



HAQAA INITIATIVE

Harmonisation of African
Higher Education Quality
Assurance and Accreditation

African Quality Rating Mechanism (AQRM):

Integrated report of evaluations conducted in 2017

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP

Copyright © 2018* HAQAA Consortium, All rights reserved.

This report has been developed for the European Commission (EC). However, it reflects the views only of the authors, and the European Commission (EC) cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Content

Overview	3
1. Introduction.....	4
The HAQAA Initiative	4
The African Quality Rating Mechanism (AQRM).....	4
The AQRM in the context of HAQAA	5
2. Summary results of the AQRM evaluations conducted for HAQAA.....	9
2.1 Al Azhar University, Egypt	9
2.2 Botho University, Lesotho	35
2.3 The Catholic University of Eastern Africa, Kenya	54
2.4 Crawford University, Nigeria	69
2.5 Durban University of Technology, South Africa	87
2.6 University Eduardo Mondlane, Mozambique	103
2.7 Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Ghana.....	121
2.8 University Moulay Ismail, Morocco.....	141
2.9 Ndejje University, Uganda.....	156
2.10 Sudan University of Science and Technology, Sudan	174
2.11 Zimbabwe Open University, Zimbabwe	189
2.12 Ecole Normale Supérieure Assia DJEBAR Constantine, Algérie (FRENCH)	208
2.13 Université of Kisangani, DR Congo	226
2.14 University Ouaga II, Burkina Faso (FRENCH)	242
2.15 University of Science and Technology of Masuku, Gabon (FRENCH).....	257



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



THE AFRICA-EU PARTNERSHIP

Overview

This document collectively **presents the final verification reports** that were conducted in 15 African universities that undertook the African Quality Rating Mechanism – AQRM - in 2017, under the HAQAA Initiative.

This exercise formed part of the HAQAA Initiative, a service contract funded by the European Union in the context of the Africa-EU Strategic Partnership, supported by the guidance of the African Union Commission, which led the initial development of the AQRM tool in 2008. For selected institutions (15 universities from five African regions), self-rating (via the AQRM survey) was conducted and subsequently validated by international external reviewers through site visits (one per institution). More than 15 experts from Africa and Europe conducted these visits. The universities that participated have agreed to make their results public, in the interest of transparency and in promoting the AQRM as a tool for self-enhancement and quality improvement in the African continent. Reports are presented in the languages in which the experts drafted them, hence three reports are in French. This publication complements a similar shorter report that has been produced as a summary of the entire exercise, available on the websites of the [HAQAA initiative](#) and of the [Association of African Universities](#).



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION



THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP

1. Introduction

The HAQAA Initiative

The HAQAA Initiative, funded by the European Union in partnership with the African Union, has been established to support the development of a harmonised quality assurance (QA) and accreditation system at institutional level, national, regional and Pan-African continental level. The Initiative is currently being implemented by a consortium consisting of the University of Barcelona (coordinator), the Association of African Universities (AAU), the European University Association (EUA), the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA) and the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD). Activities involve important African regional and national organisations and networks active in the field and address both internal and external quality assurance.

Amongst the activities that HAQAA has supported have been:

1. Building a common language for QA in Africa, via a continental Training Course for nationally appointed quality assurance professionals.
2. The development of the African Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance (ASG-QA), a reference document for internal and external QA in the African continent.
3. The general promotion of the Pan African Quality Assurance and Accreditation Framework (PAQAF), the politically endorsed framework of the African Union.
4. The generation of a database of professionals interested in continental initiatives in quality assurance in Africa.
5. Supporting internal quality assessment and culture via the AQRM.

The African Quality Rating Mechanism (AQRM)

Adopted by the Conference of Ministers of Education of the African Union (COMDAF) in 2007, the AQRM is a *quality assessment tool for higher education institutions* in Africa and one means of supporting continuous quality improvement. The self-evaluation/self-rating survey that comprises the AQRM consists of Institutional-level reference points (Governance and Management, Infrastructure, Finance, Teaching and Learning, Research, Publication and Innovation and Community Engagement) and Programme-level reference points (Programme Planning and Management, Curriculum Development, Teaching and Learning, Assessment and Programme Results). Institutions are asked to rate that themselves against standards defined under each reference point, on a scale of 1-4. In total there are 49 Institutional level standards and 35 programme level standards. It should be noted that **the AQRM is not a ranking instrument** for comparing institutions and is not used to create league tables.

The AQRM has been developed with the oversight of the African Union Commission (AUC) and in cooperation with higher education stakeholders and experts. The AUC supported a pilot self-rating exercise in 2010 in which 32 African institutions participated. Based on the experience and feedback gained from the pilot survey, a revised version of the AQRM questionnaire and rating instrument was developed and is now available in English, French and Portuguese.

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

4



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA

EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

As the AQRM should ideally be complemented with a validation visit; In 2014, a pilot cohort of nine universities participated in the self-rating exercise and received validation visits of expert teams. In 2017, the HAQAA Initiative facilitated the selection of an additional 15 universities to conduct the AQRM self-rating survey and receive verification visits by teams of African and European experts.

Currently, the AQRM survey is available for any interested institutions on [the website of the Association of African Universities](#), the implementing body of the African Union Commission for higher education.

The AQRM in the context of HAQAA

In the interest of supporting internal quality assurance, the HAQAA Initiative has sponsored 15 African universities to evaluate themselves with the AQRM and to subsequently receive validation visits. This was intended to help the institutions build their internal QA systems and to identify areas for improvement. It was also a means to further test and apply the AQRM as a tool for quality enhancement in the African continent.



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



**UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA**



EUA

European University Association



ENQA

EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



Image 1: Map of countries that participated in the AQRM Survey



In November 2016, a call was made via the Association of African Universities (AAU) for participation in this endeavour. Fifteen diverse universities from the five African regions were selected. The selection considered the motivation of the university leadership towards quality enhancement, geographic diversity, diversity of resources and missions, and linguistic diversity.





In addition, a call was made for experts, versed in institutional quality assessment, from both Africa and Europe. Fifteen different evaluation teams were composed of one European and one African expert each, as well as one African facilitator from the AAU. Some experts conducted multiple visits.

Image 2: List of selected universities and evaluation teams

S/No.	University	Country	Team of experts	Schedule of Visits
1	Ecole Normale Supérieure De Constantine (ENSC)	Algeria	Prof. Amany El Sharif, Manager of NAQAAE Training (National Authority of Quality Assurance and Accreditation of Education), Egypt	29-30 June 2017
			Prof. Patricia Pol, Professeur at the Université Paris-Est Créteil, France	
			Prof. Ethiene Ehile, Secretary General, AAU	
2	University Ouaga II	Burkina Faso	Prof. Ekisawa Constant Nkiama, Coordinateur national, Coordination nationale d'assurance qualité DR Congo	15-16 June 2017
			Prof. Patricia Pol, Professeur at the Université Paris-Est Créteil, France	
			Mrs Adeline Addy, Project Officer, Association of African Universities, Ghana	
3	Université of Kisangani	DR Congo	Prof. Mohammed Amine Allal, Algeria	20-21 July 2017
			Dr. Jochen Hellmann, Secretary General of the Franco-German University, Germany	
			Dr. Violet Makuku, Project Officer, Association of African Universities, Ghana	
4	Al-Azhar University	Egypt	Hortense Atta Diallo, Vice-President University Nangui Abrogoua, Cote d'Ivoire	16-17 July 2017
			Tatjana Volkova, Head of Licensing and Accreditation Commission, Latvia	
			Dr. Violet Makuku, Project Officer, Association of African Universities, Ghana	
5	University of Science and Technology of Masuku (USTM)	Gabon	Prof. Ekisawa Constant Nkiama, Coordinateur national, Coordination nationale d'assurance qualité DR Congo	19-20 June 2017
			Prof. Patricia Pol, Professeur at Université Paris-Est Créteil, France	
			Mrs. Adeline Addy, Project Officer, Association of African Universities, Ghana	
6	Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology	Ghana	Prof. Olugbemiro Jegede, Professor Emeritus at National Open University of Nigeria, Nigeria	22-23 June 2017
			Professor Henrik Toft Jensen, Prof. Emeritus Denmark	
			Prof. Jonathan Mba, Director of Research and Academic Planning, AAU, Ghana	
7	The Catholic University of Eastern Africa	Kenya	Dr. Jefy Mukora, African expert from the Conselho Nacional de Avaliação da Qualidade do Ensino Superior (CNAQ), Mozambique.	6-7 July 2017
			Dr. Ingederd Palmér, former rector, Mälardalen University, Sweden	

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

			Mrs. Gabrielle Hansen, Coordinator from the Association of African Universities.	
8	Botho University Lesotho, Maseru	Lesotho	Prof. Olugbemiro Jegede, Professor Emeritus at National Open University of Nigeria	26-27 June 2017
			Mrs. Doris Hermann, Managing Director for Strategy, Process and International - Head of Sector International, AQAS, Germany	
			Prof. Jonathan Mba, Director of Research and Academic Planning, AAU, Ghana	
9	Université Moulay Ismail	Morocco	Prof. Amany El Sharif, Manager of NAQAAE Training (National Authority of Quality Assurance and Accreditation of Education), Egypt	26-27 June 2017
			Prof. Patricia Pol, Professeur at the Université Paris-Est Créteil, France	
			Prof. Ethiene Ehile, Secretary General, AAU	
10	Eduardo Mondlane University, Maputo	Mozambique	Mrs. Carla Queiroz, Deputy General Director, Institute for Evaluation, Accreditation and Recognition of Studies in Higher Education, Angola	8-9 August 2017
			Mr. Howard Davies, Senior Adviser, European University Association, United Kingdom	
			Prof. Jonathan Mba, Director of Research and Academic Planning, AAU, Ghana	
11	Crawford University, Igbesa	Nigeria	Dr. Beatrice Achieng' Odera-Kwach, Senior Assistant Commission Secretary, Commission for University Education, Kenya	20-21 June 2017
			Prof. Andy Gibbs, QA Expert, United Kingdom	
			Ms. Nodumo Dhlamini, Director ICT Service and Knowledge Management, AAU, Ghana	
12	Durban University of Technology	South Africa	Prof. Goolam Mohamedbhai, Former Vice-Chancellor, University of Mauritius.	19-20 June 2017
			Dr. Margret Flieder, European Expert, Protestant University of Applied Sciences Darmstadt, Germany	
			Dr Violet Makuku, Project Officer, Association of African Universities, Ghana	
13	Sudan University of Science and Technology, Khartoum	Sudan	Dr. Jefy Mukora, African expert from the Conselho Nacional de Avaliação da Qualidade do Ensino Superior (CNAQ), Mozambique.	2-3 July 2017
			Dr. Ingederd Palmér, former rector, Mälardalen University, Sweden	
			Mrs. Gabrielle Hansen, Coordinator from the Association of African Universities	
14	Ndejje University, Kampala	Uganda	Dr. Beatrice Achieng' Odera-Kwach, Senior Assistant Commission Secretary, Commission for University Education, Kenya	15-16 June 2017
			Prof. Andy Gibbs, QA Expert, United Kingdom	
			Ms. Nodumo Dhlamini, Director ICT Service and Knowledge Management, AAU, Ghana	
15	Zimbabwe Open University	Zimbabwe	Prof. Goolam Mohamedbhai, Former Vice-Chancellor, University of Mauritius.	22-23 June 2017

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

8



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



THE AFRICA-EU PARTNERSHIP

			Dr. Margret Flieder, European Expert, Protestant University of Applied Sciences Darmstadt, Germany	
			Dr. Violet Makuku, Project Officer, Association of African Universities, Ghana	

In order to prepare both the institutions and the selected experts, a preparatory workshop was held on 28-29 March in Accra, Ghana. The event was an occasion to present the general continental framework for quality assurance harmonisation (which was provided by the African Union Commission) and introduce the AQRM to the institutions and experts. Training sessions were held on how to conduct an institutional self-assessment and practices were shared from both Europe and Africa. Experts who had participated in a prior round of evaluation visits for the AQRM also shared their experiences and provided suggestions both for the expert teams and the institutions. It was reiterated that the AQRM aims at self-improvement and enhancement and was not a tool to rank or compare African universities.

Between March and June 2017, the fifteen institutions collected data and evidence internally and prepared their self-ratings according to the AQRM survey. This included selecting one study programme that would also be rated, in addition to the overall institutional ratings. Their self-assessment reports were submitted to the respective expert team in advance, which conducted validation visits between June and September. The visits entailed discussions with university leadership, programme directors, deans, professors, students and local partners. They also entailed visiting the universities' facilities. The expert teams subsequently delivered their validation reports, which are featured in this publication. The reports have been formatted for facility of the readership, however it should be noted that they vary in style due to the fact that they were written by different experts. Three reports were delivered in French, as the visits were to francophone institutions. These reports are included here but also can be found in a separate document aimed at a French-speaker readership.

2. Summary results of the AQRM evaluations conducted for HAQAA

2.1 Al Azhar University, Egypt

2.1.1 Composition of the review team

The team consisted of three (3) persons as follows:

- Dr. Violet Makuku, Project Officer, Association of African Universities, Ghana
- Hortense Atta Diallo, Vice-President University Nangui Abrogoua, Cote d'Ivoire
- Tatjana Volkova, Head of Licensing and Accreditation Commission, Latvia

2.1.2 Introduction to the report

This report is the result of the evaluation of Al-Azhar University, Cairo (Egypt), based on the African Quality Rating Mechanism(AQRM) approach.

The self-rating of the university was validated by international external reviewers through a site visit which took place from 16 to 18 July 2017. The Self-evaluation report was prepared by the university



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

based on the AQRM survey that was sent to the international expert's team. The further information was provided after the physical visit and was incorporated in the report.

Al-Azhar University has a unique position in Egypt. Indeed, it has the largest number of students and serves as the main Islamic learning centre and Arabic literature centre alongside different fields of subjects, like Business, Economics, Science, Pharmacy, Medicine, Engineering, Agriculture, Dentistry, etc.

During the site visit, the international expert team found a dynamic university that has developed successfully since its foundation with a high level of commitment to the university from all stakeholders.

The international experts team (hereinafter named the team) consisted of:

Dr Violet Makuku, The Association of African Universities Quality Assurance Specialist and Harmonization of African Higher Education Quality Assurance and Accreditation (HAQAA) Initiative Project Officer, Accra, Ghana
Prof Hortense Atta Diallo, Vice-President University Nangui Abrogoua, Cote d'Ivoire
Prof Tatjana Volkova, Head of Licensing and Accreditation Commission, Latvia

The team would like to specially thank Professor Muhammad Hussein Mahrasawi, President of Al-Azhar University for his hospitality, and the entire organizing committee headed by Prof. Hamdy Abouzaid for their continuous support before and during the site visit as well as for their openness and enthusiasm.

As the result of the visit, this Evaluation Report was prepared and should be published and disseminated among various stakeholders of the university community.

2.1.3 Institution's general information

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 branches are spread over most Egyptian governorates, over 1 mlj km².

Al-Azhar University (further - 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 focus 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 is 313 565, including 133 160 female students. Full-time (194 860) and part-time (101 284) undergraduate students represent the biggest part of the student body. Postgraduate students (8 282) are studying as well, while 2 926 of them are in graduate full-time programmes. Regarding international students, there are 236 part-time students in total, 147 of which are graduate students. In addition, Al-Azhar University offers full-time and part time Diplomatic programmes.

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

10



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

The age range of students is between 18 to 35. In the age group 18 - 25, 54,86% are men, while in the age group 26 - 35 78.12% are women. This shows that women are mostly studying at the undergraduate level and the rate of participation in later stages of studies decreases.

The University is mainly publicly funded and domestic students are paying rather small tuition fees (9 USD for undergraduate students and 75-100 USD average). 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.

2.1.4 African Quality Rating Mechanism Validation at Institutional Level

The evaluation by the team was based on AQR Survey coupled with meetings involving academic and administrative staff, students and external stakeholders and the study of relevant documents. Visits of faculties, laboratories, libraries and classrooms concluded the evaluation in the six areas which are outlined below.

2.1.4.1 Governance and Management

a. Institutional Strengths

Al-Azhar University has clearly stated vision and mission statements at the central and faculty levels. The vision of the University is *to become the leading university worldwide for presenting the correct Islamic thought based on moderation*. It aims to achieve excellence and promote access in education and scientific research. It prepares professionals on the local, regional and international levels, in a climate rich with independence, freedom, democracy and equity for the welfare of the entire community and aiming at achieving sustainable development.

Although there are no University values formally formulated, the team has learned that values are under development for the next strategic period. The University is developing the strategic plan for period 2018-2022. The Strategic planning committee is established and is operating successfully.

There are governance structures in place such as University Council. The Council, consisting of around 90 members, meets on a monthly basis. The University Council board includes all faculties Deans (men and women) and external stakeholders. Although students are not represented in University Council board, they can be invited whenever required.

The Rector and Senior Management team ensures implementation of strategic decisions by the University Council, demonstrates strong leadership and conducts operational activities. Clear accountability structures for responsible officers are in place. There are four Vice-Presidents: Vice-President for the Assiut Branch, Vice-President for the Girls Branch, Vice-president for Graduate studies and Research, and Vice-President for Education and Students. The Government appoints the Rector of the university. The International Excellence Bureau, established with clear responsibilities, deals with the university’s internationalisation activities. The university has other offices among which, an international office that works on university Ranking and Internationalisation was established.

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

There are Quality Assurance (QA) Units established in each faculty, with close oversight by the Central Quality Assurance Unit. Students are represented in all quality assurance units on faculties level. The Director of the QA Centre is a full member of the University Council, which proves that University leadership is concerned about quality issues and places them as a strategic priority. This means that strong efforts are made to ensure the development of a quality culture in the University.

The institution has developed quality assurance policies and procedures. Indeed, the university has many policies in place, e.g. Distance Education, Quality Assurance HIV/AIDS, Partnership with industry, Research, Religious tolerance, Academic Freedom and Staff recruitment/ retention and promotion, Code of Student Conduct, Gender, Harmonisation of qualifications with other institutions and regions, among others. The University has specific policies to ensure and support diversity of staff and students and in particular, representation of women and people with disabilities.

The Accountability State Authority makes the evaluation of the university staff according to the State’s agreements and systems. There are clear criteria for each level of responsibility. Trainings for faculty staff members are categorized in two groups: one from Lecturer to Associate Professor and the other, from Associate Professor to Professor. There are also evaluation elements in measuring the performance efficiency at different levels of responsibility in the organizational structure.

The university has a policy and standard procedures in place to ensure staff and student welfare. Thus, the university provides a health-care system for academic and administrative staff and students free of charge, and the necessary regulations are developed for this purpose. During the site visit, e.g. faculty staff mentioned the possibility to receive medical treatment at the University hospitals.

The institution has put in place an information management system to manage student and staff data, and also to track student performance.

Al-Azhar University has to be praised for its internationalisation efforts as shown by the many partnerships developed with international partners in Africa and outside Africa. There are 15 427 foreign students from 116 countries currently studying at the university.

b. Areas of Concern

The vision, mission and values have to be aligned throughout the University, thus integrating all the different structures. There are no values currently formulated at the university level, but the university is working on it for the next period of development. Values have already been developed at the level of some faculties, e.g. Faculty of Medicine. The specific strategies are not well communicated in order to identify problem areas and to achieve the university goals.

The team has noticed that the Strategic planning committee is working on a SWOT analysis but concentrating only on the strengths of the university. The opportunities, threats and weaknesses have to be identified and analysed towards the goals set for the next period of development.

The different time frames for strategic development plans of University, e.g. the new strategic plan for the university is prepared for the period 2018 – 2022, while that of the Faculty of Medicine covers the period from 2016 – 2021 need to be synchronized.

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

The size of the University Council (90 members) makes it difficult to ensure effective meetings since not all members could raise matters of concern or express their viewpoints. The students are not represented in University Council Board and this needs to be addressed to ensure that student representatives attend the Council Board meetings not only by invitation, but that their representative (s) having a seat at the Council Board. Due to the recent events that occurred in Egypt students' unions were banned but since calm has been restored, students need to be allowed to form students' unions and associations.

The university has developed quality assurance policies and procedures although an internal quality management system is under development. There is room for development of a quality assurance system based on a systemic and systematic approach.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. The vision, mission and values at the university and faculties level have to be aligned to ensure the integrity of university;
- II. The strategic planning period has to be aligned across the different units, thus allowing the monitoring of the university performance alongside commonly set of criteria and key performance indicators (KPIs);
- III. The strategic goals have to be specific, measurable, achievable, realistic within a given time frame (SMART) and formulated based on balanced approaches (e.g. Balanced Scorecard) with clear key performance indicators (KPIs). The benchmarking exercise would be helpful for establishing goals in some areas, e.g. real estate management;
- IV. There is an opportunity to reconsider the responsibility of the University Council around strategic issues of development of the university as a whole, by decreasing the number of participants for example at the level of the Vice-Presidents and to establish Academic Senate dealing with Academic and Research strategic and tactical issues. The representation of students in Governance bodies would benefit decision making processes and enhance the quality of the University activities, overall;
- V. An Advisory Council to the President composed of national and international experts could be established to bring new ideas for further development of the University;
- VI. Systemic and 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. A regular survey on the impact of the university on society, students and staff satisfaction and the analysis of achieving strategic goals have to be conducted. The longitudinal studies will help to monitor development trends and to take corrective measures based on collected evidence;
- VII. Tracer studies on student drop out, completion rates, delays in completion, students' challenges and where they get employed would assist a lot during planning and also support change and improvement,
- VIII. The achievements of the University are not well communicated internationally, thus limiting development potential and building brand awareness. There is a possibility to improve the University's website as some links to English version are not active.
- IX. Linked to the above, publications and other valuable literature in Arabic needs to be translated into English so that you enhance your chances of participation in the global HE

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

13



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



THE AFRICA-EU PARTNERSHIP

arena and compete favourably for project grants as well as allowing the outside world to critique your work and exchange ideas with you. This will make you more relevant and more competitive in the global space.

- X. Based on student’s feedback, the team found that management of tuition fees have to be improved;
- XI. More documentation in English has to be provided, keeping in mind the University’s global outreach and the opportunity to communicate the institution’s achievements to a global academic community.

Table 1: Governance and Management

Reference Number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
1.1.	The institution has a clearly stated vision, mission, and values with specific goals and priorities.	4	3
1.2.	The institution has specific strategies in place for monitoring achievement of institutional goals and identifying problem areas.	3	3
1.3.	Clear accountability structures for responsible officers are in place.	4	3
1.4.	Where appropriate, staff, students and external stakeholders are represented in governance structures. Governance structures are representative in terms of gender.	4	3
1.5.	The institution has developed quality assurance policies and procedures.	4	4
1.6.	Appropriate mechanisms are in place to evaluate staff in line with performance agreements with relevant authorities.	4	4
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
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	4
1.9.	The institution has a policy and standard procedures in place to ensure staff and student welfare.	4	4
	Total assessment value / Aggregated value: Aggregated Value	35/9= 3.89	32/9= 3.56

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.1.4.2 Infrastructure

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



a. Institutional Strengths

- I. Al-Azhar University is located in different areas and the team of experts was not able to visit all of them. From what the team saw during the visit, the University has necessary teaching and research facilities, e.g. Science laboratories, Language laboratories, Students hostels, Staff offices, Sports and Recreation facilities, Auditorium labs for students with vision disabilities.
- II. The experts noticed that the senior management is putting some efforts in modernizing the facilities, e.g. the Faculty of Arabic and Islamic Studies is modernizing the auditoriums, equipping them with comprehensive equipment.
- III. The university provides sufficient learning/studying space for students, e.g. the Central University library has a big collection of textbooks, reference materials journals/periodicals, Thesis, etc. Internet access is provided in the library. There are study spaces for students, mixed and an option of man and women apart. Networking with National and International libraries is in place. Access to the Egyptian Knowledge bank is provided. The online access to the resources of library of Alexandria is ensured, thus providing a good learning environment.
- IV. The University invests resources in the development of facilities, including dormitories for students and updating equipment. There are 23 student's hostels offered to more than 30 000 students and the university has invested in the development of new hostels.
- V. The Faculty of Medicine has equipment, e.g. for dentistry studies at the University, Anatomical have a good collection of resources to facilitate teaching and learning. The modern laboratories of some faculties (Nuclear Physics, Dentistry, Medicine for Girls) are helpful in acquiring knowledge, building necessary skills of students. The Medicine for girls is well equipped with a lot of learning and teaching aids. It is highly commendable.
- VI. The University is updating the digital infrastructure with fibre optics which enables the provision of an Electronic Data Centre. It has embarked on a major project to boost Internet by increasing servers so as to expand bandwidth and increase the speed of the Internet. This will also allow many more students to access online e-resources without challenges.
- VII. There is a maintenance center (Engineering center) which main role is to periodically check equipment's and infrastructure.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. Facilities visited by the expert team, e.g. classrooms and Library, could be more equipped by installing air conditioners, thus increasing ventilation and conducive temperatures for the level of comfort to studies. The equipment in some faculties was no adequate for Masters and Ph.D. level studies.
- II. The offices of the academic staff could be equipped with some computers to provide better conditions for academic and research activities.
- III. There is a need for better attention to the infrastructure maintenance from the University administrative and technical staff side, thus making sure that university community works and studies in a stimulating environment.
- IV. The balance of attention given to local students and international students who are mainly from Malaysia needs to be checked because preferential treatment is more towards Malaysian students with well-equipped and well-ventilated lecture rooms. Although they are paying more, some of their fees could be used to augment infrastructure for other students too. The level of discrimination in this area needs to be controlled in order to avoid making Malaysian students victims of xenophobia in a foreign country.





