme Results	3.25	3.25
Aggregate rating score	**3.5**	**3.44**
Quality Rating	**Good Quality**	**Good Quality**

Comments, conclusion and recommendations from experts

As shown in the Table 29, the ratings by DUT and the External Evaluation are essentially the same. Only in Community/Societal Engagement is the External Evaluation rating slightly lower. Under Standard 6.4, there was only partnership with the TVET sector, and we found no evidence of partnerships with the other sub-sectors, especially the secondary school one. The questionnaire should perhaps be more explicit in the nature of partnerships being referred to.

On the other hand, we felt that the institution had under-assessed itself under Governance and Management. We were impressed by the fact that DUT had not only re-visited its Strategic Plan at mid-term but had also an Annual Performance Plan (Standard 1.2). Similarly, we felt the institution had an excellent management information system (Standard 1.7). The weakness under Governance and Management was that it had been unable to put in place a mechanism for staff performance appraisal (Standard 1.6). The overall institutional quality rating is **Good.**

Regarding programme level rating, there is hardly any difference between the ratings given by DUT and those of External Evaluation. The two areas where the ratings have been reduced are Curriculum Development and Teaching and Learning. In the former case, it is the fact that the curriculum did not include aspects of African values (Standard 8.7) that lowers the score; and in the latter case we were

unable to find any evidence to support the existence of a clear strategy to identify materials necessary for programme delivery (Standard 9.2). The overall programme quality rating is thus **Good**.

Table 30. UNIVERSITY EDUARDO MONDLANE (UEM): Self-rating versus External evaluation

UNIVERSITY EDUARDO MONDLANE (UEM): Self-rating versus External Evaluation		
Institutional Level		
Standards	**Self – rating**	**External – rating**
Governance and Management	3.78	2.94
Infrastructure	2.75	2.94
Finances	3.17	2.83
Teaching and Learning	2.56	2.67
Research, Publication and Innovation	2.3	2.25
Community/Societal Engagement	2.29	2.14
Aggregate rating score	**2.81**	**2.63**
Quality Rating	**Good Quality**	**Satisfactory Quality**
Programme Level		
Programme Planning and Management	3.13	3.13
Curriculum Development	2.86	2.71
Teaching and Learning	2.67	2.67
Assessment	2.17	2
Programme Results	2.5	2.44
Aggregate rating score	**2.66**	**2.59**
Quality Rating	**Satisfactory Quality**	**Satisfactory Quality**

Comments, conclusion and recommendations from experts

The Institutional Evaluation Team considers that the AQRM evaluation and rating exercise was a developmental activity that validates UEM self-evaluation.

The External Evaluation Team, on behalf of the Association of African Universities (AAU) and on behalf of the HAQAA Initiative Consortium, acknowledges its appreciation of all the technical and logistical arrangements that made possible the implementation of the AQRM visit to the UEM, as well as of the willingness of stakeholders to speak with openness and to address the team as peers.

The Team concludes that the quality of the institution and the delivery of the services at the UEM is Satisfactory. The MD programme is also assessed as Satisfactory.

Table 31. CRAWFORD UNIVERSITY (CU): Self-rating versus External evaluation

CRAWFORD UNIVERSITY (CU): Self-rating versus External Evaluation		
Institutional Level		
Standards	**Self – rating**	**External – rating**
Governance and Management	3.22	2.67
Infrastructure	2.88	2.5
Finances	2.16	2.16
Teaching and Learning	3.00	2.67
Research, Publication and Innovation	2.40	2.10
Community/Societal Engagement	2.43	2.29
Aggregate rating score	**2.68**	**2.40**
Quality Rating	**Satisfactory Quality**	**Satisfactory Quality**
Programme Level		
Standards	**Self – rating**	**External – rating**
Programme Planning and Management	3.63	3.38
Curriculum Development	3.86	2.71
Teaching and Learning	2.67	2.67
Assessment	3.50	3.00
Programme Results	3.13	3.00
Aggregate rating score	**3.35**	**2.95**
Quality Rating	**Good Quality**	**Good Quality**

Comments, conclusion and recommendations from experts

At the institutional level comparison, the university rated itself at 2.68 while the Team's rating came up to a rating score of 2.40, a difference of 0.28 points. However, it can be deduced that the institution still fell within the range of satisfactory quality, as indicated in Table 31.

The University rated itself at the programme level with a score of 3.35, while the Team rated the programme level at 2.95. There was an insignificance difference of 0.40. This placed the overall rating of the programme within the range of Good Quality as indicated in Table 31.