- V. The e-learning services are under development and more efforts have to be made to ensure e-learning services availability and accessibility.
- VI. Students expressed willingness to have internal website providing information on the system of studies, study programmes, schedules, etc.
- VII. The current student accommodation facilities are not enough to meet all students' needs.
- VIII. Some faculties have better facilities and maintenance services than others. Therefore, infrastructure development has to become an investment priority, alongside ensuring efficient and effective use of existing facilities. For example, there are auditoriums with more than 100 seats on the same level, thus the level of engagement with the academic staff differs in the group and depends on the seats taken. Lecturer theaters offer better opportunities for interaction, monitoring and participation.

c. Opportunities for improvement

- I. To invest more in the development of infrastructure, updating lecturing rooms, providing access to computer resources, Internet and intranet;
- II. To invest in the development of lecture venues and library facilities equipped with air-conditioners to support effective learning environment;
- III. To invest in the development of internal website for study purposes;
- IV. To maintain existing infrastructure to ensure comfortable learning and working environment wherever necessary.
- V. Public-Private Partnerships can assist in increasing infrastructure where, for example there is joint construction of a hostel or dormitory and then the investor takes a larger percentage of the money paid by students occupying the hostel. When payment is finished the University has completed ownership and control of the infrastructure.
- VI. Large venues for lectures with level benches can be converted into lecture theatres since they normally accommodate large student numbers and those sitting at the back do not see the lecturer and miss on the close presence of the lecturer. Such lecture rooms are like those in the Medical School for Girls.
- VII. Although there are elevators to assist the disabled, other infrastructure for the disabled could be availed as alternatives in case the elevators are mal-functional at times due to breakdowns or power failures.

Table 2: Infrastructure

Reference Number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
2.1.	The institution has sufficient lecturing spaces to accommodate student numbers taking the institutional mode of delivery into account.	4	4
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	4
2.3.	Academic and Administrative Staff have access to computer resources and the Internet.	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	3
2.5.	The institution has sufficient laboratory facilities to accommodate students in science programs, taking institutional mode of delivery into account.	4	3
2.6.	Laboratory equipment is up to date and well maintained.	4	4
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.	4	3
2.8.	The institution makes provision for managing and maintaining utilities and ensuring that appropriate safety measures are in place.	4	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value: Aggregated Value		31/8=3.75	27/8=3.38

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.1.4.3 Finances

a. Institutional Strengths

- I. The main sources of funding of Al-Azhar University are public funds, tuition and fees. The university provides financial support to target groups of students through the Social Solidarity Fund. Based on the information provided after the site visit, the University is building two faculties of Pharmacy & Dentistry totally funded by a Saudi Arabian Company, and some other faculties totally funded through donation.
- II. Information regarding financial aid and criteria for allocation are provided. The University Council discusses the annual budget, thus ensuring transparency of the process.

b. Areas of Concern

The current budget is not sufficient to cover all needs of development. The University budget constraints prevent the institution from modernizing further all faculty infrastructures, financing more research and attracting international faculty.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. To continue efforts of diversification of income streams to ensure the achievement of strategic goals.
- II. To ensure more investments in priority areas, including research, quality assurance, infrastructure, etc.
- III. To ensure that the third-stream income could also be pursued through Alumni.

Table 3: Finance

Reference Number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
------------------	------------------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





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
3.2.	The institution has procedures in place to attract funding, including from industry and the corporate sector.	3	3
3.3.	Clearly specified budgetary procedures are in place to ensure allocation of resources reflects the vision, mission and goals of the institution.	4	3
3.4.	The institution provides financial support to deserving students (institutional bursaries and/or scholarships).	4	4
3.5.	Information about financial aid and criteria for its allocation is provided to students and other stakeholders.	4	4
3.6.	The institution publishes income and expenditure statements.	4	4
Total assessment value / Aggregated value: Aggregated Value		22/6=3.66	21/6=3,5

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.1.4.4 Teaching and Learning

a. Institutional Strengths

- I. The University offers more than 359 study programs, thus providing a wide range of opportunities for students to choose the ones that suit them most.
- II. There are 15 386 academic staff members and among them, 10 121 are male and 5 265 females. The academic staff is highly qualified. Indeed, among the academic staff members, there are 7 168 with Ph.D. degrees and 2 390 with master’s degrees. However, there are 5 828 academic staff with a bachelor’s degree, which brings to attention the necessity to increase their level of qualification. The academic staff/student’s ratio is in line with international practice, within the range of 1:40.
- III. The University has a structure to promote international cooperation and enhance Intra-Africa mobility of students and staff. The University has a number of agreements on academic and scientific research exchange with 8 African and 38 non-African institutions.
- IV. A competence-based learning approach is introduced at the university and the development of transferable skills is considered. There is a system for quality assurance on the level of study programmes. The annual reports followed by improvement plans are prepared.
- V. International students studying at the university represent 5 % of the total number of students. The majority of international students come from Africa and Asia (97,63 %) and the remaining from Europe (2,15%), USA (0.21%) and Australia (0.02%).
- VI. The University applies diverse students’ performance assessment approaches, e.g. term paper, projects, mid-term exam, final exam, etc. This helps to accumulate knowledge and acquire skills during the whole study period. There is an internship (industrial attachment) provided. It varies from 28 -300 hours depending on the Faculty.
- VII. The support to students provided during the studies leads to low drop-out rates: 5%, 2% and 2%, respectively at the undergraduate, postgraduate and 2 % graduate levels.





- VIII. Monitoring the quality of teaching and learning is carried out. Monitoring student’s achievements is conducted based on a sophisticated software which provides a good insight into the performance of individual student.
- IX. The Quality Assurance Unit of each Faculty collects and analyses the feedback of students via questionnaire distributed by quality assurance units in the faculties. A report of feedback analysis is delivered to Faculty Dean and corrective actions are taken and should be involved in courses and program reports. Then, each Department considers the student’s feedback in their action plan for the next semester.
- X. All course and programme specifications include general skills that stress on enable students to be lifelong learning. Also, assessment methods include project, dissertations, etc. which need surfing and navigation via the internet, collecting and analysis of data in order to present them.
- XI. The University has procedures in place to support the induction to teaching, pedagogy, counselling and upgrading of staff teaching and learning skills through continuing education and lifelong learning activities. Study regulations and guidelines are helpful for students during the studies. The Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) and Training Centre organize the academic staff trainings. Teacher training is a pre-requisite to the promotion of academic staff and the Centre is the responsible unit for organizing academic staff competence development.
- XII. There is a procedure in place for curriculum review at the university. It is done through broad involvement of faculty staff, Curriculum Committee, Deans, Heads of Department and Vice-president for Education and Students. Joint supervision of Master and Doctoral thesis is introduced, thus providing a better support for students in their thesis development.
- XIII. Student support services, including academic support and counselling are provided, in line with the institutional mode of delivery. The university offers a system of academic advisory for students.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. The team noticed that a “feedback to students on their feedback” is not always provided. There are faculty members who do not put great efforts to engage with students and who do not demonstrate a high commitment to the courses they teach. The student’s learning approach is under-developed at Al-Azhar and this should become a focus area of the university for the next period of development.
- II. The number of faculty staff members with bachelor’s degrees raises concern. Indeed, the situation when lecturers with bachelor’s degrees teach Bachelor level students has to be considered by management. Staff development is very necessary, ideally with institutional support.
- III. Due to large group sizes *for some classes*, not all students have the opportunity to engage with staff members hence the need to change the flat desks and replace them with a lecture theatre set-up as recommended under infrastructure.
- IV. The curriculum update, e.g. in the Faculty of Engineering has to take place, ensuring that it reflects the latest updates of industry. This could also apply to other programs that we might not have time to look at. Curriculum review and renewal are highly recommended currently because of the quick socio-economic changes that are occurring throughout the world.
- V. The students mentioned that employment opportunities in their field of studies are not always available and curriculum review and renewal can also increase graduate employability.
- VI. International students mentioned that no graduation ceremony is organized for international students.
- VII. There is also a lack of data on graduation output and employment rate.

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. Student’s feedback on teaching quality should be better used. To ensure that “feedback on feedback” is provided to students;
- II. To enhance development of students centred approach;
- III. To conduct survey of graduates and their employers, thus providing data on employment of graduates and employers’ satisfaction;
- IV. To enhance collaborative research with industry;
- V. To continue to diversify international student’s body in order to enhance learning experience and cross-cultural competences of students;
- VI. To collaborate more with other African countries;
- VII. To encourage and reward teaching and learning innovation;
- VIII. To increase the number of faculty staff members holding Master and Ph.D. degrees;
- IX. To collect data on graduate’s employment and to use the results for decision making on quality enhancement activities;
- X. More teaching and learning support materials and documents in English would be helpful, especially for international students and staff;
- XI. The teaching materials should also reflect real cases;
- XII. To provide students with extra mural activities to develop their talents and to build soft skills;
- XIII. To pay more attention to the labour market and employment opportunities;
- XIV. To provide support services to students in order to facilitate employment after graduation, e.g. by organizing career days, entrepreneurship courses for development entrepreneurship skills, etc.;
- XV. To increase links and cultivate good relationships with current students who will become alumni and the alumni so that they assist in getting students placement/attachment/internship and in some cases jobs.
- XVI. To have more documents in English, including on the website, could contribute to increasing the visibility of the university and building its reputation.
- XVII. To provide university-wide course on entrepreneurship so that students think of employment creation rather than getting employed when they finish school.
- XVIII. There is a need to also develop university-wide courses on soft skills, communication skill, conflict transformation and resolution.

Table 4: Teaching and Learning

Reference Number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
4.1.	The institution encourages and rewards teaching and learning innovation.	2	2
4.2.	The institution has procedures in place to support the induction to teaching, pedagogy, counseling and the upgrading of	4	4

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA

EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



	staff teaching and learning skills through continuing education and lifelong learning.		
4.3.	Students have sufficient opportunity to engage with staff members in small groups, individually or via electronic platforms.	4	2
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	4
4.5.	The institution has policies/procedures in place to inform the development, implementation and assessment of programs offered by the institution and these policies take account the contribution of higher education to socio-economic development.	4	4
4.6.	The institution has developed a policy or criteria for staff recruitment, deployment, development, succession planning and a system of mentorship and/or apprenticeship.	4	4
4.7.	Student support services, including academic support and required counseling services are provided, in line with the institutional mode of delivery.	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	4
4.9.	The institution has a devoted office to promote international cooperation and enhance Intra-Africa mobility of students and staff.	4	4
	Total assessment value / Aggregated value: Aggregated Value	33/9= 3.67	31/9=3.44

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.1.4.5 Research, Publication and Innovation

a. Institutional Strengths

- I. The Research policy is in place. There are criteria for research development and promotion of academic staff. The academic staff is involved in research activities relevant to the nation’s development. Some staff members have received national and international awards for their achievements. Many cooperation agreements exist with various national and international partners.

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

- II. The academic staff is successful in attracting national and international research grants to conduct research. The total amount of research grants attracted was more than 4 million USD during the period 2014 -2016, while during the same period, the annual budget allocated for research was 2 million USD. Although there are good samples of project preparation and submission supports, it is not a widespread practice.
- III. Academic staff and students publish their research results in international peer-reviewed journals and participate at national and international conferences, which are partly funded by the university.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. There is lack of data available on research output at the institutional level. Based on self-evaluation, there are not enough collaborative research projects addressing industrial problems.
- II. The strategic goals with key performance indicators related to research have to be elaborated and research performance should be monitored based on data analysis.
- III. There are no policies on Innovation, Intellectual Property Ownership and Technology Foresight.
- IV. Applicability and relevance of research could be strengthened. Collaborative research with industry is underdeveloped.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. Collaborative research to solve problems faced by industry;
- II. To institutionalize the data on research output using appropriate technologies and tools;
- III. To develop policies on Innovation, Intellectual Property Ownership and Technology Foresight;
- IV. Recognition of research achievements should be improved and better communicated through different media channels;
- V. More cross disciplinary research could be conducted;
- VI. The research mapping for the identification areas of Excellence could be conducted to determine research priorities;
- VII. Clear research goals with Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) defined at the University, faculties and departments have to be elaborated and achievement of results monitored;
- VIII. To develop database for research results at the institutional, Faculty and Department levels. To put as requirement for each faculty member, at the end of the academic year, to submit the list of publications based on a template approved by the university authorities. It would be helpful for monitoring the achievement of research goals, benchmarking and research recognition.
- IX. Arabic publications to be translated into English and French to prevent self-institutional, national and regional exclusion by language and to increase the exchange of knowledge and ideas as well as collaborations.

Table 5: Research, Publication and Innovation

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

22



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



Reference Number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
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.	3	2
5.2.	The institution has a policy and/or strategy on Innovation, Intellectual Property Ownership and Technology Foresight.	1	1
5.3.	The institution has demonstrated success in attracting research grants from national or international sources and in partnership with industry.	3	3
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	3
5.5.	Staff and students publish their research in accredited academic journals and apply for patents (where relevant).	4	3
5.6.	Researchers are encouraged and supported to present their research at national and international conferences.	4	4
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	3
5.8.	The institution encourages and rewards research whose results are used by society.	3	3
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	3
5.10.	The institution has established linkages to promote international joint research and publications	4	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value: Aggregated Value		31/10= 3.1	28/10= 2.8

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.1.4.6 Community / Societal Engagement

a. Institutional Strengths

- I. Al-Azhar University demonstrates high commitment to societal engagement. The university has a policy and procedures in place for engaging with the local community.

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

- II. Students and university staff are involved in delivering community services, thus demonstrating social responsibility practice. The Community Service and Environmental Development Committee puts great efforts in delivering community service by involving students and staff members across all University.
- III. The University offers medical support to people in various rural and urban areas. Al-Azhar has delivered 181 community outreach programmes and the number of programmes has been growing for the past 3 years. The University is participating in the North Sinai Development project in partnership with a number of local and international research centres.
- IV. There are many agreements in place with various stakeholders, thus creating high awareness on the needs of society. Some agreements are with the Ministry of Environment, the Egyptian Fund for Information Technology of the Ministry of Communications, etc. Many Funded research projects are concerned with Environmental issues, thus contributing to delivering services to community.
- V. The academic staff delivers consultancy services to private, public and governmental organizations.
- VI. The Islamic Studies League has been established and delivers research, organizing conferences, provides scholarships, etc. thus contributing to societal mission of University.
- VII. The university has to be praised for the courses targeting young couples seeking marriage, thus contributing to the building stronger families. The Pre-marriage Centre is another initiative demonstrating a high-level commitment to societal development.
- VIII. The awareness among students about societal engagement is increased through specialized courses on environmental protection thought to them.
- IX. The responsiveness of curricula to industry and employer’s participation in curriculum design or review, as well as industrial placements and practical trainings, demonstrate the university commitment to societal engagement. Indeed, good relationships with the private sector facilitate graduate’s employment.
- X. The Medicine for girls is highly positioned too to solve topical religious and cultural issues like genital mutilation, reproductive health, etc. and this is a direct response to societal needs.

b. Areas of Concern

Community programmes are growing in the recent years but there are no clear goals set for the next strategic period of development.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. There is room for development of partnerships with the private sector;
- II. Clear goals for societal engagement with associated KPIs could be developed at the level of the University as the part of the Strategic Development Plan for the next period;
- III. Social entrepreneurship skills could be developed for students, thus fostering the establishment of social enterprises and therefore contributing to solving societal challenges;
- IV. To continue to promote and reward social responsibility initiatives.

Table 6: Community/Societal Engagement

Reference Number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
------------------	------------------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



**UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA**



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



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	4
6.2.	The institution encourages departments and staff to develop and implement strategies for community engagement.	4	4
6.3.	Students are required to engage with communities through their academic work.	4	4
6.4.	The institution has forged partnerships with other education sub-sectors to enhance the quality of education in the country and region.	3	3
6.5.	The Institution disseminates information on its community engagement activities to the local community.	4	4
6.6.	The institution offers relevant short courses to the community/broader society based on identified needs and supporting identified economic opportunities.	4	4
6.7.	The institution makes its facilities available (where possible) to the local community in support of community and socio-economic development activities.	4	4
Total assessment value / Aggregated value: Aggregated Value		27/6=3.86	27/6=3.86

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.1.4.7 Rating Summary at Institutional level

Table 7: Rating Summary at Institutional Level

Major standard	Aggregated Value by University	Aggregated Value by Experts
Governance and management	3.89	3.56
Infrastructure	3.75	3.38
Finance	3.66	3.50
Teaching and Learning	3.67	3.44
Research, Publication and Innovation	3.10	2.80
Societal Engagement	3.86	3.86
Total	21.93/6= 3.66	20.54/6=3.42

<1 = Poor; 1.0-1.99 = Insufficient; 2.0-2.79 = Satisfactory; 2.8-3.5 = Good; and >3.5 = Excellent

- By the university as EXCELLENT Quality
- By the experts as GOOD Quality

2.1.5 African Quality Rating Mechanism Validation at Programme Level

The evaluation conducted by the team was based on the African Quality Rating Mechanism (AQRM) Survey and meetings with academic and administrative staff, students and external stakeholders in addition to studying relevant documents. Visits of faculties, laboratories, library, and classrooms were also made.

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





2.1.5.1 Programme Planning and management

a. Programme Strengths

There is a Strategic Plan developed for Faculty of Medicine for the period 2016 - 2021. The programme corresponds to the National Academic Reference Standards (NARS) for medicine.

There is a general coordinator who is responsible for preparing annual reports, analysing students' feedback. The person is also responsible for quality improvement of the study programme.

A Central library is available in the faculty for staff and students. According to information provided, there are also libraries in two hospitals, in addition to departmental libraries available in some other departments.

The university management team puts in great efforts to update or upgrade laboratories equipment, materials and infrastructure in the Faculty of Medicine. The Dentistry Department, for example is well equipped and set up to cater for all levels of students. Such equipment availability helps to increase the chances of hands on minds on by students and so helps to develop actual skills based on practice and not theory. For example, according to the information provided, the central computer laboratory in the main building is in the process of being renewed.

The faculty staff is qualified, with Doctoral degrees in areas of specialization. Based on Faculty of Medicine Annual Report 2015/2016, the total number of students was 3 349 with a 1:3.6 staff to student ratio and assistant to student ratio 1:7.2. These small ratios give opportunity for small group teaching and also ensure that individual students achieved the necessary learning outcomes.

Mode of delivery is varied and include lectures, tutorials, self- directed learning, practical sessions, clinical rounds and small group teaching.

A programme evaluation process is in place. The academic staff reviews the subjects and suggests improvements for the study programme. The students give feedback not only on the course content, but also on teaching and learning experience. Periodic external reviews take place, thus providing feedback on study program development.

b. Areas of Concern

The strategic development goals are not specific, measurable, time bound (not formulated based on the SMART approach) and the performance indicators associated with these goals have to be aligned.

There are areas where more investments are needed to support programme development. According to Faculty of Medicine, laboratories for the Departments of Basic Sciences are available, but there is a lack of maintenance plan for the infrastructure.

There is a need to accurately refine the educational aids and improve the facilities. There is also a need for Wi-Fi access in some departments.

The needs and challenges of all targeted students should be considered in the delivery mode of programmes.





c. Opportunities for improvement

- I. To develop goals based on SMART approach aligned, with key performance indicators;
- II. To invest more resources into the development of programmes, e.g. staff professional development, infrastructure development, etc.;
- III. To develop further the different study programme delivery modes, considering the needs and challenges of all targeted students;
- IV. To develop an infrastructure maintenance plan.

Table 8: Programme Planning and Management

Reference point	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment value by University	Assessment value by experts
7.1.	The programme is aligned with the overall institutional mission and vision.	4	4
7.2.	The programme meets national accreditation criteria.	4	4
7.3.	The institution allocates sufficient resources to support the programme.	3	3
7.4.	There is a programme coordinator(s) responsible for managing and ensuring quality of the program.	4	4
7.5.	The mode of delivery takes account of the needs and challenges of all targeted students.	3	3
7.6.	Staff teaching on the programme have the appropriate type and level of qualification.	4	4
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	4
7.8.	Programme planning includes a strategy for the use of technology in a manner appropriate to the program, facilities available, and target students.	3	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value: Aggregated Value		29/8= 3.63	29/8=3.63

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.1.5.2 Curriculum Development

a. Programme strengths

- I. The programme of Bachelor of Science in Medicine and Surgery target group is specified. The learning outcomes (LO) approach is applied for each module/course and for the programme as a whole on the level of knowledge and understanding, intellectual skills, professional and

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





practical skills, general and transferable skills. The linkage between programme aims and LOs are developed.

- II. There is a process in place for curriculum review, thus ensuring that new content of study subjects follows technological developments and helps to create knowledge and learning outcomes supporting African development. The team has learned and seen that modern equipment, e.g. 3D surgery is used to train doctors. The content of the study course has been adjusted to demonstrate latest achievements in medicine.
- III. Modules/courses are coherently planned and provide a sequenced learning pathway for students towards attainment of a qualification.
- IV. The curriculum includes an appropriate balance of theoretical, practical and experiential knowledge and skills, as well as core and elective areas. The university has six hospitals, thus ensuring gaining practical and experiential knowledge and professional skills.
- V. The curriculum has been developed to maximize student career pathways, opportunities for articulation with other relevant qualifications, and employment prospects. Curriculum is designed in light of National Academic Reference Standards (NARS). NARS are stated to acquire medicine graduate with the knowledge, professional, intellectual, transferable & general skills and attitude to meet international guidelines.
- VI. Curriculum development has been informed by thorough research and consultation with relevant stakeholders including public sector planners, industry and other employers.
- VII. Curriculum is updated annually, and the faculty is accredited few months ago and one of the accreditation standards is about updating of the curriculum to support market and society needs.
- VIII. Curriculum include major topics related to Africa endemic diseases, Parasitic diseases, emerging and re-emerging infectious diseases for example HIV/AIDS, Ebola, Zika, etc.
- IX. The curriculum reflects positive African values, gender sensitivity and the needs of society.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. There are too many learning outcomes (LO) defined at the programme and course levels thus, making it difficult to ensure that all LO are observable and measurable. There is a need for collection of accurate and reliable data for each LO to prove its achievement.
- II. On a study programme level, LOs are usually very broad and relate to the knowledge and skills students have developed over the whole programme: e.g. analyze, synthesize; draw conclusions, etc. Some LOs are too narrow for the study programme level but rather applicable for course LOs, e.g. identify the non-biological determinants of poor health, etc.
- III. The grouping of LOs around 3 major blocks: knowledge, skills and attitudes, thus forming together competences. The focus on attitudes, including ethics would be necessary to add by reducing the number of LOs around knowledge and skills.
- IV. The curriculum development or review would benefit from wider consultations with relevant stakeholders, including public sector planners, industry and other employers.

c. Opportunities for improvement

- I. To benchmark LOs at undergraduate programme and course levels, with selected international undergraduate study programs to improve the expected LOs.
- II. To reduce number of LOs, both at the programme and course levels, and to make sure that LOs are observable and measurable.

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





- III. To ensure wide consultations with relevant stakeholders, including public sector planners, industry and other employers for program development.

Table 9: Curriculum Development

Reference Point	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment value by University	Assessment value by experts
8.1.	The curriculum clearly specifies target learners and learning outcomes/competencies for each module/course and for the programme as a whole.	4	4
8.2.	The curriculum is regularly updated to take account of new knowledge and learning needs to support African development.	4	3
8.3.	Modules/courses are coherently planned and provide a sequenced learning pathway for students towards attainment of a qualification.	4	4
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	4
8.5.	The curriculum has been developed to maximize student career pathways, opportunities for articulation with other relevant qualifications, and employment prospects.	4	4
8.6.	Curriculum development has been informed by thorough research and consultation with relevant stakeholders including public sector planners, industry and other employers.	4	3
8.7	The curriculum reflects positive African values, gender sensitivity and the needs of society.	4	4
	Total assessment value / Aggregated value: Aggregated Value	28/7=4	26/7=3.71

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.1.5.3 Teaching and Learning

- a. **Programme Strengths**
 - I. Teaching and learning are based on LOs, which are consistent with the aims of the programme and course. The study course descriptions needed to support programme delivery are developed. The Programme Handbook is available also in English, on the Faculty website: www.medicineazhar.edu.eg, where a list of study courses is presented and in the Faculty Quality Assurance Unit.
 - II. Learning materials have been clearly mentioned in the program and course specification. These include notebooks, handouts, electronic notes (power point or PDF slides) and textbooks. Learning aims, and outcome are mentioned in course specifications. Topics of the course content are also included at a given time.





THE AFRICA-EU PARTNERSHIP

III. The teaching and learning methods in the clinical departments are mainly lectures, tutorial, demonstrations on models and animals, movies, computer simulations and presentations.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. The level of defined LOs is not in line with the best international practices and therefore, learning materials have to be revised alongside expected learning outcomes.
- II. There is no appropriate system in place to take into account individual differences among students and thus facilitating learning experience.

c. Opportunities for improvement

- I. To invest in the development of innovative teaching and learning materials. Learning materials have to be clearly presented, including reference to the learning aims and outcomes and an indication of study time.
- I. To develop academic staff competencies in defining LOs and assessment towards LOs approach;
- II. To develop assessment template for measuring students' performance based on LOs approach;
- III. The Program Handbook (e.g. in English versions) should contain a list of literature;
- IV. To develop system to take into account differences among students and thus facilitating learning experience.

Table 10: Teaching and Learning

Reference point	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment value by University	Assessment value by experts
9.1.	Teaching and learning are based on explicit learning outcomes which are consistent with programme and course aims.	4	4
9.2.	A clear strategy is in place to identify the learning materials needed to support programme delivery.	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	3
9.4.	The learning materials have been designed with the purpose of engaging students intellectually, ethically and practically.	3	3
9.5.	Program review procedures include materials review and improvement.	3	3
9.6.	Innovative teaching and learning materials are provided for students.	2	2
	Total assessment value / Aggregated value: Aggregated value	18/6= 3	18/6=3

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION



Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.1.5.4 Assessment

a. Programme Strengths

- I. Assessment is used as an integral part of the teaching and learning process and seeks to ensure that students have mastered specific outcomes. There is an accumulative assessment applied for evaluating study results.
- II. A variety of assessment methods such as essay, structured oral examination, objective structured practical examination (OSPE), objective structured clinical examination (OSCE) are used in the, program.
- III. Most of the departments have external examiners systems (oral exams) in place.
- IV. All courses specifications should include mode of assessment and clear demonstration to the weight of each assessment method. Clear information about mode of assessment is provided in program and course specifications, as well as course outline that is regularly distributed to all students at the beginning of the course.
- V. There is a continuous assessment of the students in academic Departments (Pharmacology, Community Medicine, Pathology) and midyear or end of year exam that comprises 20 % of the whole mark.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. Information about mode of assessment is provided for all courses/modules making up the programme towards the level LOs of achievement, but not based on an LOs assessment approach.
- II. The experts have noticed that faculty does not provide a feedback on student’s feedback.

c. Opportunities for improvement

- I. The procedures ensure consistency and accuracy, and the provision for feedback to students is in place but it has to be improved to make sure that “feedback on student’s feedback” is delivered and feedback analysis take place to make better-informed decisions for the improvement of study program;
- II. To expand the practice of inviting external examiners for student’s assessment.

Table 11: Assessment Rating

Reference point	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment value by University	Assessment value by experts
9.1.	The institution has systems in place for external examiners.	3	3
9.2.	Clear information about mode of assessment is provided for all courses/modules making up the program.	4	4
9.3.	Assessment is used as an integral part of the	4	4

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by: 31





	teaching and learning process and seeks to ensure that students have mastered specific outcomes.		
9.4.	The level of challenge of assessments is appropriate to the specific program and targeted students.	3	3
9.5.	A variety of assessment methods are used in the program.	4	4
9.6.	Marking procedures ensure consistency and accuracy and the provision of feedback to students.	3	3
	Total assessment value / Aggregated value: Aggregated Value	21/6= 3.5	21/6= 3.5

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.1.5.5 Programme Results

a. Programme Strengths

- I. There is a software in place to monitor Student progress is monitored throughout the programme and early warning is provided for students at risk.
- II. There is a process in place to monitor completion rates per cohort to conform to established norms for the subject area and mode of delivery.
- III. Students' feedback on study process is collected and analyzed. There is an annual report filled by the end of each academic year. There is also a questionnaire given random samples of students at the end of the programme. The feedback is taken from the students twice, once after the mid-term exam and the other one after the end year exam, usually two weeks before their final results approved and signed by the Faculty Dean and distributed to all departments to be considered in corrective actions. The two types of student's feedback are provided: student's response to student and feedback for their progress periodically. Relations with business owners and authorities are in place to ensure getting feedback on quality of graduates.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. There is no comprehensive system for student's counseling services regarding academic support and career guidance.
- II. There is no comprehensive data system on employment of graduates.
- III. There is a need to develop a process for providing feedback on feedback to students to close the feedback loop.

c. Opportunities for improvement

- I. To develop system for student's counseling services on academic support and career guidance.

Table 12: Program results: University versus External Validation

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

Reference	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment	Assessment
-----------	------------------------------	------------	------------

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



THE AFRICA-EU PARTNERSHIP

Point		value by University	value by experts
10.1.	Student progress is monitored throughout the programme and early warning is provided for students at risk.	3	4
10.2.	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
10.3.	Quality student feedback is provided.	4	4
10.4.	Expert peers and/or professional bodies review the relevance and quality of learning achieved by students.	4	4
10.5.	There is established linkage with potential employers that facilitate graduate employment.	4	4
10.6.	Tracer studies of graduates and their employers are conducted to obtain feedback on achievement of graduates.	4	3
10.7.	The programme has an effective research plan with suitable implementation, evaluation and feedback mechanisms.	4	3
10.8.	Research and consultancy is undertaken in the subject area to solve industrial problems and support the social and economic development.	3	4
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		29/8= 3.63	29/8=3. 63

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.1.5.5 Rating summary at programme level

University Rating versus the External Validation

Table 13: Rating summary at Programme level

Major Standard	Aggregated Value by University	Aggregated value by Experts
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
Total	16.96/5= 3.39	17.47/5=3.49

<1 = Poor; 1.0-1.99 = Insufficient; 2.0-2.79 = Satisfactory; 2.8-3.5 = Good; and >3.5 = Excellent

Overall quality at programme level is rated:

- By the university as EXCELLENT Quality
- By the experts as GOOD Quality

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

2.1.6 Conclusions and recommendations

a. Conclusions

Al-Azhar University, Cairo (Egypt), based on the African Quality Rating Mechanism approach, is rated as GOOD QUALITY and demonstrating high-level commitment for quality improvement.

Al-Azhar University has to be praised for the achievements it has demonstrated up until today and the visionary leadership that will bring the University to the next level of development.

b. Recommendations:

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

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



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



**UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA**



EUA

European University Association



ENQA

EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



2.2 Botho University, Lesotho

2.2.1 Composition of the Review Team

The AQRM validation of the self-rating instrument and External assessment was done through teams of experts and was based on the Self-Assessment Report of the programme by the relevant peers. The membership consisted of three (3) persons as follows:

- Prof. Jonathan Mba, Director of Research and Academic Planning, Association of African Universities, Ghana
- Mrs. Doris Herrmann, Managing Director for Strategy, Process and International - Head of Sector International, AQAS, Germany
- Prof. Olugbemiro Jegede, Professor Emeritus at National Open University of Nigeria

2.2.2 Introduction to the report

This is a report of the Review Visit by the Review Team to Botho University, Maseru, Lesotho carried out on Monday, 26 June and Tuesday, 27 June 2017. The University has, in addition to the institutional level review, chosen to present the Faculty of Computing, one of the three Faculties, as its flagship for programme evaluation. Specifically, the B.Sc (Honours) in Computing Programme, a very popular and well sought after programme at the University’s Faculty of Computing, was offered for the programme review.

The Visit commenced with a meeting of the Experts at 8:00pm on Sunday, 25 June, 2017. At the meeting, the following issues were discussed as (i) reinforcement of the visit plan, (ii) clarification of the AQRM Survey Questionnaire submitted through the Assistant Dean of the Campus, Abhishek Ranjan, and (iii) review of the already circulated schedule of the Review Team’s visit to the University reconciling the suggested programme of visit by the AAU.

2.2.3 Institution’s general information

Botho University, which is the first private University in Bostwana began its life 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.

Botho University’s Lesotho campus is located in Maseru, which is the country’s capital and the largest city. The name ‘Lesotho’ loosely translates into “the land of the people who speak Sesotho.” A land of

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





mountains, Lesotho, is the only country in the world which has all its land lying at altitudes in excess of 1,500m above sea-level; it is a land of heights and weather extremes.

While the main campus has 6,000 students with about 500 staff, the University in Maseru has 321 students with a total of 38 staff, 19 of which are academic staff. The staff are from five countries: Zambia, Zimbabwe, Botswana, India and Lesotho.

The thematic foci of Botho University, Lesotho are Science & Technology and Management & Business Administration. 321 student’s population is made up of 157 Male and 164 Female. 89% of the students are within the 18 to 25 age range. 4.7 Out of the 19 academic staff, there are two with Ph.D and 12 with Master degree. There is one Assistant Professor, 3 Fellows and 7 Senior Lecturers.

Being a University, which grew from the private sector and it is a for-profit institution, its governance structure is a bit different from the way conventional universities are managed. From an overall perspective, the Board of Directors is responsible for the governance of the institution and takes precedence over 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.

Indeed, the Lesotho Campus is managed by an Assistant Dean rather than a Provost as would normally be the case in the conventional university system. As a very young university, Botho Maseru Campus is only in its second year, yet to graduate any students and does not yet undertake meaningful research activities or budget for research. Therefore, the basis for the review was completely different from what is used for a university with long tradition and experience.

However, based on its track record at the main campus and the popularity of demand, the B.Sc (Honours) in Computing programme in the Faculty of Computing is well sought after and has established itself as the best programme in the Lesotho campus with close to 100 students.

2.2.4 African Quality Rating Mechanism Validation at Institutional Level

2.2.4.1 Governance and Management

a. Institutional strengths

- I. Botho University has clear governance and management structures and an explicit strategic plan which is cascaded down to key performance indicators.
- II. Botho University has very strong management information systems. - Botho University has a well-established ISO 9001-2008 -compliant quality management system.
- III. Good approaches on implementing a quality culture. Openness for criticism

b. Areas of concern

Botho University Maseru Campus needs to improve its services to special need staff and students.

c. Opportunities for improvement

Establish a wider range of departments and programmes at Maseru Campus

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





Table 1: Governance and Management

Reference Number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
12.1.1	The institution has a clearly stated vision, mission, and values with specific goals and priorities.	4	4
12.1.2	The institution has specific strategies in place for monitoring achievement of institutional goals and identifying problem areas.	4	3
12.1.3	Clear accountability structures for responsible officers are in place.	4	4
12.1.4	Where appropriate, staff, students and external stakeholders are represented in governance structures. Governance structures are representative in terms of gender.	3	3
12.1.5	The institution has developed quality assurance policies and procedures.	4	4
12.1.6	Appropriate mechanisms are in place to evaluate staff in line with performance agreements with relevant authorities.	2	2
12.1.7	The institution has put a management information system in place to manage student and staff data, and to track student performance.	4	4
12.1.8	The institution has specific policies in place to ensure and support diversity of staff and students, in particular representation of women and the disabled.	3	2
12.1.9	The institution has a policy and standard procedures in place to ensure staff and student welfare.	4	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		32/9=3.55	29/9=3.22

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.2.4.2 Infrastructure

a. Institutional strengths

- I. The learning environment has adequate and appropriate resources.
- II. Classrooms are well equipped with computers, projectors, sound systems and the internet.

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





THE AFRICA-EU PARTNERSHIP

b. Areas of concern

Library and internet bandwidth needs upgrading

c. Opportunities for improvement

More space required for campus extension

Table 2: Infrastructure

Reference point	Standard for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
12.2.1	The institution has sufficient lecturing spaces to accommodate student numbers taking the institutional mode of delivery into account.	4	3
12.2.2	The institution provides sufficient learning/studying space for students including access to electronic learning resources, as required for the institutional mode of delivery.	3	2
12.2.3	Academic and Administrative Staff have access to computer resources and the internet.	4	4
12.2.4	Students have access to computer resources and the internet at a level appropriate to the demands of the institutional mode of delivery.	4	4
12.2.5	The institution has sufficient laboratory facilities to accommodate students in science programmes, taking institutional mode of delivery into account.	3	3
12.2.6	Laboratory equipment is up to date and well maintained.	3	3
12.2.7	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.	4	3
12.2.8	The institution makes provision for managing and maintaining utilities and ensuring that appropriate safety measures are in place.	3	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		28/8=3.5	25/8=3.13

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION



2.2.4.3 Finance

a. Institutional strengths

- I. Botho University has well planned financial management procedures
- II. Botho University uses reliable computerised accounting system for maintenance of books of accounts, Payroll, Asset management. The entire system of accounting functions through ERP system (Enterprise resource planning) - Monthly management accounts are prepared and presented. They are regularly reviewed with the budgets.
- III. Botho University also has Internal Audit department which submits reports on a regular basis.
- IV. Botho University accounts are also regularly audited by an external auditor and audited financial statements are prepared in line with international financial reporting standards.

b. Areas of concern

To explore avenues and opportunity for funding from Industry and Corporate Sector

c. Opportunities for improvement

To collaborate both nationally and internationally with industry and other stakeholders to attract funding

Table 3: Finances

Reference Point	Standard for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
12.3.1	The institution has access to sufficient financial resources to achieve its goals in line with its budget and student unit cost.	3	3
12.3.2	The institution has procedures in place to attract funding, including from industry and the corporate sector.	2	2
12.3.3	Clearly specified budgetary procedures are in place to ensure allocation of resources reflects the vision, mission and goals of the institution.	3	3
12.3.4	The institution provides financial support to deserving students (institutional bursaries and/or scholarships).	3	2
12.3.5	Information about financial aid and criteria for its allocation is provided to students and other stakeholders.	4	3
12.3.6	The institution publishes income and expenditure statements.	4	4

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





Total assessment value / Aggregated value	19/6=3.20	17/6=2.83
--	------------------	------------------

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.2.4.4 Teaching and learning

a. Institutional strengths

- I. Regular staff training and recruitment of experienced staff.
- II. Strong Academic Quality Management process.
- III. Adequate teaching and learning resources for lecturers and students.
- IV. Internships are part of the programmes

b. Areas of concern

- I. More research based teaching.
- II. Upgrading of staff qualifications for existing Academic staff.
- III. Too few of the academic staff have a PhD and this affects the research output. BU should encourage its staff in their academic career.

c. Opportunities for improvement

- I. More collaboration with national, regional and international university on teaching and learning.

Table 4: Teaching and learning

Reference Point	Standard for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
12.4.1	The institution encourages and rewards teaching and learning innovation.	3	2
12.4.2	The institution has procedures in place to support the induction to teaching, pedagogy, counseling and the upgrading of staff teaching and learning skills through continuing education and lifelong learning.	4	2
12.4.3	Students have sufficient opportunity to engage with staff members in small groups, individually or via electronic platforms.	4	2
12.4.4	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	2	2

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





	provided.		
12.4.5	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.	3	3
12.4.6	The institution has developed a policy or criteria for staff recruitment, deployment, development, succession planning and a system of mentorship and/or apprenticeship.	2	2
12.4.7	Student support services, including academic support and required counseling services are provided, in line with the institutional mode of delivery.	3	2
12.4.8	The institution has mechanisms in place to support students to become independent learners, in line with the institutional mode of delivery.	3	3
12.4.9	The institution has a devoted office to promote international cooperation and enhance Intra-Africa mobility of students and staff.	3	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		27/9=3.0	21/9=2.33

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.2.4.5 Research, publication and innovation

a. Institutional strengths

- I. Well established research department to promote research.
- II. Annual budget allocation for research.

b. Areas of concern

- I. Research capacity building of staff and establishing a research culture.
- II. More research output from staff and students.
- III. More speakers to be invited.

c. Opportunities for improvement

- I. Recruitment of experienced research fellows.
- II. Have a Research Policy

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

- III. Have budgetary provision for research grants
- IV. Hire experienced staff who can undertake research

Table 5: Research, publication and innovation

Reference Point	Standard for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
12.5.1	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
12.5.2	The institution has a policy and/or strategy on Innovation, Intellectual Property Ownership and Technology Foresight.	2	1
12.5.3	The institution has demonstrated success in attracting research grants from national or international sources and in partnership with industry.	1	0
12.5.4	The institution has procedures in place to support academic staff to develop and enhance their research skills, including collaborative research and publication.	1	0
12.5.5	Staff and students publish their research in accredited academic journals and apply for patents (where relevant).	2	1
15.5.6	Researchers are encouraged and supported to present their research at national and international conferences.	3	0
15.5.7	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.	2	0
15.5.8	The institution encourages and rewards research whose results are used by society	2	0



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA

EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



15.5.9	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.	2	1
15.5.10	The institution has established linkages to promote international joint research and publications	2	1
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		19/9=2.10	6/9=0.6

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.2.4.6 Community / Societal Engagement

a. Institutional strengths

- I. Botho university not only funds community projects but also gives technical support to the beneficiaries where applicable.
- II. Botho university maintains good relations with the community.

b. Areas of concern

- I. Disseminating information on community engagement.
- II. Involve more staff and students in community engagement.

c. Opportunities for improvement

- I. Increasing partnerships with communities.
- II. Develop a policy on community engagement

Table 6: Community / Societal Engagement

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

Reference Point	Standard for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
12.6.1	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	2	2





THE AFRICA-EU PARTNERSHIP

12.6.2	The institution encourages departments and staff to develop and implement strategies for community engagement.	3	1
12.6.3	Students are required to engage with communities through their academic work.	2	1
12.6.4	The institution has forged partnerships with other education sub-sectors to enhance the quality of education in the country and region.	2	2
12.6.5	The Institution disseminates information on its community engagement activities to the local community.	1	1
12.6.6	The institution offers relevant short courses to the community/broader society based on identified needs and supporting identified economic opportunities.	1	1
12.6.7	The institution makes its facilities available (where possible) to the local community in support of community and socio-economic development activities.	2	1
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		13/7=1.86	9/7=1.29

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.2.4.7 Rating Summary at Institutional level

Table 6

Major Standard	Aggregated Value by University	Aggregated Value by Experts
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
Societal Engagement	1.86	1.29



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



THE AFRICA-EU PARTNERSHIP

Total rating value / Aggregated rating score

17.21/6= 2.87

13.4/6=2.23

<1 = Poor; 1.0-1.99 = Insufficient; 2.0-2.79 = Satisfactory; 2.8-3.5 = Good; and >3.5 = Excellent

Overall quality at institutional level is rated:

- By the University as GOOD Quality
- By the experts as SATISFACTORY Quality

2.2.5 African Quality Rating Mechanism Validation at Programme Level

2.2.5.1 Programme planning and management

a. Institutional strengths

- Botho University's effective structure and mechanism in place for effective delivery of the programme.
- Botho University ensures consistency on the delivery of programme across all campuses. This is done through proper coordination under the Module Leader or Team Leader.
- Botho University has a process for ensuring Delivery and Management of Programme as planned.
- Botho University has a "Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy" (2013-2017) in place.

b. Areas of concern

- More training on the latest development in the areas of the respective programme.
- More focus on best practice sharing.

c. Opportunities for improvement

- The Learning and Teaching Strategy has to be reviewed.
- Encourage peer review for improvement purposes.

Table 7: Programme planning and Management

Reference Point	Standard for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
13.1.1	The programme is aligned with the overall institutional mission and vision.	3	4
13.1.2	The programme meets national accreditation criteria.	3	3
13.1.3	The institution allocates sufficient resources to support the programme.	3	3
13.1.4	There is a programme coordinator(s) responsible for managing and ensuring quality of the programme.	4	4

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

45



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



13.1.5	The mode of delivery takes account of the needs and challenges of all targeted students.	3	3
13.1.6	Staff teaching on the programme has the appropriate type and level of qualification.	3	2
13.1.7	The programme is regularly subjected to internal and external review in a participatory manner to reflect developments in the area of study.	3	3
13.1.8	Programme planning includes a strategy for the use of technology in a manner appropriate to the programme, facilities available, and target students.	4	4
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		26/8= 3.25	26/8= 3.25

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.2.5.2 Curriculum development

a. Institutional strengths

- I. Established process in place for Design of Curriculum.
- II. Involvement of Industry as a stakeholder in the design of curriculum.

b. Areas of concern

- I. Detailed Market analysis needs to be done for developing curriculum relevant to the local market.

c. Opportunities for improvement

- I. Joint development of programmes with local and regional institutions with focus on student mobility

Table 8: Curriculum development

Reference Number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
13.2.1	The curriculum clearly specifies target learners and learning outcomes/competencies for each module/course and for the programme as a whole.	3	3
13.2.2	The curriculum is regularly updated to take account of new knowledge and learning needs to support African development.	2	2
13.2.3	Modules/courses are coherently planned	3	3

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





	and provide a sequenced learning pathway for students towards attainment of a qualification.		
13.2.4	The curriculum includes an appropriate balance of theoretical, practical and experiential knowledge and skills (where applicable) as well as core and elective areas	3	3
13.2.5	The curriculum has been developed to maximize student career pathways, opportunities for articulation with other relevant qualifications, and employment prospects.	3	3
13.2.6	Curriculum development has been informed by thorough research and consultation with relevant stakeholders including public sector planners, industry and other employers	3	3
13.2.7	The curriculum reflects positive African values, gender sensitivity and the needs of society.	2	2
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		19/7=2.71	19/7=2.71

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.2.5.3 Teaching and Learning

a. Institutional strengths

- I. Clear module descriptors and session plans shared with staff and students for teaching and learning.
- II. Adequate learning materials provided. E-learning material available from library and blackboard.

b. Areas of concern

- I. Encourage Tutors to engage the student in increasing student research output.

c. Opportunities for improvement

- I. More student-centered and independent learning to be encouraged among students - Teachers to get more creative while teaching students moving away from traditional teaching

Table 9: Teaching and Learning

Reference Number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
------------------	------------------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------





13.3.1	Teaching and learning are based on explicit learning outcomes which are consistent with programme and course aims.	4	4
13.3.2	A clear strategy is in place to identify the learning materials needed to support programme delivery.	4	3
13.3.3	Learning materials have been clearly presented, include reference to the learning aims and outcomes and an indication of study time.	4	4
13.3.4	The learning materials have been designed with the purpose of engaging students both intellectually, ethically and practically.	3	3
13.3.5	Programme review procedures include materials review and improvement.	3	3
13.3.6	Innovative teaching and learning materials are provided for students.	3	2
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		21/6=3.5	19/6=3.17

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.2.5.4 Assessment

a. Institutional strengths

- I. Well monitored and moderated assessments based on learning outcomes and level of learners.

b. Areas of concern

- I. Feedback to students for all assessments.

c. Opportunities for improvement

- I. Detailed and timely feedback on assessments from lecturers to students.
- II. Students to participate in mid-semester evaluation of courses rather than at the end

Table 10: Teaching and Learning

Reference Number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
------------------	------------------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------





13.4.1	The institution has systems in place for external examiners.	3	3
13.4.2	Clear information about mode of assessment is provided for all courses/modules making up the programme.	4	3
13.4.3	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
13.4.4	The level of challenge of assessments is appropriate to the specific programme and targeted students.	3	3
13.4.5	A variety of assessment methods are used in the programme.	4	3
13.4.6	Marking procedures ensure consistency and accuracy and the provision of feedback to students.	3	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		21/6=3.5	19/6=3.17

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.2.5.5 Programme results

a. Institutional strengths

- I. Easy access to student performance data to respective tutors and Academic Advisor for regular monitoring and improvement of student performance.

b. Areas of concern

- I. Linkage with Industry

c. Opportunities for improvement

- I. Strengthen Industry Advisory Forum to also include student placement as one of the focus areas.