General Observations

- The University had prepared for the AQRM validation as expected; and
- During the interactions with various categories of staff it was evident that there was general awareness about the audit and their respective responsibilities;

Conclusions

- It is commendable that the University submitted itself to the rating exercise; and
- There is sufficient infrastructure to support teaching and learning currently;
- However, a maintenance policy and implementation plan are required.

Recommendations

- The University should develop a physical master plan for the University to adequately address the growth of the University;
- Alternative sources of income should be explored and harmonized into the University's financial structure to ensure orderly development of all departments/sectors of the University;
- Intra-Africa mobility of staff and students should be encouraged through partnerships and projects;
- The University has a well-laid out policy for research and publications and this should be followed through to ingrain the research culture in the institution.
- The university should exploit its membership to the Association of African Universities and fully understand the benefits of being a member and the services available to members of the association; and
- The university's visibility and marketing strategy must clarify responsibilities for social media marketing, management of the university research repository and preparation and uploading of university staff profiles and research interests.

Table 32. UNIVERSITE DE KISANGANI (UNIKIS): Self-rating versus External evaluation

UNIVERSITE DE KISANGANI (UNIKIS): Self-rating versus External Evaluation		
Institutional Level		
Standards	**Self – rating**	**External – rating**
Governance and Management	3.00	1.89
Infrastructure	2.13	1.88
Finances	2.17	2.00
Teaching and Learning	2.56	2.00
Research, Publication and Innovation	2.50	2.10
Community/Societal Engagement	3.00	1.43
Aggregate rating score	**2.56**	**1.88**
Quality Rating	**Satisfactory Quality**	**Insufficient Quality**
Programme Level		
Standards	**Self – rating**	**External – rating**
Programme Planning and Management	2.63	2.50
Curriculum Development	2.43	2.00
Teaching and Learning	2.67	1.83
Assessment	3.00	1.67
Programme Results	1.63	1.63
Aggregate rating score	**2.47**	**1.93**
Quality Rating	**Satisfactory Quality**	**Insufficient Quality**

Comments, conclusion and recommendations from experts

The total evaluation at the institutional level was "SATISFACTORY" for the University and "INSUFFICIENT" for the team of experts. The University rated it-self at 2.56 while the Team's rating came up to a rating score of 1.88, a difference of 0.70 points. According to the expert evaluation, the University performed poorly across all the six focus areas at the institutional level. The University's Governance and Management, Infrastructure, and Community/Societal Engagement were identified as insufficient by the experts.

Similar rating was reported at the programme level, where the total evaluation was "SATISFACTORY" for the University and "INSUFFICIENT" for the team of experts. The University rated itself with an aggregate score of 2.47, while the team rated the programme level at 1.93. There was a significance difference of 0.54. Programme Planning and Management and Curriculum Development were rated "SATISFACTORY" by both the University and the Team of Experts. However, major differences were identified in the ratings for Teaching and Learning and Assessment. Programme Results was rated as "INSUFFICIENT QUALITY" by both the University and the Team of Experts.

Despite the poor ratings of Université De Kisangani (UNIKIS), the Team of Experts identified the follow strengths:

- Capable and competent Institutional Governing Board (leaders) who will not easily give up their declared positions.
- Visible effort to improve library equipment by scanning books to make them available electronically.
- Well-structured strategic plan for the period of 2016-2020.
- Good financial reporting system and transparency.
- Teaching is perfectly in line with the national criteria.

The Team of Experts pointed out the following as key areas of concern for the University:

- Poor representation of external stakeholders in governance structures.
- Lack of financial resources, electronic learning resources, equipment and Internet connection.
- No financial support for students.
- Insufficient feedback between students and teachers.
- Poor communication of research findings by the academic staff to the larger community.
- Lack of specific training for graduate employment prospects.

Based on the external evaluation of the foci areas, the following recommendations were suggested by the Team of Experts:

- The Management Committee should comply with the legal provisions regarding the composition of the University Council (Articles 14 and 15 of Ordinance 16/0171 of 29 September 2016). There should also be members of the Faculty Council who should be actively involved in the review and renewal of the school's curricula.
- The academic staff should be evaluated on the basis of their research performance.
- There should be a plan to improve career opportunities for women in the university.

- It is recommended that more attention be paid to modern evaluation methods, particularly with regard to the specific needs of different programs. Also, the assessment of learning outcomes should be tailored to specific career aspirations.

The evaluation team wishes Université De Kisangani (UNIKIS) good luck in further effort to develop the quality culture at the university.