Table 11: Programme results

Reference Number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
13.5.1	Student progress is monitored throughout the programme and early warning is provided for students at risk.	3	3





THE AFRICA-EU PARTNERSHIP

13.5.2	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
13.5.3	Quality student feedback is provided.	3	3
13.5.4	Expert peers and/or professional bodies review the relevance and quality of learning achieved by students.	2	2
13.5.5	There is established linkage with potential employers that facilitate graduate employment.	2	2
13.5.6	Tracer studies of graduates and their employers are conducted to obtain feedback on achievement of graduates.	2	2
13.5.7	The programme has an effective research plan with suitable implementation, evaluation and feedback mechanisms.	2	1
13.5.8	Research and consultancy is undertaken in the subject area to solve industrial problems and support the social and economic development.	1	1
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		18/8=2.25	17/8=2.13

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.2.5.6 Rating summary at Programme Level

Table 12: Rating summary at Programme Level

Major standard	Aggregated Value by University	Aggregated Value by Experts
Programme Planning and Management	3.25	3.25
Curriculum Development	2.71	2.71
Teaching and Learning	3.50	3.17
Assessment	3.50	3.17
Programme Results	2.25	2.13
<u>Total Aggregated Value</u>	15.21/5= 3.04	14.43/5=2.89

<1 = Poor; 1.0-1.99 = Insufficient; 2.0-2.79 = Satisfactory; 2.8-3.5 = Good; and >3.5 = Excellent

Overall quality at programme level is rated:

- By the University as GOOD Quality
- By the experts as GOOD Quality

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

50



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

2.2.6 Conclusions and recommendations

BU, as a young university, only two years old, seems to be on the right and strong footing. It 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 positive remarks made copiously by the stakeholders we met with and the noticeable excitement of the students in studying at the University are signs that BU is meeting its objectives as well as the needs of the local environment. What is now required is for the University to network more closely with the Government of Lesotho and all its relevant agencies to make a strong in-road to the country and make meaningful contributions to the development of capacity that is seriously required.

In doing the aforementioned, attention must be paid to the issue of integrity and credibility associated with the institution of higher learning called a university. The general understanding of a university is an institution located on its own land of about 100 hectares, with well-equipped buildings and set in an aesthetically alluring place that makes it quite inviting to people and comfortable as a teaching and learning environment. Admittedly, the current location of the University in a shopping mall does not sit very well with the psyche of the general populace, especially parents who might be interested to send their children to BU. The Board of Directors should plan to enhance and market their product and should as a matter of urgency relocate to the University's permanent site. BU would be doing itself, the staff, students and the public that wishes them well, a great favour. It is hoped that eventually, the University would become BU, Lesotho and not a campus of BU Botswana as it is currently.

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 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.

There is great and abundant evidence that BU, Lesotho is on the right track of building a quality culture in the institution. The Quality Management Office and the Assistant Dean of the Campus must be congratulated for doing an excellent job of managing the onerous process of getting the whole institution ready and geared up for the AQRM visit. Co-ordinating such a gigantic visit between two campuses is no small feat. The staff 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.

On the basis of all the documentary evidence made available to us, and the objective and painstaking observations made by the Review Team throughout the visit, it is our considered view that the University can benefit from paying attention to a few minor details to boost its quality assurance culture.

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

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 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 levels and qualifications of staff 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.
- In addition to the first point above, staff should be encouraged to engage in practical and useful research to further the teaching and learning processes in the university as well as contribute to the professional and academic growth of the University and meeting the needs of the local community by using research to focus on local problems and needs.
- For the staff to fully participate in the governance of the University, a structured framework should be developed for a comprehensive participation of staff in the overall governance of the University. The University will immensely benefit from staff and students being made to own the University one way or the other, especially as BU is a for-profit venture started from a private sector environment.
- BU, seem to deviate from the governance structure, academic position nomenclature and administrative set up that universities are normally known for. One can appreciate the effort to bring into academia a managerial approach similar to that of business ventures. Surely the transposing of the business culture is a plus to the University. However, deviating too much from the culture of a university may be counter-productive. BU should consider hiring and renaming staff into the academic ranks using the normal academic ranks (from Assistant Lecturer to Professor). Similarly, the administrative cadre should use the nomenclature of Administrative Officers (from Administrative Officers II, Assistant Registrar and Registrar). The various units should be reflected as Faculties, Departments, Schools, Centres, to be headed by Deans, Directors, Provosts, Heads of Departments, etc.
- Being a forward-looking and forward-thinking University operating purely as a business venture, it would be necessary for the proprietors and top management to consider selling some shares, no matter how small or symbolic, to staff (as individuals or and unions) and students (Students Union) in order to enhance commitment, loyalty, as well as foster ownership. These would bring untold and unquantifiable advantages which the University would harvest handsomely in the future.
- 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

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

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.
- While the university focuses on African values being reflected in the curriculum, BU must take concerted steps to fully integrate these into all the curricula of all the programmes in the University.
- The computing programmes follow the strategic focus of the University and are indicative of the 21st century global development in computer education and training. However, efforts should be made to tease out new programmes that reflect where the jobs will be required in the near future.
- It is observed that while the students have a central coordinating body of the Students Representative Council, nothing similar seems to be on ground for the staff. Perhaps the avenue for the formation of a staff union at Maseru campus should be made available, if not already in existence.
- Although there is no Lesotho Manpower Policy in place yet, we commend the University's posture of working with the Government to provide programmes and produce graduates that fit within the Lesotho national objectives. We recommend that until such a policy is in place, BU's programmes should continue to address access, relevance, equity, cost and quality.
- BU, by participating in this AQRM Review Visit, has become a member of a well organised structure within an elaborate QA system on the continent. The AQRM instrument has evolved through a process-based quality management framework directed at transforming higher education in Africa. The University should ensure that the instrument is used to monitor quality assurance processes in every programme, in order to derive maximum benefit from this Review Visit.

The AQRM validation team would like to express its sincere thanks and appreciation to all the staff and students of BU for sparing their precious time in meeting the team for discussion and clarification. Our very best wishes to the University in her future endeavours.



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA

EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP

2.3 The Catholic University of Eastern Africa

2.3.1 Composition of the Review Team

The assessment team consisted of:

- Professor Ingegerd Palmér, former rector, Mälardalen University, Sweden
- Dr. Jefy Mukora, African expert from the Conselho Nacional de Avaliação da Qualidade do Ensino Superior (CNAQ), Mozambique.
- Mrs Gabrielle Hansen, Coordinator from the Association of African Universities.

2.3.2 Introduction to the report

The Catholic University of Eastern Africa (CUEA) was visited by the evaluation team on July 6-7, 2017. The team met with the university management under Vice Chancellor Professor Justus G. Mbae, visited facilities, interviewed stakeholders and verified evidence gathered during self-assessment. The programmes chosen for validation were Bacalaureate (BA), Licentiate (MA) and Doctorate in Theology.

The evaluation team held meetings with the university management, the programme committee, the chief librarian, members of the Directorate for Quality Assurance and a group of stakeholders. The team visited classrooms, laboratories for education and for research, the main library, facilities for innovation work, sports facilities and a students' hostel for female students. Ample documentation for review was provided in the team's meeting room.

2.3.3 Institution's general information

CUEA was established in 1984 and was first 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, ca 25 km from the city center of Nairobi. There are also campuses in Eldoret and Kisumu, and since 2013 a campus in Nairobi's central business district.

Programmes are offered at all levels: Bachelor, Master and Doctorate. The number of bachelor students is 3614 (out of which 56 % women), of master students 530 (51 % women), of doctoral students 133 (37 % women). There are 206 non-degree students. The criteria used for admission comprises of performance on national exams from secondary school, performance on the university's standardized tests, cumulative high school grade average, diplomas and advanced diplomas from recognized institutions, transfer of credits from recognized institutions.

The university charges fees according to the following: domestic students pay US\$ 800 -1200 per semester (2-4 years) at undergraduate level and US\$ 1000-1200 per semester (1-2 years) at post-graduate level. International students pay the same fees as domestic students. By agreement with the Kenyan government some domestic students at undergraduate level pay a fee of US \$ 1100 per year out of which the Kenyan government contributes with US\$ 700. Students studying by online mode pay a fee of US\$ 60 per 3 credit points unit.

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

54



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

The University has loans scholarship and bursary schemes. These are provided by the government. The University provides student housing on campus for some of the theology students. The University cooperates with external organisations, mainly catholic, for further student housing. There is also a number of private hostels in the vicinity of the University campus.

The academic staff comprises 247 persons. There are 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). 41 % of academic staff hold a PhD, and 59 % a master degree.

The University is legally regulated by the Ministry of Education, Kenya and by the Pontificate in Rome. The general management of CUEA is comprised of: The 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. There is a Students Union and an Alumni Association.

The Vice Chancellor is appointed by the university council and the deans are appointed through interviews following advertisement.

The main sources for funding of the University are student fees (85 %) and from training and consultancy services, hire of facilities and accommodation (15 %).

Less than 25 % of staff are involved in research activities and 25 % of the staff research is considered relevant for national development. In 2015/2016, US\$ 7820 was allocated to research. (US\$ 13530 in 2014/2015) In 2016, the university received 2 foreign grants amounting to US\$ 1.08 million (in 2015 US\$ 40 000). A national grant amounting to US\$ 193517 has so far been received in 2017.

In 2016/2017, three community outreach programmes were run (6 in 2015/2016 and 8 in 2014/2015).

The University is ISO9001- 2008 certified.

2.3.4 African Quality Rating Mechanism Validation at Institutional Level

2.3.4.1 Governance and Management

a. Institutional strengths

- I. The University has clearly stated vision and mission, objectives and strategies, including a Quality Policy. The Quality Assurance is well organised.
- II. The strategic plan for 2012-2022 is strong and contains an Action Plan with timeframes and responsible actors.
- III. The University has a strong Catholic value-based education culture.
- IV. The student representation in councils and committees is good.

b. Areas of concern

- I. The progress of strategic development is not systematically monitored.
- II. The Strategic Plan is not made known to academic staff and students.

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

55



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



c. Opportunities for improvement

- I. Publish the Strategic Plan and the Action Plan at least internally, to make it transparent to staff and allow them to contribute to the University's development.
- II. Make a more detailed Action Plan for 2018-2022.
- III. Develop an institutional monitoring scheme to follow-up on the implementation of strategies. Make changes in the implementation when need is discovered (could be in an objective or in the form for implementation).

Table 1: Governance and Management

Reference Number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
1.1.	The institution has a clearly stated vision, mission, and values with specific goals and priorities.	3	3
1.2.	The institution has specific strategies in place for monitoring achievement of institutional goals and identifying problem areas.	3	3
1.3.	Clear accountability structures for responsible officers are in place.	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
1.5.	The institution has developed quality assurance policies and procedures.	4	4
1.6.	Appropriate mechanisms are in place to evaluate staff in line with performance agreements with relevant authorities.	4	4
1.7.	The institution has put a management information system in place to manage student and staff data, and to track student performance.	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.	3	3
1.9.	The institution has a policy and standard procedures in place to ensure staff and student welfare.	4	4
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		30/9=3.33	30/9=3.33

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.3.4.2 Infrastructure

a. Institutional strengths

- I. A modern Learning Resource Center and an excellent library with access to relevant international and national databases and international textbooks.

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





THE AFRICA-EU PARTNERSHIP

- II. Good computer resources for staff and students.
- III. Good and sufficient classrooms.
- IV. Good and well-maintained laboratories for teaching and for research.
- V. Good sports grounds for studenttr5 and staff recreation and for competitive sports activities at national and university level.
- VI. A very nice and safe campus.

b. Areas of concern

- I. The current available facilities are underutilized, they can host double the present student population.
- II. The costs for maintaining the infrastructure are high.
- III. The evaluation team noted some instability of the wireless access to the computer network.

c. Opportunities for improvement

- I. Increase marketing of opportunities for outsiders to hire facilities.
- II. Improve recreational and welfare facilities by installing a well-equipped fitness center.
- III. Up-date laboratories for science

Table 2: Infrastructure

Reference Number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
2.1.	The institution has sufficient lecturing spaces to accommodate student numbers taking the institutional mode of delivery into account.	4	4
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	4
2.3.	Academic and Administrative Staff have access to computer resources and the Internet.	4	4
2.4.	Students have access to computer resources and the internet at a level appropriate to the demands of the institutional mode of delivery	4	4
2.5.	The institution has sufficient laboratory facilities to accommodate students in science programs, taking institutional mode of delivery into account.	4	4
2.6.	Laboratory equipment is up to date and well maintained.	3	3
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	4
2.8.	The institution makes provision for managing and maintaining utilities and ensuring that appropriate safety	4	4

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION



	measures are in place.		
	Total assessment value / Aggregated value	30/8=3.75	31/8=3.88

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.3.4.3 Finance

a. Institutional strengths

- I. The University owns valuable land.
- II. The University has a good brand through its Catholic basis and the proven social impact since its beginning.
- III. An alumni association with members engaged in supporting the University.
- IV. Excellent facilities like the Learning Resource Centre that can create income.

b. Areas of concern

- I. The present mismatch between income and expenditures
- II. Funding for research and community projects
- III. Recruitment of students

c. Opportunities for improvement

- I. Immediately make a plan for earning more income from the good facilities such as the Learning Resource Centre (investigate the market, build marketing strategies etc.)
- II. Establish a plan for developing the education offer through new programmes. E.g. a programme in sports to take advantage of the good sports facilities and good national performance in some sports.
- III. Use the University's values and the facilities, including the serene and safe campus, in marketing the study programmes.
- IV. Offer more attractive courses online.
- V. Encourage research staff to apply for funding from national, regional and international sources. Create a support structure for making applications, i.e. set up a group of staff to provide information on available funding sources (and for which specific research areas), their various objectives and requirements, time and procedures for applying.
- VI. Provide support in writing applications.

Table 3: Finance

Reference Number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
3.1.	The institution has access to sufficient financial resources to achieve its goals in line with its budget and student unit cost.	2	2
3.2.	The institution has procedures in place to attract funding, including from industry and the corporate sector.	2.5	3





THE AFRICA-EU PARTNERSHIP

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
3.4.	The institution provides financial support to deserving students (institutional bursaries and/or scholarships).	3	3
3.5.	Information about financial aid and criteria for its allocation is provided to students and other stakeholders.	3	3
3.6.	The institution publishes income and expenditure statements.	2.5	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		16/6=2.67	17/6=2.83

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.3.4.4 Teaching and Learning

a. Institutional strengths

- I. The University has a well-qualified academic staff.
- II. There are a number of staff members with innovative ideas on teaching.
- III. The University provides online-teaching

b. Areas of concern

- I. Students should become independent learners.
- II. Access points to ICT for students are too few.

c. Opportunities for improvement

- I. Develop the students as independent learners.
- II. Provide staff development in innovative teaching methods
- III. Revise the Quality Assurance Policy regarding QA for programmes (not only for courses). e.g. appoint teachers responsible for whole programmes when needed.
- IV. CUEA could benefit from benchmarking with other relevant universities to judge its levels of performance in teaching, research, community outreach, governance and funding, e.g. through an exchange programme for staff and students.

Table 4: Teaching and Learning

Reference Number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
4.1.	The institution encourages and rewards teaching and learning innovation.	3	3
4.2.	The institution has procedures in place to support the induction to teaching, pedagogy, counseling and the upgrading of staff teaching and learning skills through continuing education and lifelong learning.	2.83	3
4.3.	Students have sufficient opportunity to engage with staff	2.83	3

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION



	members in small groups, individually or via electronic platforms.		
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.	3.33	3
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.	3.50	3
4.6.	The institution has developed a policy or criteria for staff recruitment, deployment, development, succession planning and a system of mentorship and/or apprenticeship.	3	3
4.7.	Student support services, including academic support and required counseling services are provided, in line with the institutional mode of delivery.	3.33	3
4.8.	The institution has mechanisms in place to support students to become independent learners, in line with the institutional mode of delivery.	3.17	3
4.9.	The institution has a devoted office to promote international cooperation and enhance Intra-Africa mobility of students and staff.	3.17	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		28.67/9=3.24	27/9=3

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.3.4.5 Research, Publication and Innovation

a. Institutional strengths

- I. Interdisciplinary forum held regularly to develop joint projects
- II. Undergraduate and post-graduate students take research courses for credit units.

b. Areas of concern

- I. Funding for research, both own allocation and from external sources
- II. Heavy workload for some academic staff in teaching and supervision

c. Opportunities for improvement

- I. Make use of the good and experienced researchers to develop the research capacity of the not so experienced academic staff. e.g. by creating research groups led by senior scholars.
- II. See also under *iii* Infrastructure the recommendation on encouraging and supporting academic staff to apply for research funding.

Table 5: Research, publication and innovation

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





THE AFRICA-EU PARTNERSHIP

Reference Number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
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.	4	4
5.2.	The institution has a policy and/or strategy on Innovation, Intellectual Property Ownership and Technology Foresight.	3	2
5.3.	The institution has demonstrated success in attracting research grants from national or international sources and in partnership with industry.	4	4
5.4.	The institution has procedures in place to support academic staff to develop and enhance their research skills, including collaborative research and publication	4	4
5.5.	Staff and students publish their research in accredited academic journals and apply for patents (where relevant).	3	3
5.6.	Researchers are encouraged and supported to present their research at national and international conferences.	4	4
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	3
5.8.	The institution encourages and rewards research whose results are used by society.	4	4
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.	2	2
5.10.	The institution has established linkages to promote international joint research and publications	4	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		35/10=3.5	33/10=3.3

2.3.4.6 Community / Societal Engagement

a. Institutional strengths

- I. Students enjoy community service and large numbers participate in this.
- II. Students get certificates of participation after doing community service.

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION



III. The surrounding local community views the University as highly beneficial.

b. Areas of concern

- I. Funding for community engagement.
- II. The knowledge of the University's competences and outreach activities is low in the local community.

c. Opportunities for improvement

- I. Improve communication to the outside world on what the University does and can provide that could be of use/interest to communities/firms/organisations.
- II. Consider making a policy on student's involvement in service programmes for communities and industries. Certificates of such student's activities can be of use for employers, and thus attractive to potential students.

Table 6: Community / Societal Engagement

Reference Number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
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.	3	3
6.2.	The institution encourages departments and staff to develop and implement strategies for community engagement.	4	4
6.3.	Students are required to engage with communities through their academic work.	3	3
6.4.	The institution has forged partnerships with other education sub-sectors to enhance the quality of education in the country and region.	4	4
6.5.	The Institution disseminates information on its community engagement activities to the local community.	2	2
6.6.	The institution offers relevant short courses to the community/broader society based on identified needs and supporting identified economic opportunities.	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	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		24/7=3.4	22/7=3.1

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.3.4.7 Rating Summary at Institutional Level

Table 7: Rating Summary at Institutional Level

Major Standard	Aggregated Value by University	Aggregated value by Experts
----------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION



THE AFRICA-EU PARTNERSHIP

Governance and Management	3.33	3.33
Infrastructure	3.75	3.87
Finances	2.67	2.83
Teaching and Learning	3.24	3
Research, Publication and Innovation	3.50	3.3
Societal Engagement	3.40	3.1
Total	19.89/6=3.315	19.43/6=3.24

<1 = Poor; 1.0-1.99 = Insufficient; 2.0-2.79 = Satisfactory; 2.8-3.5 = Good; and >3.5 = Excellent

Overall quality at institutional level is rated:

- By the University as GOOD Quality
- By the experts as GOOD Quality

2.3.5 African Quality Rating Mechanism Validation at Programme Level

The University had chosen its degree programmes in Theology for validation at programme level. The evaluation team met with the faculty and department management, some academic staff and students at PhD-level with experience from undergraduate and master level. The department provided good documentation for its ratings.

2.3.5.1 Programme Planning and Management

a. Institutional strengths

- The faculty has well-qualified academic staff.
- Good international textbooks are used.
- The Quality Assurance is both according to the Kenyan University Law and by the Pontificate in Rome.

b. Areas of concern

N/A

c. Opportunities for improvement

- Consider appointing programme coordinators for the degree programmes, for the Quality Assurance of the whole programme in addition to the courses.

Table 8: Programme Planning and Management

Reference point	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment value by University	Assessment value by experts
7.1.	The programme is aligned with the overall institutional mission and vision.	4	4
7.2.	The programme meets national accreditation criteria.	4	4
7.3.	The institution allocates sufficient resources to support the programme.	3	3

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION



7.4.	There is a programme coordinator(s) responsible for managing and ensuring quality of the programme.	4	3
7.5.	The mode of delivery takes account of the needs and challenges of all targeted students.	4	4
7.6.	Staff teaching on the programme have the appropriate type and level of qualification.	4	4
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	4
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	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		30/8=3.75	29/8=3.63

2.3.5.2 Curriculum Development

a. Institutional strengths

I. Curricula are regularly revised every 4th year.

b. Areas of concern

- I. There are no learning outcomes for degree programmes.
- II. Gender sensitivity is not obvious in the curriculum.

c. Opportunities for improvement

- I. Develop programme-specific learning outcomes for degree programmes.
- II. Make explicit in the curricula the faculty's view on gender sensitivity.

Table 9: Curriculum Development

Reference point	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment value by University	Assessment value by experts
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
8.2.	The curriculum is regularly updated to take account of new knowledge and learning needs to support African development.	4	4
8.3.	Modules/courses are coherently planned and provide a sequenced learning pathway for students towards attainment of a qualification.	4	4
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	4
8.5.	The curriculum has been developed to maximize student career pathways, opportunities for articulation with other	4	4





	relevant qualifications, and employment prospects.		
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
8.7	The curriculum reflects positive African values, gender sensitivity and the needs of society.	4	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		27/7=3.85	25/7=3.57

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.3.5.3 Teaching and Learning

a. Institutional strengths

I. Several teachers use innovative teaching methods.

b. Areas of concern

I. Learning outcomes are not programme-specific for degree programmes

c. Opportunities for improvement

I. For the degree programmes, consider developing the student's independent learning through innovative teaching methods and learning materials.

Table 10: Teaching and Learning

Reference point	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment value by University	Assessment value by experts
9.1.	Teaching and learning are based on explicit learning outcomes which are consistent with programme and course aims.	3	3
9.2.	A clear strategy is in place to identify the learning materials needed to support programme delivery.	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	3
9.4.	The learning materials have been designed with the purpose of engaging students intellectually, ethically and practically.	3	3
9.5.	Program review procedures include materials review and improvement.	4	4
9.6.	Innovative teaching and learning materials are provided for students.	3	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		19/6=3.16	19/6=3.16

2.3.5.4 Assessment

a. Institutional strengths

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





- I. External examiners are used when required by law
- II. Continuous assessment is used when appropriate.

b. Areas of concern

N/A

c. Opportunities for improvement

- I. External examiners are beneficial also when not required.

Table 11: Assessment

Reference point	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment value by University	Assessment value by experts
9.1.	The institution has systems in place for external examiners.	4	3
9.2.	Clear information about mode of assessment is provided for all courses/modules making up the programme.	4	4
9.3.	Assessment is used as an integral part of the teaching and learning process and seeks to ensure that students have mastered specific outcomes.	3	3
9.4.	The level of challenge of assessments is appropriate to the specific program and targeted students.	4	4
9.5.	A variety of assessment methods are used in the programme.	4	4
9.6.	Marking procedures ensure consistency and accuracy and the provision of feedback to students.	3	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		22/6=3.66	21/6=3.5

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.3.5.5 Programme Results

a. Institutional strengths

- I. The faculty has a close relation to a part of the potential employers.

b. Areas of concern

- I. Relations to other employers than just the Catholic church and its parishes

c. Opportunities for Improvement

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





I. Consider ways of informing students on what the faculty/the departments have undertaken from the students' views in their evaluations.

Table 12: Programme Results

Reference point	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment value by University	Assessment value by experts
10.1.	Student progress is monitored throughout the programme and early warning is provided for students at risk.	3	3
10.2.	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
10.3.	Quality student feedback is provided.	4	3
10.4.	Expert peers and/or professional bodies review the relevance and quality of learning achieved by students.	3	3
10.5.	There is established linkage with potential employers that facilitate graduate employment.	4	4
10.6.	Tracer studies of graduates and their employers are conducted to obtain feedback on achievement of graduates.	3	3
10.7.	The programme has an effective research plan with suitable implementation, evaluation and feedback mechanisms.	3	3
10.8.	Research and consultancy is undertaken in the subject area to solve industrial problems and support the social and economic development.	2	2
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		25/8=3.12	24/8=3

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.3.5.6 Rating Summary at Programme Level

Major Standard	Aggregated Value by University	Aggregated value by Experts
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
Total	17,54/5 =3.51	16.86/5=3.37

<1 = Poor; 1.0-1.99 = Insufficient; 2.0-2.79 = Satisfactory; 2.8-3.5 = Good; and >3.5 = Excellent

Overall quality at Programme level is rated:

- By the University as EXCELLENT Quality
- By the experts as GOOD Quality

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

2.3.6 Conclusions and recommendations

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 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.

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 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.



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



**UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA**



EUA

European University Association



ENQA

EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

2.4 Crawford University, Nigeria

2.4.1 Composition of the Review Team

The AQRM validation of the self-rating instrument and External assessment was done through teams of experts and was based on the Self-Assessment Report of the programme by the relevant peers. The membership consisted of three (3) persons as follows:

- Prof. Andy Gibbs, QA Expert, United Kingdom
- Dr. Beatrice Achieng’ Odera-Kwach, Senior Assistant Commission Secretary, Commission for University Education, Kenya
- Ms. Nodumo Dhlamini, Director ICT Service and Knowledge Management, AAU, Ghana

2.4.2 Institution’s general information

Crawford University is a private University established by the Apostolic Faith Mission. The University received its operating license from the Federal Government of Nigeria on the 9th June 2005 and opened to 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 & 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”.

2.4.3 African Quality Rating Mechanism Validation at Institutional Level

A tentative programme and list of evidences required for the AQRM Mission to Crawford University was prepared and sent to the institution ahead of the scheduled visit on 20th to 22nd June 2017.

Day One

The team of experts arrived in Crawford University, Nigeria on the 19th June 2017. A brief meeting to familiarize with expectations and the schedule of the verification was held at the hotel at 6pm on 19th June 2017. The team agreed on modalities of the verification exercise.

Day Two

On 20th June at 8.30 am the Team paid a courtesy call on the Vice Chancellor and University Management. The VC welcomed the Team to the University and after the introduction of the Panel he

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA

EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



THE AFRICA-EU PARTNERSHIP

made remarks where he outlined the vision, mission and objectives of the University. The team was informed that the University had a strategic plan that was being implemented gradually; various achievements of the university was outlined. A group photograph was taken with the VC, Experts and Senior Management as shown in Group Photo 1.

A meeting with the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) including the Director Academic Planning and QA Director and other members of the QA subcommittee on the modalities of conducting the verification was held. During the meeting the Team asked the Committee members if they had jointly filled the questionnaire. The response was that they were not aware of the questionnaire and it had been filled by one person. In the meeting, it was agreed that the QAC would complete the questionnaire and resubmit. The Team also met with the QA committee for the AQRM to verify documentation provided.

After a health break the Team of experts held a meeting with the members of the Department of Accounting within the College Business and Social Sciences.

The Team also met with various stakeholders of the University including the representatives of the community, industry and parents.

The Team then toured the university including the Administrative Building; University Library; International Student Office; Computer Centre; Multipurpose Hall and the lecture rooms, Academic staff offices and student hostels.

After the tour the team made a summary of the evaluation of the facilities, student and staff support services and the overall academic and non-academic staff profiles for the Accounting Programme under evaluation.

Day 3.

The day started with a meeting with the students, which was composed of foreign students, students of 1st year to 4th year and the student representative Council President, Deputy President and Secretary.

This was followed by a consultative meeting of the Team to recap the day’s activities and prepare a summary of observations and recommendations for the oral feedback to the University Management in an exit session on the general outcome of the AQRM assessment exercise. During this time the Team also verified evidence presented.

The team also met with an alumnus of the University and the Proprietor of the University.

The oral feedback was presented to the University management subsequently in the later part of the day.

2.4.3.1 Governance and Management

a. Institutional Strengths

- I. The License to operate as a Private University Act 9 of 1993 was granted on 9th June 2005 to the University. The “Proposed Crawford University; Academic Brief, October 2004 of the University provides for the establishment, rules and responsibilities of the

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

Board of Trustees (Chairman); Governing Council Chancellor (Pro-Chancellor); Senate (Vice Chancellor), Senate, Registrar, Bursar and Librarian, Dean of College, College Board, Directors and Head of Department.

- II. The governance structures are in place with clear roles: BoT, Governing Council, Senate and Student Representative Council;
- III. The Governance Structure provides a centralized and top down form of governance which comprises the;
 - Board of Trustees
 - Chancellor
 - University Council
 - Senate;
- IV. The University operates a collegiate system of two colleges; College of Natural and applied sciences and College of Business and Social Sciences;
- V. The Staff, and external stakeholders are represented in the University Council as per the License and other governance structures of the university in terms of gender;
- VI. The Students Representative Council is established;
- VII. There are forms of evaluation of academic staff;
- VIII. The University has established developed quality assurance policies and procedures and established a Quality Assurance Directorate;
- IX. There is a management information system for data capturing, however there is need to build a strong reporting system for quality assurance.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. The mission statements did not address the thematic focus of the institution such as science and technology, management and business administration.
- II. The Mission and Vision statements and the Core Values of the University were not displayed in a majority of the premises;
- III. There are clear administrative and academic structure of the university on the ground, but they are not in any published format;
- IV. No clear accountable structures of the academic and administrative officers;
- V. Students were not members of the Senate;
- VI. No clear policy on diversity of staff and students, representation of women and disabled;
- VII. Poor representation of women amongst the administrative and academic staff;
- VIII. Representation of international students is very low in the institution with only 12 students 9 from Benin, one from Uganda and the other 2 from Gambia;



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

- IX. The university has a strategic plan and current Administration 12-Point Agenda but not in published format: and
- X. Most of the policies of the University were in draft format and not published.

c. Opportunities of improvement

- I. Mission and Vision statements and the objectives of the University should be revised to indicate the thematic focus of the University and thereafter displayed in other areas in the institution;
- II. Develop separate administrative and academic organogrammes with clear accountability structures;
- III. Students should be represented in the senate to allow them to participate in decision making in relation to their education;
- IV. The University should market its products to attract more international students;
- V. Representation of women should be increased in the governance and faculty of the university;
- VI. The strategic plan for the University for short and long-term planning should be published; and
- VII. The draft policies should be finalized and published.

Table 1: Governance and Management

Reference Number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
1.1	The institution has a clearly stated vision, mission, and values with specific goals and priorities.	4	3
1.2	The institution has specific strategies in place for monitoring achievement of institutional goals and identifying problem areas.	3	3
1.3	Clear accountability structures for responsible officers are in place.	4	2
1.4	Where appropriate, staff, students and external stakeholders are represented in governance structures. Governance structures are representative in terms of gender.	3	2
1.5	The institution has developed quality assurance policies and procedures.	3	3



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



1.6	Appropriate mechanisms are in place to evaluate staff in line with performance agreements with relevant authorities.	4	4
1.7	The institution has put a management information system in place to manage student and staff data, and to track student performance.	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.	2	1
1.9	The institution has a policy and standard procedures in place to ensure staff and student welfare.	3	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		29/9=3.22	24/9=2.67

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.4.3.2 Infrastructures

a. Institutional Strengths

- V. The University is situated in a serene area, conducive to learning, with plenty of space for study;
- VI. The infrastructure meets the minimum requirements of a University by availing most of the buildings as multi-purpose hall, health center, hostels, ICT center, library, lecture rooms, adequate offices for staff;
- VII. The University has provided adequate computer resources with student computer ratio of 1:6;
- VIII. There is a purpose built functional physical library and digital library with access to e-journals, e-books and other media resources; and
- IX. The Computer Laboratory was well equipped with relevant software applications for teaching and learning;

b. Areas of Concern

- I. There were no sufficient walkways and storm drainage in the campus;
- II. Frequent power outages;
- III. Many buildings do not provide access for the physically challenged;

c. Opportunities for improvement

- I. Construct walkways leading to all buildings in the institution;
- II. Build storm drainage systems in the university to clear rain water; and
- III. Provide access to the physically challenged in the university buildings.

Table 2: Infrastructure





Reference Point	Standard for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
2.1	The institution has sufficient lecturing spaces to accommodate student numbers taking the institutional mode of delivery into account.	3	2
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.	3	3
2.3	Academic and Administrative Staff have access to computer resources and the internet.	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.	2	2
2.5	The institution has sufficient laboratory facilities to accommodate students in science programmes, taking institutional mode of delivery into account.	3	3
2.6	Laboratory equipment is up to date and well maintained.	4	3
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.	2	2
2.8	The institution makes provision for managing and maintaining utilities and ensuring that appropriate safety measures are in place.	3	2
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		23/8=2.88	18/8=2.5

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.4.3.3 Finances

a. Institutional Strengths

- I. The Board of Trustees is committed to mobilizing resources for the University
- II. The Apostolic Faith Church is an important supporter of the University
- III. The University has a funding policy in place that articulates all funding issues
- IV. Participatory Budgeting is used and commences at departmental levels

b. Areas of Concern

- I. The University relies heavily on tuition fees as the only main funding sources;
- II. The Tertiary Education Trust Fund of Nigeria does not provide support for private Universities in Nigeria; and
- III. The University shoulders high overhead costs related to generator costs.

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. The University should diversify its sources of funding;
- II. A fund-raising strategy with a strong marketing plan for the University is recommended;
- III. Alumni could be engaged to support resource mobilization for the University; and
- IV. A visibility strategy for the University’s research outputs could be used to enhance the university’s resource mobilization strategy.

Table 3: Finances

Reference Point	Standard for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
3.1	The institution has access to sufficient financial resources to achieve its goals in line with its budget and student unit cost.	2	3
3.2	The institution has procedures in place to attract funding, including from industry and the corporate sector.	2	2
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
3.4	The institution provides financial support to deserving students (institutional bursaries and/or scholarships).	2	1
3.5	Information about financial aid and criteria for its allocation is provided to students and other stakeholders.	2	2
3.6	The institution publishes income and expenditure statements.	2	2
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		13/6=2.16	13/6=2.16

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.4.3.4 Teaching and Learning

I. Institutional Strengths

- I. The Lecturer/ Student ratio is estimated at 1:11;
- II. The University has 64 academic staff with PhDs representing 61% of the total number of academic staff, full professors number 15 and associate professors are 6;
- III. Serene teaching and learning environment;
- IV. The teaching classrooms meet the minimum required standards;
- V. The computer center is being used to support computer-based teaching;
- VI. Detailed course outlines are developed for all courses;
- VII. The University is actively engaging industry to provide learning and internship opportunities for the students; and
- VIII. The University has a very strong physical and digital library.





**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

II. Areas of Concern

- I. Curriculum policy is only a draft;
- II. Learning outcomes are not clearly spelt out in some of the course outlines;
- III. There are opportunities for mobility of staff and students; and
- IV. There appeared to be limited knowledge of harmonized curricula and qualifications to promote continental mobility.

III. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. The Curriculum policy should be finalized and approved by the University;
- II. Review of learning outcomes articulated in the programme curriculum documents;
- III. Explore new ways of assessing the effectiveness of learning to test learning outcomes;
- IV. Explore the use of technology to fully support the teaching and learning process through e-learning implementation; and
- V. Enhance international cooperation and intra-African mobility of staff and students.

Table 4: Teaching and Learning

Reference Point	Standard for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
4.1	The institution encourages and rewards teaching and learning innovation.	2	2
4.2	The institution has procedures in place to support the induction to teaching, pedagogy, counseling and the upgrading of staff teaching and learning skills through continuing education and lifelong learning.	3	2
4.3	Students have sufficient opportunity to engage with staff members in small groups, individually or via electronic platforms.	3	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.	3	3
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.	3	3
4.6	The institution has developed a policy or criteria for staff recruitment, deployment, development, succession planning and a system of mentorship and/or apprenticeship.	4	3



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



**UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA**



EUA

European University Association



ENQA

EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



4.7	Student support services, including academic support and required counseling services are provided, in line with the institutional mode of delivery.	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.	3	3
4.9	The institution has a devoted office to promote international cooperation and enhance Intra-Africa mobility of students and staff.	3	2
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		26/9=2.88	24/9=2.67

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.4.3.5 Research, Publication and Innovation

a. Institutional Strengths

- I. The University has qualified academic staff who are researching and publishing, evidenced by the numerous published articles and books;
- II. Research outputs are available for the undergraduate and postgraduate students’
- III. Have a well-equipped physical and virtual library to facilitate research;
- IV. Policies guiding undergraduate and postgraduate research developed;
- V. An annual Crawford University Journal of Business and Social Sciences; and
- VI. The University supports and encourages staff to present their research in national conferences.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. Draft research policy not approved by the relevant authorities of the University;
- II. Visibility of research undertaken in the university is poor and not available on the website;
- III. There are no profiles of the highly qualified academic staff on your website
- IV. No evidence of attracting research grants from national and international sources and partnership with industry;
- V. No policy and strategy on innovation, intellectual property ownership and technology foresight.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. The draft research policy should be finalized and approved;
- II. Design and implement an institutional digital repository of knowledge generated in the University;
- III. The University should write proposals to attract funds for research from national, regional, international sources and industry; and
- IV. Develop a policy and strategy on innovation, intellectual property ownership and technology foresight.

Table 5: Research, publication and innovation





Reference Point	Standard for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
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.	3	3
5.2	The institution has a policy and/or strategy on Innovation, Intellectual Property Ownership and Technology Foresight.	2	1
5.3	The institution has demonstrated success in attracting research grants from national or international sources and in partnership with industry.	2	1
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	3
5.5	Staff and students publish their research in accredited academic journals and apply for patents (where relevant).	3	3
5.6	Researchers are encouraged and supported to present their research at national and international conferences.	3	3
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	2
5.8	The institution encourages, and rewards research whose results are used by society	1	1
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.	2	3
5.10	The institution has established linkages to promote international joint research and publications	2	1
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		24/10=2.4	21/10=2.10

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.4.3.6 Community / Societal Engagement

a. Institution Strengths

- I. The location of the University in a rural community with strong community support and collaboration;
- II. There was evidence of societal engagement through the sunflower research, engaging the community in fixing roads and improving security;





THE AFRICA-EU PARTNERSHIP

- III. The parent’s forum is another method that the University uses to engage the local community whose students are enrolled at Crawford University; and
- IV. The University avails its facilities for use by the community – e.g. the national registration exercise and the computer-based testing for the joint matriculation board examinations.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. No written policy on community engagement activities;
- II. Various publications are in place and these should be available in a repository to disseminate information and knowledge to the community; and
- III. Dissemination of community engagement activities is not extensive.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. Develop and implement a policy on community engagement;
- II. Undertake relevant short courses for the community; and
- III. Document and disseminate community engagement activities.

Table 6: Community / Social Engagement

Reference Point	Standard for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
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	3	2
6.2	The institution encourages departments and staff to develop and implement strategies for community engagement.	3	3
6.3	Students are required to engage with communities through their academic work.	2	2
6.4	The institution has forged partnerships with other education sub-sectors to enhance the quality of education in the country and region.	2	2
6.5	The Institution disseminates information on its community engagement activities to the local community.	2	2
6.6	The institution offers relevant short courses to the community/broader society based on identified needs and supporting identified economic opportunities.	2	1
6.7	The institution makes its facilities available (where possible) to the local community in support of community and socio-economic development activities.	3	4

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION



Total assessment value / Aggregated value	17/7=2.43	16/7=2.29
--	------------------	------------------

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.4.3.7 Rating Summary at Institutional Level

Table 7: Rating summary at Institutional Level

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

Major Standard	Aggregated Value by University	Aggregated value by Experts
Governance and Management	3.22	2.67
Infrastructure	2.88	2.5
Finances	2.16	2.16
Teaching and Learning	2.88	2.67
Research, Publication and Innovation	2.4	2.10
Societal Engagement	2.43	2.29
Total	16.77/6=2.68	13.82/6=2.4

<1 = Poor; 1.0-1.99 = Insufficient; 2.0-2.79 = Satisfactory; 2.8-3.5 = Good; and >3.5 = Excellent

At the institutional level comparison, the University rated it-self at 2.8 while the Team’s rating came up to a rating score of 2.3046, a difference of 0.50 points. However, it can be deduced that the institution still fell within the range of satisfactory quality, as indicated in Table 7.

Overall quality at institutional level is rated:

- By the university as SATISFACTORY Quality
- By the experts as SATISFACTORY Quality

2.4.4 African Quality Rating Mechanism Validation at Programme Level

2.4.4.1 Programme Planning and Management

a. Institutional Strengths

- The Bachelor of Accounting Programme was aligned with the institution’s vision and mission;
- The programme was accredited by the Nigeria Universities Commission therefore complying with the national accreditation criteria;
- Adequate resources available to support the programme by the university;
- Programmes are subjected to external review;
- The Staff teaching the programme are highly qualified with PhD’s and ranks of professors.

b. Areas of Concern

- There was need to enhance teaching and learning resources; such as adequate number of projectors;

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. The University should acquire additional state of the art teaching and learning resources.

Table 8: Programme Planning and Management

Reference Point	Standard for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
7.1	The programme is aligned with the overall institutional mission and vision.	4	3
7.2	The programme meets national accreditation criteria.	4	4
7.3	The institution allocates sufficient resources to support the programme.	3	3
7.4	There is a programme coordinator(s) responsible for managing and ensuring quality of the programme.	3	3
7.5	The mode of delivery takes account of the needs and challenges of all targeted students.	4	4
7.6	Staff teaching on the programme have the appropriate type and level of qualification.	4	3
7.7	The programme is regularly subjected to internal and external review in a participatory manner to reflect developments in the area of study.	3	3
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	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		29/8=3.63	27/8=3.38

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.4.4.2 Curriculum Development

a. Institutional Strengths

- I. Theoretical, practical and experiential learning are balanced in the curriculum at a ratio of 60:40; and
- II. There is coherence of modules within the curriculum.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. Learning outcomes/competencies are not clearly specified in the curriculum;
- II. It was not evident to show that the curriculum is regularly updated to take account of new knowledge and learning needs to support African development; and
- III. It was not evident that the University conducts market surveys and adopts benchmarks for curriculum development.

c. Opportunities for Improvement





**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

- I. The Curriculum should be reviewed to incorporate learning outcomes/competencies in each module/course;
- II. During review of curriculum new knowledge and learnings needs to support African development should be considered; and
- III. Ensure wider stakeholder involvement in curriculum development;
- IV. Curricula should show explicitly how each of the programmes and courses contributes to the mission outcomes of the University; and
- V. Develop relevant short courses to enable the optimum utilization of the facilities available as part of income-generating activities.

Table 9: Curriculum Development

Reference Point	Standard for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
8.1	The curriculum clearly specifies target learners and learning outcomes/competencies for each module/course and for the programme as a whole.	3	1
8.2	The curriculum is regularly updated to take account of new knowledge and learning needs to support African development.	3	2
8.3	Modules/courses are coherently planned and provide a sequenced learning pathway for students towards attainment of a qualification.	4	4
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
8.5	The curriculum has been developed to maximize student career pathways, opportunities for articulation with other relevant qualifications, and employment prospects.	4	3
8.6	Curriculum development has been informed by thorough research and consultation with relevant stakeholders including public sector planners, industry and other employers	4	3
8.7	The curriculum reflects positive African values, gender sensitivity and the needs of society.	3	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		27/7=3.86	19/7=2.71

2.4.4.3 Teaching and Learning

a. Institutional Strengths

- I. There were adequate resources for teaching and learning;
- II. The Quality Assurance and Training unit trains teachers and students on research;
- III. A computer center is in place and provides sufficiently equipped for teaching and learning;
- IV. Students are exposed to electronic accounting systems;
- V. Support of students to undertake international and national accounting professional courses;

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



- VI. Staff in the Department are highly qualified and from industry; and
- VII. Students have opportunities to attend summits such as the ACCA.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. Provision of more office accommodation of lecturers;
- II. Improve ICT for teaching, learning and research; and
- III. Implement Internship Exchange programmes with other African Universities.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. More visits to industry to facilitate students learning for example Nestle company offered to expose students to understand the management of the supply chain;
- II. Learning outcomes in the BSc Accounting needs review and alignment with required global competencies; and
- III. Facilitate student exchange programs with other African Universities.

Table 10: Teaching and Learning

Reference Point	Standard for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
9.1	Teaching and learning are based on explicit learning outcomes which are consistent with programme and course aims.	3	1
9.2	A clear strategy is in place to identify the learning materials needed to support programme delivery.	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	3
9.4	The learning materials have been designed with the purpose of engaging students both intellectually, ethically and practically.	3	3
9.5	Programme review procedures include materials review and improvement.	2	3
9.6	Innovative teaching and learning materials are provided for students.	2	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		16/6=2.67	16/6=2.67

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.4.4.4 Assessment

a. Institutional Strengths

- I. There is a variety of assessment methods used in the programme by continuous tests including written exams;
- II. External examination system in place;
- III. There is a policy on mode of assessment; and

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





THE AFRICA-EU PARTNERSHIP

IV. There are procedures for marking and feedback to students.

b. Areas of Concern

I. Over reliance on formal examinations which brings associated issues related to constructive alignment, teacher and student workload.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

I. Explore new ways of assessing the effectiveness of learning to test learning outcomes.

Table 11: Assessment

Reference Point	Standard for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
10.1	The institution has systems in place for external examiners.	4	4
10.2	Clear information about mode of assessment is provided for all courses/modules making up the programme.	3	2
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	3
10.4	The level of challenge of assessments is appropriate to the specific programme and targeted students.	3	3
10.5	A variety of assessment methods are used in the programme.	4	3
10.6	Marking procedures ensure consistency and accuracy and the provision of feedback to students.	3	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		21/6=3.5	18/6=3

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.4.4.5 Programme results

a. Institutional Strengths

- I. Good completion rates of students;
- II. Established processes for monitoring student progress and providing feedback;
- III. Tracer studies undertaken at the departmental level; and
- IV. Adequately provided for research in the subject area.

b. Areas of Concern

I. There was no evidence of Alumni Association to support the University; and

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

- II. There was no formal evidence of tracer studies of graduates undertaken by the University; and
- III. Visibility of research is poor.

c. Opportunities of improvement

- I. Actively engage past students to establish an Alumni Association Establish;
- II. Institutionalize trace studies in the university; and
- III. Create a digital the repository and profile the academic strength of the university on the website.

Table 12: Programme Results

Reference Point	Standard for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
11.1	Student progress is monitored throughout the programme and early warning is provided for students at risk.	4	4
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
11.3	Quality student feedback is provided.	3	3
11.4	Expert peers and/or professional bodies review the relevance and quality of learning achieved by students.	4	3
11.5	There is established linkage with potential employers that facilitate graduate employment.	3	2
11.6	Tracer studies of graduates and their employers are conducted to obtain feedback on achievement of graduates.	4	3
11.7	The programme has an effective research plan with suitable implementation, evaluation and feedback mechanisms.	3	3
11.8	Research and consultancy is undertaken in the subject area to solve industrial problems and support the social and economic development.	1	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		25/8=3.13	24/8=3

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA

EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



THE AFRICA-EU PARTNERSHIP

2.4.4.6 Rating Summary at Programme Level

The University rated itself at the programme level with a score of 3.5, while the Team rated the programme level at 2.951. There was an insignificant difference of 0.55. This placed the overall rating of the programme within the range of Good Quality as indicated in Table 2.