Table 33. UNIVERSITY MOULAY ISMAIL (UMI): Self-rating versus External evaluation

UNIVERSITY MOULAY ISMAIL (UMI): Self-rating versus External Evaluation		
Institutional Level		
Standards	**Self – rating**	**External – rating**
Governance and Management	3.11	2.55
Infrastructure	2.5	2.38
Finances	2.00	2.00
Teaching and Learning	2.00	1.89
Research, Publication and Innovation	2.40	2.40
Community/Societal Engagement	3.00	2.86
Aggregate rating score	**2.50**	**2.35**
Quality Rating	**Satisfactory Quality**	**Satisfactory Quality**
Programme Level		
Standards	**Self – rating**	**External – rating**
Programme Planning and Management	3.51	3.38
Curriculum Development	2.71	2.57
Teaching and Learning	2.67	2.67
Assessment	2.83	2.83
Programme Results	2.375	2.13
Aggregate rating score	**2.819**	**2.716**
Quality Rating	**Good Quality**	**Satisfactory Quality**

Comments, conclusion and recommendations from experts

The total evaluation at the institutional level was rated. **"SATISFACTORY**" both by the University and by the team of experts. As for the level of the Program, this total evaluation was considered "Good " by the University and **"SATISFACTORY**" by the team of experts.

The university has to manage a difficult duality, with faculties with an open access, a high student population and quite high-level rates of non-completion and, schools regulated by a selective entrance, high level of completion and of employability, and very good ratios of students/ academic and administrative. Thanks to a very dynamic and efficient leadership, the university is ready to develop and implement strategic development within the framework of its national and international environment.

Some of the main points that need a specific attention to engage the institution in a sustainable development (UN développement pérenne) are:

- to go on developing a quality culture and a culture of project in all the components (Faculty and schools),
- to enhance the scientific policy and its international dimension,
- to involve more the students in the decision processes and the evaluation of teaching and learning
- to consolidate the cooperation policy, in particular with the economic sector, in the region of Meknès, as well as in whole Morocco and beyond, in the fields where the university is recognized as a main provider of high quality graduates and researchers.
- to have a clear human resource policy to implement the strategy for the next 5 years.

Finally, Université Moulay Ismail has to be praised for the achievements made up today and visionary leadership leading University to the next level of development. The team appreciates the initiatives that have been taken by the University's leaders to ensuring quality improvement.

Table 34. UNIVERSITE DE OUAGA II (UO2): Self-rating versus External evaluation

UNIVERSITE DE OUAGA II (UO2): Self-rating versus External Evaluation		
Institutional Level		
Standards	**Self – rating**	**External – rating**
Governance and Management	3.22	2.33
Infrastructure	1.12	0.87
Finances	1.66	1.5
Teaching and Learning	2.66	1.78
Research, Publication and Innovation	2.6	1.7
Community/Societal Engagement	0.86	0.71
Aggregate rating score	**2.02**	**1.48**
Quality Rating	**Satisfactory Quality**	**Insufficient Quality**
Programme Level		
Standards	**Self – rating**	**External – rating**
Programme Planning and Management	3.12	2
Curriculum Development	2.28	2
Teaching and Learning	2.83	1.83
Assessment	2.8	1.83
Programme Results	0.62	0.5
Aggregate rating score	**2.33**	**1.63**
Quality Rating	**Satisfactory Quality**	**Insufficient Quality**

Comments, conclusion and recommendations from experts

The total evaluation at the institutional level was "SATISFACTORY" for the University and "INSUFFICIENT" for the team of experts. As for the level of the Program, this total evaluation was judged as "SATISFACTORY" by the University and also "INSUFFICIENT" by the team of experts.The University of Ouaga II is totally supported by the Burkinabe State. The financial resources allocated being insufficient, do not allow the academic authorities to achieve the objectives they have set themselves despite the elaboration of the strategic plan well circumscribed in terms of the policy of the succession of the academic staff, the training and the research.

The university site is still under construction since 2007 and remains vacant despite the few buildings erected 10 years ago. Working conditions for both staff and students are very poor. The rental infrastructure does not meet the standards required for the course, especially for the first-year classes. The small space allocated to staff has a significant impact in terms of efficiency and performance. Following repeated strikes, the overlapping of academic years does not allow for normal program development. In this very difficult context, which is detrimental to the training expected of future managers, the University of Ouaga 2 has the reputation of fighting for solutions and forging its own identity given its long history with Ouaga 1. However political and administrative burdens slow down developments. It is obvious that the state cannot do everything. Stronger leadership is needed to better engage the university community and diversify funding sources, support the implementation of graduate follow-up, and develop research projects with third parties.

Table 35. BOTHO UNIVERSITY (BOTHO): Self-rating versus External evaluation

BOTHO UNIVERSITY (BOTHO): Self-rating versus External Evaluation		
Institutional Level		
Standards	**Self – rating**	**External – rating**
Governance and Management	3.55	3.22
Infrastructure	3.50	3.13
Finances	3.20	2.83
Teaching and Learning	3.00	2.33
Research, Publication and Innovation	2.10	0.60
Community/Societal Engagement	1.86	1.29
Aggregate rating score	**2.87**	**2.23**
Quality Rating	**Good Quality**	**Satisfactory Quality**
Programme Level		
Standards	**Self – rating**	**External – rating**
Programme Planning and Management	3.25	3.25
Curriculum Development	2.71	2.71
Teaching and Learning	3.5	3.17
Assessment	3.5	3.17
Programme Results	2.25	2.13
Aggregate rating score	**3.04**	**2.89**
Quality Rating	**Good Quality**	**Good Quality**

Comments, conclusion and recommendations from experts

Botho University (BU), as a young university, only two years old, seems to be on the right and strong footing. It definitely benefits from the experiences of the main campus. BU Lesotho is very well organised and has the potential of doing very well provided the Proprietors maintain and indeed enhance the level of attention being paid to details in the development of the campus.

The University must be commended for nominating itself for this first round of AQRM review using the finalised instrument. Their self-nomination for the first round of validation studies of the AQRM must have found concordance with their idea of developing a quality culture in a university. This makes the university to automatically become a role model for other universities in the Southern African sub-region and certainly in Lesotho and Botswana.

The Vice Chancellor, the management and the entire staff of the university deserve our unreserved commendation for the way and manner they seriously addressed the issue of the AQRM visit and their preparation for it which, judging from all the documentation and other materials available to us, indicated that huge outlay of time and other resources have been committed to prepare for the visit.

Main Recommendations

We therefore make the following recommendations with the firm belief that their immediate and strategic implementation would be of tremendous benefit to the university. The recommendations are as follows:

The students have expressed an overwhelming interest in the choice of BU and their satisfaction with the services they receive there from. However, the University must aim not only to maintain this interest but should continually improve, introduce novel ideas and courses to meet the growing unmet demands for higher education that lie ahead in Lesotho, the Southern African region and definitely the whole of the African continent.

 Staffing, in quantity and quality, is an issue at the moment. BU should commit more effort into hiring a good number of Ph.Ds and a variety of the different cadres of staffing to reflect the three major functions of teaching, research and community service that must be performed by a University. We note in particular that there are no staff at the full professorial grade at BU, Maseru Campus. It would be most desirable and effective to have two to three full professors in the flagship programmes of the University.

BU should commence the development of a research agenda and carve out a niche to engender a university with a research profile. It takes time to build but the time to begin is now so that the research ethos of the university would grow with its establishment.

Partnerships and collaborations with industry (e.g. Chamber of Commerce) should be intensified to ensure sufficient relationship that guarantees the adequate provision of places for internship and industrial attachment, feedbacks on programmes and products, and the provision of friendly avenues and corridors to attract funding for research and training.

While the University is striving to establish a high quality and tremendously functional library, there is a dire need to hire more qualified library staff to reduce the librarian: student ratio of 1:160. A fairly comfortable ratio of 1:70 should be the barest minimum.

Internationalisation must be a priority to be pursued with vigour in order to diversify the population of students to reflect the growing global trend, to broaden the experience of staff and students, and attract global recognition as an international player in quality private provision of higher education.

Table 36. L'UNIVERSITE DES SCIENCES ET TECHNIQUES DE MASUKU, A FRANCEVILLE (USTM) : Self-rating versus External Evaluation

L'UNIVERSITE DES SCIENCES ET TECHNIQUES DE MASUKU, A FRANCEVILLE (USTM) : Self-rating versus External Evaluation		
Institutional Level		
Standards	**Self – rating**	**External – rating**
Governance and Management	1.22	1.44
Infrastructure	0.87	1.13
Finances	1	1
Teaching and Learning	1	1
Research, Publication and Innovation	1.5	1.7
Community/Societal Engagement	2	1.86
Aggregate rating score	**1.26**	**1.36**
Quality Rating	**Insufficient Quality**	**Insufficient Quality**
Programme Level		
Standards	**Self – rating**	**External – rating**
Programme Planning and Management	2.62	2.25
Curriculum Development	2.43	2.14
Teaching and Learning	2	2
Assessment	2.67	2.5
Programme Results	2	2.25
Aggregate rating score	**2.34**	**2.228**
Quality Rating	**Satisfactory Quality**	**Satisfactory Quality**

Comments, conclusion and recommendations from experts

The total evaluation at the institutional level was rated "INSUFFICIENT" by both the University and the team of experts. At the programme level, the total evaluation was deemed "SATISFACTORY" by the University and the team of experts.