Table 13. Rating Summary at Programme Level

Major Standard	Aggregated Value by University	Aggregated value by Experts
Programme Planning and Management	3.63	3.38
Curriculum Development	3.86	2.71
Teaching and Learning	2.67	2.67
Assessment	3.5	3.0
Programme Results	3.13	3.0
Total	16.8/5=3.35	14.8/5=2.95

<1 = Poor; 1.0-1.99 = Insufficient; 2.0-2.79 = Satisfactory; 2.8-3.5 = Good; and >3.5 = Excellent

Overall quality at programme level is rated:

- By the university as GOOD Quality
- By the experts as GOOD Quality



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION



2.5 Durban University of Technology

2.5.1 Composition of the review team

This report describes the validation visit to the DUT. The visit was undertaken over the period 19-20 June 2017 and the validation team was comprised of:

- Professor Goolam Mohamedbhai, Former Vice-Chancellor, University of Mauritius.
- Professor Margret Flieder, Protestant University of Applied Sciences Darmstadt, Germany (European Expert).
- Dr Violet Makuku, Project Officer, Association of African Universities, Ghana.

2.5.2 Introduction to the report

The filling in of the questionnaire was coordinated by the Centre for Quality Promotion and Assurance (CQPA), which is headed by a Director and has several full-time staff. The questionnaire was sent to management and all the Faculties. It was discussed at one of the monthly meetings convened by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor: Teaching & Learning. A second meeting was held a few weeks later and the questionnaire was eventually finalised. There was thus full ownership of the questionnaire by the institutional stakeholders. There was consensus on fully participating in the AQRM exercise as this was considered as preparation for the Institutional Reviews to be conducted nationally, from 2018 onwards, by the Council on Higher Education.

With regard to the selection of the three best Departments/Subject Areas, requested at the end of Part 1 of the questionnaire, each of the 6 Faculties were invited to submit a maximum of three Departments using the specified criteria. There are 62 academic Departments at DUT. From the submissions received, the CQPA then selected the three best. These are:

1. Department of Biotechnology & Food Technology
2. Department of Public Relations Management
3. Department of Basic Medical Sciences

For the choice of the programme for Part 3 of the questionnaire, DUT does not run any programme in Crop Science or Medicine. From the remaining three subject areas, there was wide agreement that Chemistry was the best one. The selected programme was the new Diploma in Analytical Chemistry.

In preparation of the visit of the verification team, the CQPA had carefully documented all the evidence in support of their assessment of the different parts of the questionnaire. This was very methodically done. The documents were grouped in accordance with the various sections of the questionnaire, placed in labelled files and arranged in two cupboards. A complete index of the files and the documents therein was prepared to facilitate reference.

Visit of the Validation Team

The visit took place over two full days on 19 and 20 June 2017. However, as all the three members of the validation team were in Durban on 18 June evening, an informal meeting was arranged at the





**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

team's hotel with Mrs K. Sattar, Director of the CQPA and the main coordinator of the AQRM Questionnaire, and Dr L. Samuels, Director of International Education and Partnerships. This brief meeting proved to be very useful. The two-day programme was discussed and the team obtained an insight into the DUT and the process used for completing the questionnaire.

The detailed two-day programme, with the participants in each meeting slot, Initially, on the morning of day 1, it was proposed that the two Experts would hold meetings separately and in parallel, in order to save time. However, after discussion, it was decided that both Experts would meet all the staff together.

The programme enabled the Experts to meet a wide variety of stakeholders: management, academic staff, external stakeholders and students. The site visits in the afternoon of day 1 were undertaken in parallel: Prof Mohamedbhai visited the Steve Biko campus and Prof Flieder the ML Sultan campus. The various units visited (Library, lecture rooms, computer labs, Science, Engineering and Chemistry laboratories, staff offices, the new student residence, the gymnasium, clinic facilities, etc.) are listed in Appendix 1 of the report that was submitted to the institution.

The morning of the second day of the visit was devoted to the inspection of the evidence documents and the verification of the ratings. This was a tedious task, took a lot of time and as part 3 of the questionnaire with respect to the programme could not be completed, it was done later. After meeting staff and students without, respectively, the presence of management and staff, the Chair reported back on the main findings. The report was positively received. Among the main issues that were highlighted were: greater attention to the maintenance of equipment and buildings, the high dropout rates among students, the need for academic staff to upgrade their qualifications to PhD and the importance of having an institutional policy on community engagement.

2.5.3 Institution's general information

The Durban University of Technology (DUT), a public university, is located in the province of KwaZulu Natal in South Africa. It operates from two main sites, one in Durban and the other in Pietermaritzburg, about 80 km away. 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 in terms of 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.

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 focus 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.

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

88



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA

EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

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. The student population is about 28,000, most of whom (84%) are full-time students. Of these, about 70% are registered on Diploma/Certificate programmes, 26% on Bachelor's, 3% on Master's and 1% on Doctorate. There is gender parity among the student population, with a slightly larger number of female students. About 76% of the students are in the age range of 18-25. The student dropout rates are relatively high. For undergraduate programmes, they are 30% in the first year, 28% in the second year and 34% in the third year. For Master's programmes, they are 32% in the first year and 44% in the second year.

The annual undergraduate tuition fees charged by DUT are US\$ 5,342, students from other African countries paying the same fees except for a small additional foreign levy. The fees for international students from outside Africa, however, are twice those for domestic students. Also, the tuition fees for all postgraduate students, domestic or international, are only 19% of those for undergraduates. About 32% of the students benefit from the Government National Student Financial Aid Scheme (NSFAS) loans awarded to the financially needy.

Currently, the main sources of funding to the institution are government (44%), students' fees (37%), and other sources, such as investment, sales of goods, etc. (19%). There is hardly any income from the private sector. It does, however, receive research grants from various sources.

DUT has a total of 629 academic staff, with equal number of male and female staff, giving a staff: student ratio of 1:44. Only 21% of the staff have a PhD. Also, 8% of the staff are at Professor/Associate Professor rank and 60% at Lecturer rank.

The DUT has over 100 agreements and partnerships for student and staff mobility and collaborative research with institutions and organisations throughout the world.

2.5.4 African Quality Rating Mechanism Validation at Institutional Level

2.5.4.1 Governance and Management

a. Institutional Strengths

- I. DUT has a good five-year 2015-2019 Strategic Plan with clear vision, mission, etc.. The plan has recently been updated at mid-term in May 2017.
- II. There is an excellent, dynamic, well-staffed Quality Assurance (QA) Centre and a QA policy exists. QA is properly devolved to the different Faculties.
- III. There is a good governance structure and an effective Council with its various committees.
- IV. There is a transparent and independent process for selecting the Vice-Chancellor and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor.
- V. The institution has achieved gender equity, both among academic staff and students.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. Performance appraisal of staff is not yet in place and implementing a system is proving to be challenging because of resistance from staff unions.

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

89



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



- II. Ensuring equity and diversity of staff is proving to be difficult. This is partly due to the historical background of the university when there was a merger of two Technikons.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. A new Vice-Chancellor has been appointed in October 2016. This provides an opportunity for the institution to address some of its challenges using a fresh approach.
- II. An attempt should be made to cost the various objectives of the Strategic Plan.
- III. Most of the instruments for staff appraisal have been put in place; efforts should now be made to implement them.

Table 1: Governance and Management

Reference Point	Standard for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
1.1	The institution has a clearly stated vision, mission, and values with specific goals and priorities.	4	4
1.2	The institution has specific strategies in place for monitoring achievement of institutional goals and identifying problem areas.	3	4
1.3	Clear accountability structures for responsible officers are in place.	4	4
1.4	Where appropriate, staff, students and external stakeholders are represented in governance structures. Governance structures are representative in terms of gender.	4	4
1.5	The institution has developed quality assurance policies and procedures.	4	4
1.6	Appropriate mechanisms are in place to evaluate staff in line with performance agreements with relevant authorities.	2	1
1.7	The institution has put a management information system in place to manage student and staff data, and to track student performance.	3	4
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.	2	2
1.9	The institution has a policy and standard procedures in place to ensure staff and student welfare.	3	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		29/9 = 3.22	30/9= 3.33

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.5.4.2 Infrastructure

a. Institutional Strengths

- I. Several new infrastructure projects have recently been completed or are underway, e.g. a new student residence block, an extension of the main building of the Steve Biko campus with new computer labs, lecture venues, etc.

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





- II. Several departments have been able to acquire new equipment through external research funding.
- III. There are very good library facilities for both staff and students.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. Because of lack of funding, maintenance of infrastructure has not been possible, causing inconveniences to staff and students.
- II. The planned increase in student enrolment will place greater pressure on the existing infrastructure (laboratories, lecture theatres, residences).
- III. The items of equipment in several laboratories are out of date or not functional.
- IV. The staff offices in some Departments are either inadequate or insufficient.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. There is need for wider and more reliable access to Wi-Fi throughout the institution as this will be greatly beneficial to students in their teaching and learning.
- II. As student numbers increase, more student residences will need to be put up.
- III. Efforts should be made to improve staff offices and increase their numbers.
- IV. More funds should be allocated for maintenance.

Table 2: Infrastructure

Reference Point	Standard for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
2.1	The institution has sufficient lecturing spaces to accommodate student numbers taking the institutional mode of delivery into account.	3	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.	3	3
2.3	Academic and Administrative Staff have access to computer resources and the internet.	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	3
2.5	The institution has sufficient laboratory facilities to accommodate students in science programmes, taking institutional mode of delivery into account.	3	2
2.6	Laboratory equipment is up to date and well maintained.	2	2
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.	2	3
2.8	The institution makes provision for managing and maintaining utilities and ensuring that appropriate safety measures are in place.	2	2
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		21/8 = 2.63	21/8=2.63

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.5.4.3 Finances

a. Institutional Strengths

- I. DUT has a strong Finance Department, with good controls in place.
- II. The budget has been balanced over the past couple of years, and annual externally-audited accounts are published in time.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. The national policy with regard to students’ fees is currently uncertain. Any significant reduction in fees could have a negative impact on the resources available to the institution.
- II. The funding received from industry or the private sector is very limited.
- III. There is significant bureaucracy in the procurement processes.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. The current personnel cost (68% of income) is quite high and needs to be brought down to the national benchmark of 58-62%.
- II. There is need for a more vigorous marketing of the institution, which would encourage more funding from industry/private sector.
- III. The institution’s alumni could, if properly targeted, provide additional resources.

Table 3: Finances

Reference Point	Standard for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
3.1	The institution has access to sufficient financial resources to achieve its goals in line with its budget and student unit cost.	2	2
3.2	The institution has procedures in place to attract funding, including from industry and the corporate sector.	2	2
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
3.4	The institution provides financial support to deserving students (institutional bursaries and/or scholarships).	2	2
3.5	Information about financial aid and criteria for its allocation is provided to students and other stakeholders.	3	3
3.6	The institution publishes income and expenditure statements.	4	4
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		16/6 = 2.67	16/6 = 2.67

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.5.4.4 Teaching and Learning

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





a. Institutional Strengths

- I. The institution is very active in international cooperation, encouraging mobility of staff and students.
- II. DUT has a comprehensive human resources policy for recruitment and appointment of staff.
- III. The institution has a wide pool of motivated academic staff.
- IV. Good procedures are in place to support students working in groups.
- V. There is good library support, especially for open access to publications.
- VI. There is a good orientation programme for new and young academics.
- VII. The in-service placement of students in industry is commendable.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. In most Departments, there are too few academic staff having a PhD.
- II. The current staff: student ratio is too high and well above the national average.
- III. The student drop-out rates at all levels and throughout the years of study are quite high.
- IV. There is a danger that the beneficial in-service training in industry may be curtailed as student numbers grow.
- V. There are relatively few intra-African collaborative agreements, including for staff and student mobility.
- VI. Some of the lecture rooms and laboratory facilities are too small to accommodate the increasing number of students, and facilities (e.g. chairs and white boards) are not well-maintained.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- DUT needs to be more active intra-Africa with regard to staff and student mobility.
- The number of Bachelor’s programmes and number of Bachelor’s students need to be increased.
- It should be ensured that there is good Wi-Fi access in all lecture rooms.
- Academic staff should be encouraged to upgrade their qualification to PhD.

Table 4: Teaching and Learning

Reference Point	Standard for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
4.1	The institution encourages and rewards teaching and learning innovation.	3	3
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.	3	3
4.3	Students have sufficient opportunity to engage with staff members in small groups, individually or via electronic platforms.	3	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.	2	2

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





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.	3	3
4.6	The institution has developed a policy or criteria for staff recruitment, deployment, development, succession planning and a system of mentorship and/or apprenticeship.	3	3
4.7	Student support services, including academic support and required counselling services are provided, in line with the institutional mode of delivery.	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.	3	3
4.9	The institution has a devoted office to promote international cooperation and enhance Intra-Africa mobility of students and staff.	3	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		26/9=2.89	26/9=2.89

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.5.4.5 Research, publication and Innovation

a. Institutional Strengths

- I. DUT has a good and well-staffed research office to promote research.
- II. All the research publications are recorded in the Research Annual Reports.
- III. The institution holds an annual Research Day for new researchers.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. Too few of the academic staff have a PhD and this affects the research output.
- II. The procurement regulations are too complicated and slow, and this handicap the implementation of research projects.
- III. The lack of a Creative Art policy for recognising the research output of artists does not encourage research in Arts.
- IV. Academic staff do not communicate their research findings to the larger community.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. There is need to increase opportunities for staff exchange with other universities.
- II. More research of relevance to the community should be undertaken.
- III. The contract period for research officers, currently of 3 months' duration, should be increased.
- IV. The institution should encourage the funding of post-doctoral students from other African universities to enable academic staff to proceed on sabbatical leave in connection with their PhD.

Table 5: Research, publication and Innovation





Reference Point	Standard for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
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.	3	3
5.2	The institution has a policy and/or strategy on Innovation, Intellectual Property Ownership and Technology Foresight.	3	3
5.3	The institution has demonstrated success in attracting research grants from national or international sources and in partnership with industry.	4	4
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	3
5.5	Staff and students publish their research in accredited academic journals and apply for patents (where relevant).	3	3
5.6	Researchers are encouraged and supported to present their research at national and international conferences.	4	4
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	3
5.8	The institution encourages and rewards research whose results are used by society	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	3
5.10	The institution has established linkages to promote international joint research and publications	3	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		31/10=3.1	31/10=3.1

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.5.4.6 Community / Societal Engagement

a. Institutional Strengths

- I. In some Departments, the final year project is geared towards the need of the community.
- II. DUT has projects to enable it to engage with the community, e.g. the Health Awareness Day and the Urban Futures Centre.
- III. DUT has a special semester module on community engagement for its students.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. There is no formal institutional policy and procedure specifically for community engagement.
- II. There are no institutional funds allocated for engagement with the community.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





- I. DUT should develop an institutional community engagement policy.
- II. An office or even directorate for community engagement should be established and adequate funds provided to it.
- III. Community engagement should be made an explicit/implicit part of every programme.
- IV. Gearing teaching and research towards achieving the Sustainable Development Goals in Africa can provide immense opportunities for engaging with the community.

Table 6: Community / Societal Engagement

Reference Point	Standard for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
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	1	1
6.2	The institution encourages departments and staff to develop and implement strategies for community engagement.	2	2
6.3	Students are required to engage with communities through their academic work.	2	2
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
6.5	The Institution disseminates information on its community engagement activities to the local community.	2	2
6.6	The institution offers relevant short courses to the community/broader society based on identified needs and supporting identified economic opportunities.	4	4
6.7	The institution makes its facilities available (where possible) to the local community in support of community and socio-economic development activities.	3	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		17/7=2.43	16/10= 2.29

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.5.4.7 Rating Summary at Institutional Level

Table 7: Rating Summary at Institutional Level

Major Standard	Aggregated Value by University	Aggregated value by Experts
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
Total	16.94	16.91
Total/6 = Aggregated Value	2.82	2.82

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





<1 = Poor; 1.0-1.99 = Insufficient; 2.0-2.79 = Satisfactory; 2.8-3.5 = Good; and >3.5 = Excellent

- By the university as GOOD Quality
- By the experts as GOOD Quality

As shown in the Table above, 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.

2.5.5 African Quality Rating Mechanism Validation at Programme Level

2.5.5.1 Programme Planning and Management

a. Programme Strengths

- I. The programme has recently been accredited by the Council on Higher Education of South Africa.
- II. A strong element of the programme is that it incorporates work-integrated learning, which facilitates subsequent employment of the students.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. The programme is operated from two campuses, and this poses some challenge.
- II. The programme is used as a means to access other programmes which are more in demand, for example Chemical Engineering.
- III. Although the drop-out rate is lower than the institutional average, it still is high and needs to be addressed.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. The lecture rooms and laboratories of the Chemistry department should be located on a single campus.
- II. In the planning of the programme, as more students are enrolled, it should be ensured that the benefits of work-integrated learning are not lost.
- III. Again, with the increase in the number of students, it should be ensured that appropriate infrastructure (lecture rooms, laboratories, equipment) is available or acquired if necessary.

Table 8: Programme Planning and Management

Reference Point	Standard for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by	Assessment Value by
-----------------	-----------------------------	---------------------	---------------------

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





		University	Experts
7.1	The programme is aligned with the overall institutional mission and vision.	4	4
7.2	The programme meets national accreditation criteria.	4	4
7.3	The institution allocates sufficient resources to support the programme.	2	2
7.4	There is a programme coordinator(s) responsible for managing and ensuring quality of the programme.	3	3
7.5	The mode of delivery takes account of the needs and challenges of all targeted students.	4	4
7.6	Staff teaching on the programme have the appropriate type and level of qualification.	4	4
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	4
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	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		28/8=3.5	28/8=3.5

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.5.5.2 Curriculum development

a. Programme Strengths

- I. There is a dynamic, multi-sector Advisory Board for the programme.
- II. The curriculum provides opportunities for career pathways.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. There is insufficient feedback from employers of the graduates.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. There should be greater inclusion of African examples and values in the curriculum.

Table 9: Curriculum development

Reference Point	Standard for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
8.1	The curriculum clearly specifies target learners and learning outcomes/competencies for each module/course and for the programme as a whole.	4	4
8.2	The curriculum is regularly updated to take account of new knowledge and learning needs to support African development.	2	2
8.3	Modules/courses are coherently planned and provide a sequenced learning pathway for students towards attainment of a qualification.	4	4

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





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	4
8.5	The curriculum has been developed to maximize student career pathways, opportunities for articulation with other relevant qualifications, and employment prospects.	4	4
8.6	Curriculum development has been informed by thorough research and consultation with relevant stakeholders including public sector planners, industry and other employers	4	4
8.7	The curriculum reflects positive African values, gender sensitivity and the needs of society.	3	2
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		25/7=3.57	24/7=3.43

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.5.5.3 Teaching and Learning

a. Programme Strengths

- I. All academic staff teaching on this programme have a PhD.
- II. Staff/student meetings are held and regular feedback is obtained from students through Questionnaires.
- III. Most of the modules have been placed online on a Blackboard platform for easy access to the students.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. The existing lecture rooms are too small to accommodate the rising number of students.
- II. Quite a few items of equipment need to be repaired and the existing equipment is insufficient for the programme.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. To overcome the difficulty in procuring equipment, consideration should be given to leasing the equipment. This would also solve the problem of maintenance.
- II. As the modules are on an online platform, the students should be trained in e-learning.

Table 10: Teaching and Learning

Reference Point	Standard for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
9.1	Teaching and learning are based on explicit learning outcomes which are consistent with programme and course aims.	4	4
9.2	A clear strategy is in place to identify the learning materials needed to support programme delivery.	4	3
9.3	Learning materials have been clearly presented, include reference to the learning aims and outcomes and an	4	4

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





	indication of study time.		
9.4	The learning materials have been designed with the purpose of engaging students both intellectually, ethically and practically.	3	3
9.5	Programme review procedures include materials review and improvement.	4	4
9.6	Innovative teaching and learning materials are provided for students.	3	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		22/6 = 3.67	21/6 = 3.5

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.5.5.4 Assessment

a. Programme Strengths

- I. Clear procedures for external examination and moderation are in place.
- II. Different methods of assessment, incorporating both theory and practical, are used.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. The drop-out rate is quite high.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. The time taken in assessing the students, especially in seeking the views of external moderators, should be reduced.

Table 11: Assessment

Reference Point	Standard for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
10.1	The institution has systems in place for external examiners.	4	4
10.2	Clear information about mode of assessment is provided for all courses/modules making up the programme.	4	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
10.4	The level of challenge of assessments is appropriate to the specific programme and targeted students.	3	3
10.5	A variety of assessment methods are used in the programme.	3	3
10.6	Marking procedures ensure consistency and accuracy and the provision of feedback to students.	3	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		21/6=3.5	21/6=3.5





Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.5.5.5 Programme Results

a. Programme Strengths

I. The employment rate of those students who complete the programme is excellent.

b. Area of Concern

I. It has not been possible to track the graduates once they have been employed.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. Tracer studies of graduates should be carried out.
- II. The institution should track and monitor its alumni through the use of software.

Table 12: Programme results

Reference Point	Standard for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
11.1	Student progress is monitored throughout the programme and early warning is provided for students at risk.	4	4
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
11.3	Quality student feedback is provided.	4	4
11.4	Expert peers and/or professional bodies review the relevance and quality of learning achieved by students.	4	4
11.5	There is established linkage with potential employers that facilitate graduate employment.	3	3
11.6	Tracer studies of graduates and their employers are conducted to obtain feedback on achievement of graduates.	1	1
11.7	The programme has an effective research plan with suitable implementation, evaluation and feedback mechanisms.	4	4
11.8	Research and consultancy is undertaken in the subject area to solve industrial problems and support the social and economic development.	3	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		26/8=3.25	26/8= 3.25

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.5.5.6 Rating Summary at Programme Level

Major Standard	Aggregated Value by University	Aggregated value by Experts
1. Programme Planning and Management	3.5	3.5
2. Curriculum Development	3.57	3.43

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by: 101





3. Teaching and Learning	3.67	3.5
4. Assessment	3.5	3.5
5. Programme Results	3.25	3.25
Total	17.49	17.18
Aggregated Value = Total/5	3.5	3.44

<1 = Poor; 1.0-1.99 = Insufficient; 2.0-2.79 = Satisfactory; 2.8-3.5 = Good; and >3.5 = Excellent

h Overall quality at programme level is rated:

- By the university as GOOD Quality
- By the experts as GOOD Quality

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.

2.5.6 Conclusions and Recommendations

- I. We agree with DUT’s self-assessment of its overall Institutional Quality Rating as Good.
- II. We agree with the DUT’s self-assessment of the Quality Rating of the programme Diploma in Analytical Chemistry as being in the middle range of Good.
- III. We took note of the three best Departments identified by DUT at the end of part 1 of the questionnaire. The institution used quite a consultative process in arriving at the selection but we were unable to verify whether these were indeed the best.
- IV. From the feedback obtained from DUT, the institution initially experienced a lot of difficulty in filling in the questionnaire online, but the matter was subsequently resolved. Also, the shortage of time for completing the questionnaire proved to be a real constraint.
- V. Although the validation visit was effectively arranged within the two days, we feel that the time to make a thorough verification was far too short. For example, we did not have time to verify the self-rating at programme level before reporting at the oral feedback on the second day. We did the verification afterwards. Three days should have been programmed for the visit.
- VI. The validation team should comprise at least three Experts so that the workload can be effectively distributed.

Our task was greatly facilitated by the excellent way in which the DUT collected and compiled the evidence documents for our consultation. In future, institutions to be validated should be advised to use a similar process.

From experience gained, clear guidelines for the institution should be prepared on how the validation process should be conducted and the visit arranged. The existing guidelines for the Experts may need to be revised.