The University of Sciences and Techniques of Masuku in Franceville is financially supported by the Gabonese state, in Libreville, increasing decision-making time and thus limiting its autonomy of operation. All academic authorities, from senior management to the level of Departments, are appointed by the Government. Since the financial resources allocated have been reduced to more than 50% in the last three years, university officials cannot achieve the objectives they have set themselves in terms of succession of academic staff, training and research.

The working conditions for both staff and students are very bad and deteriorate in a very worrying way while the USTM has a high potential. The university has a beautiful university campus, but the infrastructure is in a state of disrepair. The university campus is unhealthy, and the restaurant no longer works, the cost of living has increase and most students are in great difficulty. Repeated strikes lead to the overlapping of academic years that are spreading and damage the expected training of future managers.

Although there is strong documentation in terms of vision and mission, the strategic plan that was to channel all these actions and mobilize the community is non-existent.

It is obvious that the state cannot do everything. We believe that dynamic leadership by the University Authority, if properly engaged, reflected, understood and shared by the entire university community, can attract external funding that can supplement the budget allocated to the University by Government. For example, the development of self-financing activities, the creation of Alumni of all former graduates of the Masuku University of Science and Technology, research projects carried out by third parties, and the involvement of the community of origin.

To support its development, the development of a strategic plan is an indispensable tool to allow the institution to set priorities, then realistic strategies and to circumscribe an annual operational action plan.

Table 37. CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF EASTERN AFRICA (CUEA): Self-rating versus External evaluation

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF EASTERN AFRICA (CUEA): Self-rating versus External Evaluation		
Institutional Level		
Standards	**Self – rating**	**External – rating**
Governance and Management	3.33	3.3
Infrastructure	3.75	3.88
Finances	2.67	2.83
Teaching and Learning	3.24	3
Research, Publication and Innovation	3.5	3.3
Community/Societal Engagement	3.4	3.1
Aggregate rating score	**3.315**	**3.24**
Quality Rating	**Good Quality**	**Good Quality**
Programme Level		
Standards	**Self – rating**	**External – rating**
Programme Planning and Management	3.75	3.63
Curriculum Development	3.85	3.57
Teaching and Learning	3.16	3.16
Assessment	3.66	3.5
Programme Results	3.12	3
Aggregate rating score	**3.51**	**3.372**
Quality Rating	**Excellent Quality**	**Good Quality**

Comments, conclusion and recommendations from experts

The team was impressed by a well-organised university with a strong base of values. It offers good education and training in a safe environment, which should be attractive to many students and their parents. The university also offers much of value to the local community. The university belongs to the world-wide community of Catholic universities with many institutions to take lessons and inspiration from. All this should bring the university good opportunities to take on more students and more staff, to reach its objectives in the strategic plan up to 2022.

A general recommendation to the university by the team is to include the proposed actions in the planning of the university's operations, with a monitoring scheme to follow up on the implementations. The team wishes the university good fortune with its efforts to improve the university.

The team thanks the Vice Chancellor and all the staff for the hospitality shown to us and their engagement and generosity in providing answers and information to us.

Table 38. KWAME NKRUMAH UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (KNUST): Self-rating versus External Evaluation

KWAME NKRUMAH UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (KNUST): Self-rating versus External Evaluation		
Institutional Level		
Standards	**Self – rating**	**External – rating**
Governance and Management	3.90	3.67
Infrastructure	3.00	2.63
Finances	3.30	3.25
Teaching and Learning	3.80	3.40
Research, Publication and Innovation	3.70	3.30
Community/Societal Engagement	3.60	3.00
Aggregate rating score	**3.55**	**3.21**
Quality Rating	**Excellent Quality**	**Good Quality**
Programme Level		
Standards	**Self – rating**	**External – rating**
Programme Planning and Management	3.75	3.38
Curriculum Development	3.71	3.29
Teaching and Learning	4.00	3.33
Assessment	3.83	3.50
Programme Results	3.75	2.63
Aggregate rating score	**3.81**	**3.23**
Quality Rating	**Excellent Quality**	**Good Quality**

Comments, conclusion and recommendations from experts

First of all, we want to congratulate KNUST for a university with good results and aspirations.

Concerning teaching and learning, the university has put in a lot of effort in developing teaching and learning in a way that indicates that learning outcomes are in focus. The university has also developed support mechanism to ensure that the teachers and tutors have opportunities to learn about and develop this teaching methodology and use problem-based teaching. Not many universities in the region can be said to have done this in a systematic way.

The Vice Chancellor, the management and the entire staff of the university deserve unreserved commendation for the way and manner they seriously addressed the issue of the AQRM visit and their preparation for it which, judging from all the documentation and other materials available to us, indicated that huge outlay of time and other resources have been committed to prepare for the visit.

We are more than convinced that KNUST is on the right track towards building a quality culture in the institution. The Quality Assurance and Planning Unit must be congratulated for doing an excellent job of managing the whole process of getting the whole institution ready and geared up for the AQRM visit. The Unit was also at hand every time they were needed for the logistics of our visit and for other arrangements made or altered for the AQRM visit of the institution.

Main Recommendations:

The University Library Services need to be upgraded and modernised to reflect the expansive outlay of programmes and race by the university to become a first amongst equals in the ever growing 21st century global higher education environment. The university should consider the establishment of virile E-library facilities to include the acquisition of E-books and other e-publications. In addition, there should be a functional linkage and working relationship between the Library and the University Information Technology Services. The library could benefit from readily available international grants that facilitate the acquisition and use of E-books.

The Distance Learning Services and the E-Learning Centre have huge capacity and infrastructural outlay that are also under-utilized. The two need to be integrated for efficient and effective services. E-Learning is a part of distance learning. The university will benefit tremendously from a massive and professional review and streamlining of the distance learning services including turning the campus into a paperless teaching and learning environment.

The University's embrace of Quality Assurance is indicative of a positive disposition of the top management of KNUST to fully integrate QA into its day-to-day working environment. To make this transition worthwhile, the University should seriously consider upgrading the Quality Assurance & Planning Unit into a co-ordinating Directorate with full complement of staff to efficiently support the teaching staff and the department in running the QA Policy of the University.

The link and interaction between KNUST and industry is weak, to say the least, especially for a university of science and technology. There appears to be limited research collaboration with industry and therefore very little funding coming from that sector. Effort should be made and immediate steps taken to reverse this trend, as the institution, being a science and technology university, would profoundly benefit from

this symbiotic relationship between the university and industry. This could create excellent possibilities for staff and student for internship and practice.

The evaluation team wishes KNUST good luck in further effort to develop the quality culture at the university, we are impressed with what we have seen at the University.

Table 39. NDEJJE UNIVERSITY (NDU): Self-rating versus External Evaluation

NDEJJE UNIVERSITY (NDU): Self-rating versus External Evaluation		
Institutional Level		
Standards	**Self – rating**	**External – rating**
Governance and Management	3.66	2.78
Infrastructure	2.87	2.25
Finances	1.83	1.83
Teaching and Learning	2.77	2.78
Research, Publication and Innovation	2.5	1.6
Community/Societal Engagement	3.14	3.29
Aggregate rating score	**2.79**	**2.42**
Quality Rating	**Satisfactory Quality**	**Satisfactory Quality**
Programme Level		
Standards	**Self – rating**	**External – rating**
Programme Planning and Management	3.62	3.63
Curriculum Development	3.14	3.29
Teaching and Learning	3.5	3
Assessment	3.83	3.67
Programme Results	3.63	2.75
Aggregate rating score	**3.54**	**3.26**
Quality Rating	**Good Quality**	**Good Quality**

Comments, conclusion and recommendations from experts

At the institutional level comparison, the university rated it-self at 2.79 while the Team's rating came up to a rating score of 2.42, a difference of 0.37 points. However, it can be deduced that the institution still fell within the range of satisfactory quality, as indicated in Table 39. The University rated itself at the programme level with a score of 3.54, while the Team rated the programme level at 3.26. There was an insignificance difference of 0.28. This placed the overall rating of the programme within the range of Good Quality as indicated in Table 39.

General Observations

- The University had prepared for the AQRM validation as expected, the list of evidences were assembled upon consultation with the Team upon arrival for the exercise during session 2 of the programme;

- During the interactions with various categories of staff it was evident that there was general awareness about the audit and their respective responsibilities;
- The University management showed good awareness of the areas in which they wished to improve and many of the suggestions and recommendations in this report arose from their reflections.

Conclusions

- It is commendable that the University submitted itself to the rating exercise; and
- There is sufficient infrastructure to support teaching and learning currently. However, maintenance policy and implementation plans are required.

Recommendations

- The University should develop a physical master plan for the University to adequately address the growth of the University;
- Alternative sources of income should be explored and harmonised into the University's financial structure to ensure orderly development of all departments/sectors of the University;
- Intra-Africa mobility of staff and students should be encouraged through partnerships and projects; and
- The University has a well-laid out policy for research and publications and this should be followed through to ingrain the research culture in the institution.