2.6 University Eduardo Mondlane, Mozambique

2.6.1 Composition of the review team

- Dr Violet Makuku, Association of African Universities, Ghana
- Dr Howard Davies, Senior Adviser, European University Association, United Kingdom
- Mrs. Carla Queiroz, Deputy General Director, Institute for Evaluation, Accreditation and Recognition of Studies in Higher Education, Angola

2.6.2 Introduction to the report

On the 8th and 9th August 2017, a team composed of Dr Violet Makuku (Coordinator) and two Experts, Dr Howard Davies and Dr Carla Queiroz, conducted a visit to the University Eduardo Mondlane (UEM) for its external institutional verification and for the programme verification of the Faculty of Medicine. The visit was a part of the development of the African Quality Rating Mechanism (AQRM) aiming to establish an African system that will ensure that the performance of higher education institutions can be measured against a set of agreed criteria, and to help the institutions carry out self-evaluation exercises to support the development of institutional culture of quality. The programme is developed under the HAQAA Initiative (Harmonisation of African Higher Education Quality Assurance and Accreditation), a three-year initiative funded by the European Union in the context of the Africa-EU Partnership, utilising the AQRM as a key evaluation tool.

On the first day, the team met with the Vice-Chancellor (Rector) and Deputy Vice-Chancellors and Senior Management Team, and with the Quality Assurance Ad-Hoc Sub-Committee. The team also visited the infrastructures, administrative offices, laboratories, lecture rooms, library and other facilities at the main campus and at the Faculty of Medicine. The team also held meetings with students, lecturers, staff and stakeholders at the Faculty of Medicine. On the second day, the team visited accommodation facilities, ICT centre, reprography, lecture rooms and held meetings with lecturers and reviewed documents supporting the self-assessment conducted by UEM.

The methodology involved a careful review of documents supporting the AQRM questionnaire, including strategic and policy documents, procedures and other academic, administrative and finance documents; visits to facilities and infrastructures; two meetings with QA Ad-Hoc Sub-Committee and hearing confidential feedback from students, lecturers and staff members, which was developed within an approach of mutual respect and understanding.

The team acknowledges that the UEM is a recognized and well-established institution and that it has developed as a competitive institution within the country and in the region. After a careful review of the documents and the observations and findings, the team agreed with most of the conclusions made by UEM on its strengths and areas of improvement. However, the team recommends that a more participatory process for the self-evaluation is required in future, involving students, lecturers and all staff and stakeholders.

2.6.3 Institution's general information

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

103



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

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's senior managers are a Rector or Vice-Chancellor and two Deputy-Vice-Chancellors (one for academic affairs and another for administrative affairs). 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.

UEM's has a MISSION to produce and disseminate scientific knowledge and promote innovation through research, extension and outreach activities, while imparting humanistic values onto generations to face contemporary development challenges of the society.

2.6.4 African Quality Rating Mechanism Validation at Institutional Level

2.6.4.1 Governance and Management

a. Institution Strengths

The team observed that UEM has a strategic plan in place (2008-2013, extended to 2017) and has engaged in the last two years in the development of a new Strategic Plan 2017-2027, that soon will be finalized. It was observed that documents and policies are in place and clearly state the procedures and mechanisms for academic, pedagogical and research processes as well as for administrative support services, student support regulations and policies and finance and grants management.

In relation to management structures, the team observed that there are in place systems and mechanisms as well as committed and qualified personnel with clear notion of their responsibilities and duties. The University has a clear vision and mission and is projecting an ambition to move from a teaching led university to a research driven institution.

b. Areas of Concern

The team noticed that there is a prevailing model of vertical and centralised governance structures. In addition there is a lack of or outdated policy documents in some areas, particularly, policies on gender;

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

104



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA

EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



on tolerance; on sexual harassment; on HIV/IDS prevention; on support to staff and students with disability; on innovation, intellectual property ownership and technology foresight. Despite the fact that the UEM has a database for academic management (SIGA) developed internally and that it is progressively incorporating data from 1962 onwards, it is noticed that there is still a lack of an integrated information system. The team expresses the concern in relation to gender balance at all levels and structures and encourages more efforts within the whole institution as to increase women’s participation and representation. It notes that while gender is a strategic axis of UEM’s research policy, there is no commitment to gender balance in the institutional Statutes.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. To improve marketing especially through the website to improve institutional visibility. To the extent possible to maximize the use and translation of documents into English in the website; and to consider which items currently posted on the intranet could usefully be displayed on the public access pages of the UEM website;
- II. To improve SIGA database, as to configure the system and use it to maximize and provide accurate data figures on graduates in the last fifty years and to allow detailed analysis of dropout rates;
- III. To improve and find the right balance, based on consensus, between centralization and decentralization in management;
- IV. To make more efforts within the whole institution as to increase women’s participation and representation;
- V. To increase participation of students in board councils and in meetings and in quality assurance procedures;
- VI. To develop institutional policies on gender, tolerance, sexual harassment, on HIV/AIDS, and on support to staff and students with disability; a strategy or policy on innovation, intellectual property ownership and technology foresight;
- VII. To integrate these policies into the Strategic Plan 2017-2027;
- VIII. To explore ways of maximizing the contribution that all disciplines and departments might make to the national priorities of agriculture, engineering, infrastructure and tourism.

Table 1: Governance and Management

Reference Number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
1.1	The institution has a clearly stated vision, mission, and values with specific goals and priorities.	4	4
1.2	The institution has specific strategies in place for monitoring achievement of institutional goals and identifying problem areas.	4	3.5
1.3	Clear accountability structures for responsible officers are in place.	4	3





1.4	Where appropriate, staff, students and external stakeholders are represented in governance structures. Governance structures are representative in terms of gender.	4	2
1.5	The institution has developed quality assurance policies and procedures.	4	4
1.6	Appropriate mechanisms are in place to evaluate staff in line with performance agreements with relevant authorities.	3	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	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
1.9	The institution has a policy and standard procedures in place to ensure staff and student welfare.	3	2
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		34/9= 3.78	26,5/9= 2.94

2.6.4.2 Infrastructure

a. Institution Strengths

There is a well-equipped structure for administrative support services and infrastructure serving the needs of UEM. There are sufficient lecture rooms and reading spaces, as well as the library which is resourced with equipment and the means to facilitate teaching and learning. The library has more than 100,000 books and materials, uses online resources and has an annual budget allocated for the purchase of books, estimated at USD 100,000, with external funding from World Bank. It is staffed by competent librarians. The team was encouraged to learn that external funding for substantial extension of library space has been secured.

b. Areas of Concern

Regardless the fact that the UEM is the first internet provider in Maputo there are several internal challenges the university is facing in using ICT facilities. Students and lectures report poor access to internet. The University has installed new infrastructure and constructed new buildings, some of which were observed by the External Evaluation Committee during the visit. Despite this substantial improvement programme, many buildings and infrastructure are old, dating from 1962 when the University was created and need serious repairs and maintenance. In addition, students claim for better food provision services within the campus and outside campus. Subsidised meals are not responding to the best choices and wishes of the students.





c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. To make efforts for further expansion, maintenance and repair of buildings and infrastructures and laboratories as to better respond to teaching and research needs;
- II. To improve access to equipment and use of information technologies in schools and faculties, including teaching aids (data show, computers for students);
- III. Improve substantially internet access to students and lectures in campus and outside campus as to facilitate teaching and learning;
- IV. To increase the number and diversity of books in the libraries;
- V. To improve access to food facilities and services for students, using subsidized mechanisms with transparent and clear access criteria;
- VI. Improve access to toilet facilities and maintain hygiene and availability of them for students working in extra hours in the evening.

Table 2: Infrastructure

Reference Number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
2.1	The institution has sufficient lecturing spaces to accommodate student numbers taking the institutional mode of delivery into account.	3	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.	3	3
2.3	Academic and Administrative Staff have access to computer resources and the Internet.	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	3
2.5	The institution has sufficient laboratory facilities to accommodate students in science programs, taking institutional mode of delivery into account.	3	3
2.6	Laboratory equipment is up to date and well maintained.	2	2
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	4
2.8	The institution makes provision for managing and maintaining utilities and ensuring that appropriate safety measures are in place.	2	2.5
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		22/8= 2.75	21/8= 2.94

2.6.4.3 Finance

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





a. Institution Strengths

The team recognizes that there is a robust finance management structure in place. Systems for financial and grants management are also strong and reporting is consistent. The institution publishes annual income and expenditure reports.

b. Areas of Concern

The institution lacks access to sufficient financial resources to achieve its goals in line with its ambition and vision. Although procedures are in place to attract funding, there is a need for a more intensive fundraising effort. The institution does not have in place a Fundraising Office or Strategy and/or a dedicated officer for intermediate the finance department with researchers and lecturers, and for conducting training on research proposal writing and on grant management and reporting.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. To identify alternative ways to diversify university funding sources (sources other than the traditional State Budget, including more outreach and consultancy activities, more short-time courses and services for the community);
- II. To ensure that part of any increased revenue can be used to boost the financial incentives for excellence in teaching and research, in order to minimize the incidence of casualization;
- III. To maximize opportunities for an engagement of a full-time Fundraising Officer;
- IV. To ensure that the relevant financial management skills also exist in Faculties and Research Centres, in view of the relative financial autonomy which they enjoy;
- V. To improve in the implementation of transparent and objective mechanisms and criteria for access to externally and internally awarded scholarships for students and for lecturers applying for Doctorates and Master programmes.

Table 3: Finance

Reference Number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
3.1	The institution has access to sufficient financial resources to achieve its goals in line with its budget and student unit cost.	2	2
3.2	The institution has procedures in place to attract funding, including from industry and the corporate sector.	3	2
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
3.4	The institution provides financial support to deserving students (institutional bursaries and/or scholarships).	4	3
3.5	Information about financial aid and criteria for its allocation is provided to students and other	3	3

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





	stakeholders.		
3.6	The institution publishes income and expenditure statements.	4	4
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		19/6= 3.17	17/6= 2.83

2.6.4.4 Teaching and Learning

a. Institution Strengths

The University and the programme visited demonstrated to have clear academic and pedagogical procedures and systems in place. There is a Centre for Pedagogical Support (CDA) that develops induction to teaching for new lecturers and training for lecturers, composed by 11 modules. Continuing education programmes are in place allowing lecturers and researchers to benefit from scholarships which advance their knowledge. The University has mechanisms to reward teaching and learning innovation for lecturers and researchers, although a more transparent mechanism for attribution of prizes should be in place. The institution has mechanisms for sharing and disseminating institutional information, management of academic and pedagogical issues (through meetings, Faculty Councils, involvement of academic community and stakeholders for business and professional bodies).

The University has in place a very coherent Quality Assurance Manual for self-evaluation, which indicates clearly procedures and mechanisms for the monitoring of teaching, learning and the overall management of the institution.

b. Areas of Concern

A serious concern was raised regarding the opportunities for sufficient student engagement with staff, particularly with lecturers. Students complain of a lack of feedback from lecturers on their assessments and consider that lecturers sometimes use ‘subjective assessment and marking of tests and exams’. Some lecturers experience heavy workloads and it is evident that a significant number of lecturers do not spend all their time at the University, as they feel obliged to teach in other universities due to low salary and poor working conditions, such as poor office spaces, lack of internet connection and of printing facilities.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. To improve the university web-page with regularly updates and publication of all institutional policies and strategies;
- II. To increase the systems and mechanisms for staff recruitment, deployment, development, retention, succession planning and systems of mentorship are in place;
- III. To extend distance learning provision in priority disciplines and in target regions identified by market research;
- IV. Need to develop the systems for supporting students to become more independent learners;
- V. To increase exchange programmes with other universities in Africa and in the world involving students;
- VI. To improve monitoring mechanisms to assess the performance of lecturers;





- VII. To improve monitoring mechanisms for assessment and feedback to students regarding their marks and scores;
- VIII. To conduct annual student’s surveys as to assess the overall quality of teaching, learning, infrastructures, access to facilities and other major issues;
- IX. To establish a QA Committee at faculty levels and at top level as to ensure the implementation of QA policies and systems and to provide an effective link between the QA administrators and the representatives of staff and students;
- X. To improve the mechanism for rewarding the best academic staff and researchers with more clear and transparent rewarding systems;
- XI. To improve the relationship between the University and the industries and other business sectors as to facilitate and improve systems for practices and attachment of students in industries, clinics and other centres;
- XII. To improve outreach programmes and the involvement of the community in activities organized by the University.

Table 4: Teaching and Learning

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
4.1	The institution encourages and rewards teaching and learning innovation.	2	3
4.2	The institution has procedures in place to support the induction to teaching, pedagogy, counseling and the upgrading of staff teaching and learning skills through continuing education and lifelong learning.	3	3
4.3	Students have sufficient opportunity to engage with staff members in small groups, individually or via electronic platforms.	3	2
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.	2	2
4.5	The institution has policies/procedures in place to inform the development, implementation and assessment of programs offered by the institution and these policies take account the contribution of higher education to socio-economic development.	3	3
4.6	The institution has developed a policy or criteria for staff recruitment, deployment, development, succession planning and a system of mentorship and/or apprenticeship.	3	3
4.7	Student support services, including academic support and required counseling services are provided, in line with the institutional mode of	3	3

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





	delivery.		
4.8	The institution has mechanisms in place to support students to become independent learners, in line with the institutional mode of delivery.	2	2
4.9	The institution has a devoted office to promote international cooperation and enhance Intra-Africa mobility of students and staff.	2	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		23/9= 2.56	24/9= 2.67

2.6.4.5 Research, publication and innovation

a. Institution Strengths

The institution has a clear research policy and a clear research agenda. The institution has demonstrated success in attracting research grants from international sources, mainly from external donors.

b. Areas of Concern

The institution does not have a policy and/or strategy on Innovation, Intellectual Property Ownership and Technology Foresight. Lectures and researchers expressed the need for more capacity building on grants management, reporting and fundraising.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. To bring forward speedily the policy and/or a strategy on Innovation, Intellectual Property Ownership and Technology Foresight;
- II. To increase the number of lectures holding PhD degrees as to respond to the ambition of turning into a research led university;
- III. To expand the capacity building programme for developing the capacity of researchers on grants management, research proposal writing and reporting;
- IV. To diversify research grants specially to attract funding from partnerships with industry and business sector;
- V. To improve procedures to support academic staff to develop and enhance their research skills, including collaborative research and publications;
- VI. To improve the flow of information, from the administrative centre to the Faculties and Research Centres, regarding external scholarship opportunities
- VII. To increase the number of staff that publish their research in accredited academic journals and apply for patents (where relevant);
- VIII. To increase the number of students engaged in research and to publish in accredited academic journals and apply for patents (where relevant);
- IX. To engage researchers in relevant research to the resolution of African problems and the creation of economic and development opportunities;
- X. To increase collaboration in research programmes amongst different faculties and schools;
- XI. To maximise the linkages between the University’s research centres and other research international research centres to promote international joint research and publications.

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

Table 5: Research, publication and innovation

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
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.	4	4
5.2	The institution has a policy and/or strategy on Innovation, Intellectual Property Ownership and Technology Foresight.	1	1
5.3	The institution has demonstrated success in attracting research grants from national or international sources and in partnership with industry.	2	3
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	2.5
5.5	Staff and students publish their research in accredited academic journals and apply for patents (where relevant).	2	1.5
5.6	Researchers are encouraged and supported to present their research at national and international conferences.	2	2
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.	2	2
5.8	The institution encourages and rewards research whose results are used by society.	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	2.5
5.10	The institution has established linkages to promote international joint research and publications	2	2
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		23/10= 2.3	22.5/10= 2.25

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

112



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



2.6.4.6 Community / Societal Engagement

a. Institution Strengths

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. In addition, it is noted that the institution makes its facilities available (where possible) to the local community in support of community and socio-economic development activities.

b. Areas of Concern

The institution has policies and systems in place to encourage departments and staff to develop and implement strategies for community engagement. However, there is a need for more engagement of students with communities through their academic work (more work placements with commercial enterprises and with civil society). The team saw evidence that UEM has begun enlisting the support of its alumni. On the other hand, it heard conflicting reports of the extent to which professional bodies are involved in curriculum development.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. To develop a dissemination and communication plan on community engagement activities as to increase more engagement with the community and more outreach activities.
- II. To consolidate contact with UEM alumni, using SIGA data, in relation to fund-raising, institutional visibility, and provision of internships.
- III. To formulate policy regarding the involvement of professional bodies in governance, curriculum development and broader issues of engagement with society.

Table 6: Community / Societal Engagement

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
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.	3	2
6.2	The institution encourages departments and staff to develop and implement strategies for community engagement.	2	2
6.3	Students are required to engage with communities through their academic work.	2	2
6.4	The institution has forged partnerships with other education sub-sectors to enhance the quality of education in the country and region.	2	2
6.5	The Institution disseminates information on its community engagement activities to the local community.	2	2
6.6	The institution offers relevant short courses to the community/broader society based on identified needs and supporting identified	2	2

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





	economic opportunities.		
6.7	The institution makes its facilities available (where possible) to the local community in support of community and socio-economic development activities.	3	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		16/7= 2.29	15/7= 2.14

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.6.4.7 Rating Summary at Institutional Level

Table 7: Rating Summary at Institutional Level

Major Standard	Aggregated Value by University	Aggregated value by Experts
Governance & Management	3.78	2.94
Infrastructure	2.75	2.65
Finance	3.17	2.84
T & L	2.56	2.67
Research	2.30	2.25
Societal engagement	2.29	2.14
Total	16.84	15.77
Average	2.81	2.63

<1 = Poor; 1.0-1.99 = Insufficient; 2.0-2.79 = Satisfactory; 2.8-3.5 = Good; and >3.5 = Excellent

Overall quality at institutional level is rated:

- By the university as GOOD Quality
- By the experts as SATISFACTORY Quality

2.6.5 African Quality Rating Mechanism Validation at Programme Level

The Team evaluated the Faculty of Medicine, specifically the MD programme in Medicine.

2.6.5.1 Programme Planning and Management

a. Faculty Strengths

It was observed that the programme is aligned with the overall institutional mission and vision. The programme meets national accreditation criteria. There is a programme coordinator(s) responsible for managing and ensuring quality of the programme. The Faculty has 38 PhDs and the academic staff have appropriated levels of qualification and experience.

b. Areas of Concern

The institution allocates sufficient resources to support management. More efforts are required to be done as to ensure that the mode of delivery takes into account the needs and challenges of all students. Students expressed their concern regarding assessment of learning and suggest improvements in marking and scoring system. It is requested that an improvement plan is in place as to address

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





infrastructures and equipment and student support services. Students also raised a concern related to the need to introduce into the curriculum one core subject related to First Aid and Emergency and Disaster Management that is not currently taught.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. To improve infrastructures, maintenance and repair of equipment (Air conditioning in classrooms, chairs and desks, data show and other teaching aid technologies);
- II. To increase participation and representation of students in the faculty board and other management forums in order to listening and implementing student’s views and opinions;
- III. To improve assessment of learning mechanisms, particularly in relation to transparent and objective marking systems;
- IV. To regularly monitor the performance of lecturers through performance management and review and feedback from students;
- V. To improve student support services (food provision services, leisure amenities, sport facilities, access to toilets).

Table 8: Programme Planning and Management

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
7.1	The program is aligned with the overall institutional mission and vision.	4	4
7.2	The program meets national accreditation criteria.	3	3
7.3	The institution allocates sufficient resources to support the program.	3	3
7.4	There is a program coordinator(s) responsible for managing and ensuring quality of the program.	4	4
7.5	The mode of delivery takes account of the needs and challenges of all targeted students.	2	2
7.6	Staff teaching on the program have the appropriate type and level of qualification.	3	3
7.7	The program is regularly subjected to internal and external review in a participatory manner to reflect developments in the area of study.	3	3
7.8	Program planning includes a strategy for the use of technology in a manner appropriate to the program, facilities available, and target students.	3	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		25/8= 3.13	25/8= 3.13

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.6.5.2 Curriculum Development

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





a. Faculty Strengths

According to what was observed the curriculum includes an appropriate balance of theoretical, practical and experiential knowledge and skills, as well as core and elective areas. The curriculum has been developed to maximize student career pathways, opportunities for articulation with other relevant qualifications, and employment prospects.

b. Areas of Concern

Concerns were expressed regarding the high demand of the course and lack of sufficient places. Students have indicated that the course is of very high quality. However, lectures need to review their teaching methodologies adjusting to the level of students and embracing better learning opportunities.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. It is recommended a deeper involvement with professional bodies, especially with the ‘*Ordem dos Médicos*’, as to develop a Curriculum and benchmark standards for the course, informed by research and consultation with relevant stakeholders and employers;
- II. Increase access and disposal of innovative teaching and learning materials provided for students and lectures.

Table 9: Curriculum Development

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
8.1	The curriculum clearly specifies target learners and learning outcomes/competencies for each module/course and for the program as a whole.	3	3
8.2	The curriculum is regularly updated to take account of new knowledge and learning needs to support African development.	3	3
8.3	Modules/courses are coherently planned and provide a sequenced learning pathway for students towards attainment of a qualification.	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.	3	3
8.5	The curriculum has been developed to maximize student career pathways, opportunities for articulation with other relevant qualifications, and employment prospects.	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.	2	2
8.7	The curriculum reflects positive African values, gender sensitivity and the needs of society.	3	3





Total assessment value / Aggregated value	20/7= 2.86	19/7= 2.71
--	------------	------------

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.6.5.3 Teaching and Learning

a. Faculty Strengths

Teaching and learning are based on explicit learning outcomes which are consistent with programme and course aims. Learning materials have been clearly presented, include reference to the learning aims and outcomes and an indication of study time.

b. Areas of Concern

Two major areas of concerns were expressed mostly by students that related to assessment of learning and marking that students view as to be very subjective to the discretion of lectures; and the issue of use of diverse teaching methodologies and resources by lecturers.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. To make efforts to design learning materials and adjust the programme to be with the purpose of engaging students both intellectually, ethically and practically and avoid learning based in memorisation or rote learning, promoting critical thinking (understanding, applying, analysing, evaluating and creating);
- II. To improve complaint mechanisms from students by ensuring the confidentiality and an organized response mechanism towards the complaints;
- III. To maximise the use of IT teaching resources and materials in order to enhance learning outcomes;
- IV. To ensure that the Programme Review conducted every five years assesses and responds to the improvements suggested in previous evaluations and reviews.

Table 10: Teaching and Learning

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
9.1	Teaching and learning are based on explicit learning outcomes which are consistent with program and course aims.	3	3
9.2	A clear strategy is in place to identify the learning materials needed to support program delivery.	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	3
9.4	The learning materials have been designed with the purpose of engaging students intellectually, ethically and practically.	2	2
9.5	Program review procedures include materials review and improvement.	3	3

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





9.6	Innovative teaching and learning materials are provided for students.	2	2
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		16/6= 2.67	16/6= 2.67

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.6.5.4 Assessment

a. Faculty Strengths

The University and the Faculty have pedagogical regulations establishing the procedures for assessment of learning outcomes.

b. Areas of Concern

There is a need for the Faculty to improve the mode of assessment and the criteria for marking, having clear information available to students and lectures about assessment and marking procedures.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. To follow and monitor the mechanisms regarding assessment of students and marking tests and exams, giving an opportunity for students to complain and review their marks;
- II. To have clear information about the mode of assessment available to students and lectures;
- III. To make efforts in view of assessment to be used as an integral part of the teaching and learning process and seeks to ensure that students have mastered specific outcomes;
- IV. To assess the level of challenge of assessments ensuring that it is appropriated to the specific programme and targeted students;
- V. To increase use of different assessment methods and guarantee students learning;
- VI. To create a mechanism to review marking procedures ensuring consistency and accuracy and the provision of feedback to students;
- VII. To publish students' final marks and scores through online personalized and user-friendly systems instead of public boards.

Table 11: Assessment

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
10.1	The institution has systems in place for external examiners.	1	1.5
10.2	Clear information about mode of assessment is provided for all courses/modules making up the program.	3	3
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.	2	1.5
10.4	The level of challenge of assessments is appropriate to the specific program and targeted students.	3	2.5
10.5	A variety of assessment methods are used in the program.	2	2
10.6	Marking procedures ensure consistency and	2	1.5

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





	accuracy and the provision of feedback to students.		
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		13/6= 2.17	12/6= 2.00

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.6.5.5 Programme results

a. Faculty Strengths

The evidences show that the Faculty conducts research and is engaged in consultancy work in subject areas to solve problems and support the social and economic development. The programme has a good reputation in the country and the school has a strong articulation with the Ministry of Health.

b. Areas of Concern

The Faculty claims that there is established linkage with potential employers that facilitate graduate employment. However, there is a need to develop better relations with professional bodies, especially in providing feedback of the quality of graduates.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. To conduct studies and assessment of graduates employment;
- II. To publish the results of expert peers and/or professional bodies on the relevance and quality of learning achieved by students;
- III. To annually conduct student experience surveys as to ensure that quality student feedback is provided on all aspects of the programme.