Table 40. SUDAN UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (SUST): Self-rating versus External evaluation

SUDAN UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (SUST): Self-rating versus External Evaluation		
Institutional Level		
Standards	**Self – rating**	**External – rating**
Governance and Management	3.3	3.33
Infrastructure	3.1	3
Finances	2.7	2.67
Teaching and Learning	2.8	2.78
Research, Publication and Innovation	3.1	2.9
Community/Societal Engagement	4.0	3.86
Aggregate rating score	**3.2**	**3.09**
Quality Rating	**Good Quality**	**Good Quality**
Programme Level		
Standards	**Self – rating**	**External – rating**
Programme Planning and Management	3.63	3.63
Curriculum Development	3.14	3.00
Teaching and Learning	3.00	2.83

Assessment	3.33	3.33
Programme Results	2.25	2.88
Aggregate rating score	**3.07**	**3.13**
Quality Rating	**Good Quality**	**Good Quality**

Comments, conclusion and recommendations from experts

The evaluation team gave the total rating score of 3.09 = GOOD for the institution level (the institutions own rating is 3.2)

The evaluation team gave the total rating score of 3.13 = GOOD for the programme level (the institutions own rating is 3.07).

Concluding Remarks:

The team was impressed by the ambitions of the university to develop its research and teaching, albeit the restricted financial conditions and the hindrances to take part in the international scientific community due to the international sanctions on Sudan. The university, and above all the students, would benefit from a decisive move from the university towards independent learning. The university demonstrated a developed quality assurance system and a budding quality culture.

The university has in its self-rating identified a number of issues of concern and proposed actions for improvement. The team has added to the lists of issues of concern and remedial actions. A general recommendation to the university by the team is to include the proposed actions in the planning of the university's operations, with a monitoring scheme to follow up on the implementations. The team wishes the university good fortune with its efforts to improve the university.

The team thanks the Vice Chancellor and all the staff for the hospitality shown to us and their engagement and generosity in providing answers and information to us.

Table 41. ZIMBABWE OPEN UNIVERSITY (ZOU): Self-rating versus External evaluation

ZIMBABWE OPEN UNIVERSITY (ZOU): Self-rating versus External Evaluation		
Institutional Level		
Standards	**Self – rating**	**External – rating**
Governance and Management	3.78	3.33
Infrastructure	2.62	2.25
Finances	2.67	2.17
Teaching and Learning	2.67	2.33
Research, Publication and Innovation	1.80	1.50
Community/Societal Engagement	2.29	2.14
Aggregate rating score	**2.64**	**2.29**
Quality Rating	**Satisfactory Quality**	**Satisfactory Quality**
Programme Level		

Standards	Self – rating	External – rating
Programme Planning and Management	3.13	2.75
Curriculum Development	2.43	2
Teaching and Learning	3.33	2.67
Assessment	3	3
Programme Results	2.63	1.88
Aggregate rating score	**2.904**	**2.46**
Quality Rating	**Good Quality**	**Satisfactory Quality**

Comments, conclusion and recommendations from experts

In summary, there is agreement in the assessment of the institution's Quality rating as Satisfactory, with the external evaluation's assessment differing from ZOU's assessment by about 13%, but in the same scale.

At the programme level, the external evaluation's assessment of the MBA programme is Satisfactory, whereas ZOU's self-assessment is Good. Among the issues that led to this difference in assessment are: there has not been a thorough review of the programme; not all students are benefitting from the e-Learning platform; the resources (tutors, classrooms, equipment, library) for the programme may not be adequate; not all the tutors are familiar with the e-Learning platform; and adequate supervision of the research dissertations is proving to be a challenge.

Conclusions and Recommendations

- We agree with ZOU's self-assessment of its overall Institutional Quality Rating as Satisfactory, although ZOU's assessment is the fourth quarter of the 2.0-2.79 range and ours falls in the second quarter.
  Our assessment of the MBA programme is Satisfactory (higher end of the scale), whereas ZOU's self-assessment is Good (lower end of the scale).
- The compilation of evidence documents for our consultation was not done according to our expectations. Documents should be compiled in accordance with the various areas covered by the AQRM questionnaire, and properly indexed for easy reference. In future, the attention of institutions to be validated should be drawn to this matter.
- Adequate time was not available for the Experts to consult the evidence documents and start preparing their oral report. This should be a requirement for all future visits.
- There should also be guidelines on how the filling in of the questionnaire should be processed within the institution to ensure maximum buy-in by all stakeholders.

Table 42. ECOLE NORMALE SUPÉRIEURE ASSIA DJEBAR CONSTANTINE (ENSC): Self-rating versus External evaluation

ECOLE NORMALE SUPÉRIEURE ASSIA DJEBAR CONSTANTINE (ENSC): Self-rating versus External Evaluation		
Institutional Level		
Standards	**Self – rating**	**External – rating**
Governance and Management	2.89	2.56
Infrastructure	2.50	2.63
Finances	2.33	2.6
Teaching and Learning	2.44	2.3
Research, Publication and Innovation	2.00	2
Community/Societal Engagement	2.29	2
Aggregate rating score	**2.41**	**2.35**
Quality Rating	**Satisfactory Quality**	**Satisfactory Quality**
Programme Level		
Standards	**Self – rating**	**External – rating**
Programme Planning and Management	2.63	2.75
Curriculum Development	3	2.57
Teaching and Learning	2.33	2
Assessment	2.83	2.5
Programme Results	1.88	1.75
Aggregate rating score	**2.534**	**2.314**
Quality Rating	**Satisfactory Quality**	**Satisfactory Quality**

Comments, conclusion and recommendations from experts

The overall evaluation at the institutional level was considered "SATISFACTORY" by both the University and the team of experts.

Regarding the level of the program, the overall evaluation was also considered "SATISFACTORY" by the University and the team of experts.

The Ecole Normale Supérieure (ENS) of Constantine is part of the network of Higher Normal Schools in Algeria, most of whose development is strongly regulated on the one hand by the Ministry of Higher Education for the academic and professional training component and on the other hand, via the Ministry of Education for the management of practical internships and the assignment of graduates to post. By training future teachers for primary, middle and secondary schools, the ENS has the specificity of being a highly selective institution and ensuring 100% of jobs, which differentiates it from traditional university training. The institution's overall governance is sound and new strategic orientations should strengthen its image of excellence in Algeria as well as its autonomy. However, special attention must be given to all mechanisms that improve communication between academic staff and the school principal, as well as between staff and students. It is also important that the ENS moves forward, with its guardianship,

towards the LMD system in order to reinforce its international readability, to improve the possibilities offered to students for postgraduate training and to maximize the potential of teachers/researchers. The choice to start with mathematics should be integrated into a broader vision for the next ten years, in collaboration with the University of Constantine III.

SECTION 7: OVERALL QUALITY RATING OF PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

Table 43. Overall Quality rating of participating institutions

Name of Institution	Institutional Level	Programme Level
Al-Azhar University	Good Quality	Good Quality
Botho University	Satisfactory Quality	Good Quality
Catholic University of Eastern Africa	Good Quality	Good Quality
Crawford University	Satisfactory Quality	Good Quality
Durban University of Technology	Good Quality	Good Quality
Ecole Normale Supérieure Assia Djebar Constantine	Satisfactory Quality	Satisfactory Quality
Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology	Good Quality	Good Quality
L'universite Des Sciences Et Techniques De Masuku, A Franceville	Insufficient Quality	Satisfactory Quality
Ndejje University	Satisfactory Quality	Good Quality
Sudan University of Science and Technology	Good Quality	Good Quality
Universite De Kisangani	Insufficient Quality	Insufficient Quality
Universite De Ouaga Ii	Insufficient Quality	Insufficient Quality
University Eduardo Mondlane	Satisfactory Quality	Satisfactory Quality
University Moulay Ismail	Satisfactory Quality	Satisfactory Quality
Zimbabwe Open University	Satisfactory Quality	Satisfactory Quality

SECTION 8: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

As part of the HAQAA Initiative, 15 institutional evaluations were conducted in 2017, utilizing the African Quality Rating Mechanism – AQRM – as a key evaluation tool. The 15 institutions selected are from different African regions and had the opportunity to participate in a training workshop that helped to guide their institutional assessment process. For selected institutions, the self-rating (AQRM survey) of the institutions were validated by international external reviewers through site visits (1 per institution).

As a means to further promote AQRM in Africa and also, more generally, transparency around institutional quality culture, this consolidated report provides the quality ratings of the 15 selected higher education institutions at both institutional and programme levels based on institutions' self-evaluation as well as external validation of experts.

The identified institutional strengths, areas of concern, and recommendations for future consideration are beneficial to the 15 participating universities and other higher education institutions in Africa as input to support the continuous improvement in teaching/learning, research and community engagement activities. It is expected that the institutions that participated will have valuable opportunity to enhance their internal QA procedures and deepen their quality culture, as well as contribute to the African Union's harmonization and quality assurance objectives more broadly.

African Union