Table 12: Programme results

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
11.1	Student progress is monitored throughout the programme and early warning is provided for students at risk.	3	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
11.3	Quality student feedback is provided.	3	3
11.4	Expert peers and/or professional bodies review the relevance and quality of learning achieved by students.	2	2
11.5	There is established linkage with potential employers that facilitate graduate employment.	2	2
11.6	Tracer studies of graduates and their employers are conducted to obtain feedback on achievement of graduates.	2	2
11.7	The programme has an effective research plan with suitable implementation,	2	1





	evaluation and feedback mechanisms.		
11.8	Research and consultancy is undertaken in the subject area to solve industrial problems and support the social and economic development.	1	1
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		18/8= 2.5	17/8= 2.44

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.6.5.6 Rating summary at Programme Level

Major Standard	Aggregated Value by University	Aggregated value by Experts
Programme planning	3.13	3.13
Curriculum development	2.86	2.71
T & L	2.67	2.67
Assessment	2.17	2.00
Programme results	2.50	2.44
Total	13.32	12.94
Average	2.66	2.59

<1 = Poor; 1.0-1.99 = Insufficient; 2.0-2.79 = Satisfactory; 2.8-3.5 = Good; and >3.5 = Excellent

Overall quality at Programme level is rated:

- By the university as SATISFACTORY Quality
- By the experts as SATISFACTORY Quality

2.6.6 Conclusions and Recommendations

The Institutional Evaluation Team considers that the AQRM evaluation and rating exercise was a developmental activity that validates UEM self-evaluation. The team presents in this report several suggestions and recommendations to be followed by the UEM.

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**. Specific recommendations for improvements are presented for each assessment topic (see 3.1 to 3.7 and 5.1 to 5.6).





THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP

2.7 Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Ghana

2.7.1 Composition of the review team

- Professor Jonathan Mba, Director of Research and Academic Planning, Association of African Universities, Ghana
- Professor Henrik Toft Jensen, Prof. Emeritus, Denmark
- Professor Olugbemiro Jegede, Professor Emeritus at the National Open University of Nigeria, Nigeria

2.7.2 Introduction to the report

This is a report of the Review Visit by the Review Team to the Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Kumasi, Ghana carried out on the Thursday, 22 June and Friday, 23 June 2017.

The University has, in addition to the institutional level review, chosen to present The Faculty of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences (FPPS), one of the six and oldest of the Faculties/Schools of the College of Health Sciences as its flag ship for programme evaluation.

Specifically, the PharmD Programme, a brand-new programme at the University's Faculty of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences is being offered for the programme review.

2.7.3 Institution's general information

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 into six colleges: Agriculture & Natural Resources, Architecture & Planning, Art & Social Sciences, Engineering, Health Science, and the College of Science.

KNUST has its roots in the plans of the King Asantehene Agyeman Prempeh I to establish a university in Kumasi as part of his drive towards modernisation of his Ashanti kingdom. This plan never came to fruition due to the clash between British empire expansion and the desire for King Prempeh I to preserve his Ashanti kingdom's independence. However, in 1949, the dream of the Prempehs became a reality when building started on what was to be called the Kumasi College of Technology. The Chancellor of the University is the revered traditional ruler, His Royal majesty of Ashanti.

KNUST is the second public university established in the country and currently ranked the best in Ghana and West Africa by the www.webometrics.info university ranking. KNUST is a non-profit public higher education institution located in the urban setting of Kumasi in the region of Ashanti that has one of the most respected traditional rulers in the West African sub region. Apart from the main campus, the institution has other campuses including Sunyani, Accra.

Officially accredited and recognised by the National Accreditation Board of Ghana, KNUST is a large co-educational higher education institution with a current population of 41,100. Twenty-Five (25) per cent of the student population is between the age range of 18 to 25 years and it has about 8,600 international students (4,100 undergraduates, 4,500 post graduates). It offers courses and programmes

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

121



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



leading to degrees such as pre-bachelor degrees (i.e. certificates, diplomas, and associate or foundation degrees), bachelor degrees, master degrees, doctorate degrees in several areas of study.

KNUST has a total of 1,021 academic staff (male 847, Female 174), 50% of the academic staff have PhD and about 6% are at the full professorial cadre. KNUST also provides several academic and non-academic facilities and services to students including a library, housing, sport facilities and/or activities, financial aids and/or scholarships, study abroad and exchange programmes, online courses and distance learning opportunities, as well as administrative services.

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 for running the institution, ranging from Research to Sexual harassment. But it is yet to institute a policy on Partnership with Industry and Gender Issues.

KNUST attracts from the international world, on the average, about fifteen million dollars (US\$15M) annually for research purposes. This current year, the University has reported receiving over seventeen million dollars (US\$ 17.45M) as research grants for 126 projects. Based on eleven criteria which include Programme Planning & Management, Teaching & Learning and External Recognition, KNUST in the recent internal self-ranking exercise (AQRM), has listed the following as the best three Departments/subject areas in the University:

- 1st – Doctor of Pharmacy (PharmD)
- 2nd – B.Sc Civil Engineering
- 3rd – B.Sc Agriculture

The University has a record of very high-profile Alumni which include:

- His Excellency, Kofi Anan, former Secretary General of the United Nations;
- John Dumelo a Ghanaian actor nominated for categories including Most Promising Actor and Best Actor in a Supporting Role at the 6th and 7th Africa Movie Academy Awards respectively.
- Amma Darko is one of the most significant contemporary Ghanaian literary writers. She is the author of five very well-regarded novels.

2.7.4 African Quality Rating Mechanism Validation at Institutional Level

2.7.4.1 Governance and Management

a. Institutional strengths

- I. Policies have been developed in many the areas
- II. The University has an excellent governance structure
- III. It has clearly stated vision and mission statements with core values
- IV. And very good management information systems

b. Areas of concern

- I. Need to develop policies in the remaining areas: Partnership with Industry, Gender
- This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





- II. Effective implementation of these policies and evaluation.
- III. Training of staff and students on the policies.
- IV. How to inform and promote the policies through training

c. Opportunities for improvement

- I. Enhancing capacity building
- II. Making the policies available and accessible
- III. Frequent review of the policies

Table 1: Governance and Management

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
12.1.1	The institution has a clearly stated vision, mission, and values with specific goals and priorities.	4	4
12.1.2	The institution has specific strategies in place for monitoring achievement of institutional goals and identifying problem areas.	4	4
12.1.3	Clear accountability structures for responsible officers are in place.	4	4
12.1.4	Where appropriate, staff, students and external stakeholders are represented in governance structures. Governance structures are representative in terms of gender.	4	4
12.1.5	The institution has developed quality assurance policies and procedures.	4	3.5
12.1.6	Appropriate mechanisms are in place to evaluate staff in line with performance agreements with relevant authorities.	4	3.5
12.1.7	The institution has put a management information system in place to manage student and staff data, and to track student performance.	4	4
12.1.8	The institution has specific policies in place to ensure and support diversity of staff and students, in particular representation of women and the disabled.	3	2
12.1.9	The institution has a policy and standard procedures in place to ensure staff and student welfare.	4	4





Total assessment value / Aggregated value	35/9= 3.9	33/9= 3.67
--	------------------	-------------------

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.7.4.2 Infrastructure

a. Institutional strengths

- I. Internet infrastructure
- II. Excellent modern equipment for selected programmes
- III. Excellent utilities

b. Areas of concern

- I. More lecture spaces
- II. Students learning space
- III. Some other laboratories need to be upgraded with equipment

c. Opportunities for improvement

- I. To put in place a programme to facilitate students to own computers
- II. Increase the space available for students
- III. More and new equipment in teaching laboratories

Table 2: Infrastructure

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
12.2.1	The institution has sufficient lecturing spaces to accommodate student numbers taking the institutional mode of delivery into account.	3	3
12.2.2	The institution provides sufficient learning/studying space for students including access to electronic learning resources, as required for the institutional mode of delivery.	2	2
12.2.3	Academic and Administrative Staff have access to computer resources and the internet.	4	4
12.2.4	Students have access to computer resources and the internet at a level appropriate to the demands of the institutional mode of delivery.	3	3





12.2.5	The institution has sufficient laboratory facilities to accommodate students in science programmes, taking institutional mode of delivery into account.	3	2
12.2.6	Laboratory equipment is up to date and well maintained.	3	2.5
12.2.7	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.	2	1
12.2.8	The institution makes provision for managing and maintaining utilities and ensuring that appropriate safety measures are in place.	4	3.5
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		24/8= 3	21/8=2.63

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.7.4.3 Finance

a. Institutional strengths

- I. The University has excellent financial records
- II. Highly qualified staff in the Finance Office

b. Areas of concern

- I. Find ways of raising more money

c. Opportunities for improvement

- I. Increase the support for needy students
- II. Develop Measures to attract funding from industry

Table 3: Finance

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
12.3.1	The institution has access to sufficient financial resources to achieve its goals in line with its budget and student unit cost.	3	3
12.3.2	The institution has procedures in place to attract funding, including from industry and the corporate sector.	3	2





12.3.3	Clearly specified budgetary procedures are in place to ensure allocation of resources reflects the vision, mission and goals of the institution.	4	4
12.3.4	The institution provides financial support to deserving students (institutional bursaries and/or scholarships).	3	2.5
12.3.5	Information about financial aid and criteria for its allocation is provided to students and other stakeholders.	3	4
12.3.6	The institution publishes income and expenditure statements.	4	4
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		20/6=3.30	19.5/6= 3.25

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.7.4.4 Teaching and Learning

a. Institutional strengths

- I. Well established International Office
- II. Awards system in place for teaching, research and innovation
- III. Policies in place for staff development progression
- IV. The University has developed teaching modules
- V. Counselling Centre and its satellite units in the Colleges

b. Areas of concern

- I. Student: Lecturer ratio to allow staff more opportunities to deal with students
- II. Independent learning
- III. Opportunity to relate to students in small groups

c. Opportunities for improvement

- I. Recruit more academic staff to improve the student: Lecturer ratio
- II. Put in measures to improve teaching skills.
- III. Improving mentorship of younger academic staff

Table 4: Teaching and Learning

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
12.4.1	The institution encourages and rewards teaching and learning innovation.	4	4





12.4.2	The institution has procedures in place to support the induction to teaching, pedagogy, counseling and the upgrading of staff teaching and learning skills through continuing education and lifelong learning.	4	4
12.4.3	Students have sufficient opportunity to engage with staff members in small groups, individually or via electronic platforms.	3	3
12.4.4	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.	3	2
12.4.5	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	4
12.4.6	The institution has developed a policy or criteria for staff recruitment, deployment, development, succession planning and a system of mentorship and/or apprenticeship.	4	3
12.4.7	Student support services, including academic support and required counseling services are provided, in line with the institutional mode of delivery.	4	4
12.4.8	The institution has mechanisms in place to support students to become independent learners, in line with the institutional mode of delivery.	4	3
12.4.9	The institution has a devoted office to promote international cooperation and enhance Intra-Africa mobility of students and staff.	4	4
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		34/9= 3.8	31/9=3.4

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.7.4.5 Research, publication and Innovation

a. Institutional strengths





I. Well established office to put measures in place for the attraction of research grants from both national and international Sources (Office of Grants and Research)

b. Areas of concern

- I. Increase industry engagement
- II. Measures to attract more research funds from national and international
- III. sources

c. Opportunities for improvement

I. Establish a well coordinated office and industry partnership with competent staff who can deal with both academia and industry effectively.

Table 5: Research, publication and innovation

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
12.5.1	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.	4	4
12.5.2	The institution has a policy and/or strategy on Innovation, Intellectual Property Ownership and Technology Foresight.	4	3
12.5.3	The institution has demonstrated success in attracting research grants from national or international sources and in partnership with industry.	4	3
12.5.4	The institution has procedures in place to support academic staff to develop and enhance their research skills, including collaborative research and publication.	4	4
12.5.5	Staff and students publish their research in accredited academic journals and apply for patents (where relevant).	4	3
15.5.6	Researchers are encouraged and supported to present their research at national and international conferences.	4	4





THE AFRICA-EU PARTNERSHIP

15.5.7	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.	4	4
15.5.8	The institution encourages and rewards research whose results are used by society	3	2
15.5.9	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.	2	2
15.5.10	The institution has established linkages to promote international joint research and publications	4	4
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		37/10=3.7	33/10=3.3

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.7.4.6 Community / Societal Engagement

a. Institutional strengths

- I. Good relationship and partnership with the community

b. Areas of concern

- I. Formalise information delivery to the community

c. Opportunities for improvement

- I. Develop an effective way of marketing the University's innovations, achievements and proper branding, among others.

Table 6: Community / Societal Engagement

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
12.6.1	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	3	2

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

129



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

12.6.2	The institution encourages departments and staff to develop and implement strategies for community engagement.	4	3
12.6.3	Students are required to engage with communities through their academic work.	4	3
12.6.4	The institution has forged partnerships with other education sub-sectors to enhance the quality of education in the country and region.	4	3
12.6.5	The Institution disseminates information on its community engagement activities to the local community.	3	3
12.6.6	The institution offers relevant short courses to the community/broader society based on identified needs and supporting identified economic opportunities.	3	3
12.6.7	The institution makes its facilities available (where possible) to the local community in support of community and socio-economic development activities.	4	4
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		25/7=3.6	21/7=3.0

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.7.4.7 Rating Summary at Institutional Level

Table 7: Rating Summary at Institutional Level

Major Standard	Aggregated Value by University	Aggregated value by Experts
Governance and Management	3.9	3.7
Infrastructure	3.0	2.6
Finances	3.3	3.25
Teaching and Learning	3.8	3.4
Research, Publication and Innovation	3.7	3.3
Societal Engagement	3.6	3.0

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

130



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA

EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



THE AFRICA-EU PARTNERSHIP

Total	21.3/6= 3.55	19.25/6= 3.21
-------	--------------	---------------

<1 = Poor; 1.0-1.99 = Insufficient; 2.0-2.79 = Satisfactory; 2.8-3.5 = Good; and >3.5 = Excellent

Overall quality at institutional level is rated:

- By the university as EXCELLENT Quality
- By the experts as GOOD Quality

2.7.5 African Quality Assurance Rating Mechanism Validation at Programme Level

Name of the department: Faculty of Pharmacy And Pharmaceutical Sciences

Name of the programme: Pharmd

2.7.5.1 Programme Planning and Management

a. Institutional strengths

- Programme is well structured and aligned
- Approved by NCTE and accredited by NAB
- Strong academic staff with the requisite qualifications and rankings.
- Strong self, internal and external review of programme

b. Areas of concern

- Resource allocation
- Acquisition and use of audio-visuals and other teaching aids.

c. Opportunities for improvement

- More funds and resources should be allocated to the programme.
- Advance the use of technology(ICT), audio-visuals and other teaching and learning aids in the programme

Table 8: Programme Planning and Management

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
13.1.1	The programme is aligned with the overall institutional mission and vision.	4	4
13.1.2	The programme meets national accreditation criteria.	4	4
13.1.3	The institution allocates sufficient resources to support the programme.	3	3
13.1.4	There is a programme coordinator(s)	4	3

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

131



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION



	responsible for managing and ensuring quality of the programme.		
13.1.5	The mode of delivery takes account of the needs and challenges of all targeted students.	3	3
13.1.6	Staff teaching on the programme has the appropriate type and level of qualification.	4	4
13.1.7	The programme is regularly subjected to internal and external review in a participatory manner to reflect developments in the area of study.	4	3
13.1.8	Programme planning includes a strategy for the use of technology in a manner appropriate to the programme, facilities available, and target students.	4	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		30/8=3.75	27/8=3.38

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.7.5.2 Curriculum Development

a. Institutional strengths

- I. Curriculum developed in consultation with all relevant stakeholders
- II. Well defined objectives and learning outcomes and how they are measured.
- III. A good balance of theory, practical and experiential training tailored to the health needs of Africa

b. Areas of concern

- I. The period of review and update of programme.
- II. Opportunities for articulation, interaction, study and working with others health professionals.

c. Opportunities for improvement

- I. Reduce the time lapse required for curriculum review and update.
- II. Create more common working group programmes, outreaches and training workshops with students of all other health professions

Table 9: Curriculum Development

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
13.2.1	The curriculum clearly specifies target learners and learning outcomes/competencies for each	4	3





	module/course and for the programme as a whole.		
13.2.2	The curriculum is regularly updated to take account of new knowledge and learning needs to support African development.	3	3
13.2.3	Modules/courses are coherently planned and provide a sequenced learning pathway for students towards attainment of a qualification.	4	4
13.2.4	The curriculum includes an appropriate balance of theoretical, practical and experiential knowledge and skills (where applicable) as well as core and elective areas	4	4
13.2.5	The curriculum has been developed to maximize student career pathways, opportunities for articulation with other relevant qualifications, and employment prospects.	3	3
13.2.6	Curriculum development has been informed by thorough research and consultation with relevant stakeholders including public sector planners, industry and other employers	4	3
13.2.7	The curriculum reflects positive African values, gender sensitivity and the needs of society.	4	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		26/7=3.71	23/7=3.29

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.7.5.3 Teaching and Learning

a. Institutional strengths

- I. Adequate materials for teaching and learning are available and provided to make teaching and learning easy and effective.
- II. Conducive environment for teaching and learning.
- III. Adequate lab space and equipment.

b. Areas of concern

- I. Ensure consistent and timely review of learning materials.

c. Opportunities for improvement

- I. The learning materials for practical works should continue to be consistently reviewed in order to be abreast with new technological advancement.





Table 10: Teaching and Learning

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
13.3.1	Teaching and learning are based on explicit learning outcomes which are consistent with programme and course aims.	4	4
13.3.2	A clear strategy is in place to identify the learning materials needed to support programme delivery.	4	3
13.3.3	Learning materials have been clearly presented, include reference to the learning aims and outcomes and an indication of study time.	4	4
13.3.4	The learning materials have been designed with the purpose of engaging students both intellectually, ethically and practically.	4	3
13.3.5	Programme review procedures include materials review and improvement.	4	3
13.3.6	Innovative teaching and learning materials are provided for students.	4	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		24/6=4	20/6=3.33

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.7.5.4 Assessment

a. Institutional strengths

- I. The various modes and methods of assessment enable effective learning of the courses in the programme.
- II. The assessment methods are of international standards
- III. Well organised system of assessment by external examiners

b. Areas of concern

- I. Consistency in marking.
- II. Feedback of assessment outcomes to students.

c. Opportunities for improvement

- I. The assessment procedures must be clearly outlined and incorporated in the syllabus.
- II. Adequate feedback on assessment needs to be provided to students and on time

Table 11: Assessment

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
13.4.1	The institution has systems in place for external examiners.	4	4
13.4.2	Clear information about mode of assessment is provided for all courses/modules making up the programme.	4	3
13.4.3	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
13.4.4	The level of challenge of assessments is appropriate to the specific programme and targeted students.	4	4
13.4.5	A variety of assessment methods are used in the programme.	4	3
13.4.6	Marking procedures ensure consistency and accuracy and the provision of feedback to students.	3	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		23/6=3.83	21/6=3.50

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.7.5.5 Programme Results

a. Institutional strengths

- I. Qualified and experienced teaching staff.
- II. Conducive environment for teaching and research.
- III. Student progress is monitored at both department and faculty level through academic tutors, class tutors, departments and faculty examination boards.
- IV. Excellent collaboration with industry and hospitals.
- V. Quality student feedback through GPSA, GHEMSA and lecturer assessment forms.
- VI. High completion rate (95%).
- VII. Available Strategic Plan for the next ten (10) years.

b. Areas of concern

- I. Lecturer/student ratio.
- II. Research and consultancy.
- III. Tracer studies.

c. Opportunities for improvement

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





- I. Lecturer/student ratio should be improved.
- II. More research and consultancy should be encouraged and facilitated.
- III. Direct Tracer studies should be conducted and documented, and broadened to cover graduates abroad.

Table 12: Programme Results

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
13.5.1	Student progress is monitored throughout the programme and early warning is provided for students at risk.	4	3
13.5.2	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.	4	3
13.5.3	Quality student feedback is provided.	4	3
13.5.4	Expert peers and/or professional bodies review the relevance and quality of learning achieved by students.	4	3
13.5.5	There is established linkage with potential employers that facilitate graduate employment.	4	3
13.5.6	Tracer studies of graduates and their employers are conducted to obtain feedback on achievement of graduates.	3	1
13.5.7	The programme has an effective research plan with suitable implementation, evaluation and feedback mechanisms.	4	2
13.5.8	Research and consultancy is undertaken in the subject area to solve industrial problems and support the social and economic development.	3	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		30/8=3.75	21/8=2.63

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.7.5.6 Rating Summary at Programme Level

Table 13: Rating Summary at Programme Level

Major Standard	Aggregated Value by University	Aggregated value by Experts
Programme Planning and Management	3.75	3.38
Curriculum Development	3.71	3.29
Teaching and Learning	4.00	3.33

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





THE AFRICA-EU PARTNERSHIP

Assessment	3.83	3.50
Programme Results	3.75	2.63
Total	19.04/5= 3.81	16.24/5=3.23

<1 = Poor; 1.0-1.99 = Insufficient; 2.0-2.79 = Satisfactory; 2.8-3.5 = Good; and >3.5 = Excellent

Overall quality at programme level is rated:

- By the University as EXCELLENT Quality
- By the experts as GOOD Quality

2.7.6 Conclusions and recommendations

Observations and Commendation

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 into developing teaching and learning in a way that indicates that learning outcomes are in focus. The University has also developed support mechanisms 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 number of international visitors to the campus for research and partnership programmes and international students are indicative of the quality of its programmes, its output and focus on its mission and vision.

The University must be commended for nominating itself for this first round of AQRM review using the finalised instrument. This makes the University a role model for other universities in the West African sub-region and certainly in Ghana.

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:

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

137



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

Based on the totality of the evidence available to the Review Team and objective and painstaking observations made throughout the visit, it is our considered view that the University can benefit from a few minor details to boost their quality assurance culture. We therefore make the following recommendations and pieces of advice with the firm belief that their immediate and calculated implementation would be of tremendous benefit to the University. The recommendations are as follows:

- The University Library Services need to be upgraded and modernised to reflect the expansive outlay of programmes and ambition 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 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 University Information Technology Services are extensive but appear under-utilized. The staff could do with continuous refresher and capacity building courses on the modern use of ITS and electronic services for staff and students, especially for research purposes.
- 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.
- Even if the success of developing the teaching methodology is remarkable, there is a need to follow up activities in relation to the student evaluations for some teachers, who school learn to understand, that they need to change their teaching role in the direction of tutoring. Here is a responsibility for heads of departments.
- 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, fully staffed to efficiently support the teaching staff and the departments in running the QA Policy of the University.
- The University has done very well in putting in place several policies to make the administration of teaching and learning run smoothly. However, a number of policies are still in their draft stages and have not advanced. For example, the Disability Policy and the QA Policy seem to have been forgotten in their draft mode. The latter has been available in draft since 2014 but has not been ratified for use. There is need for the University to ratify all pending policies to make them fully functional working documents, even if they at the moment functioning well at some departments.
- The University should continue with as well as seek to enhance the idea of an outreach function, where people and organisations from the surrounding communities can ask for help in investigating, developing and framing community activities. These activities could be performed by student's groups as a part of their study (counting points) with supervision from a teacher.
- 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

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

138



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA

EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

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 relationship could also be to the benefit for industries – new ideas and new views.

- The issue of only one patent reported in the history of the University in spite of hundreds of research output is rather unfortunate and tremendously disturbing. It may well be that the University has not paid enough attention to or has not mastered the processes and procedures for, the issues of patent and intellectual property rights. Based on our very cursory observation in the limited time available to us during this visit, there are many patents waiting to be claimed on many of the hugely successful research activities the University has undertaken and made publications out of. Therefore, the University should seriously and urgently address the issue of assisting researchers to apply for patents and establish regulations of the sharing of benefits from patents. It is important to realise that only a few percentage of patents create money, but the honour is important. Beside this, the University should offer help to researchers to be visible in relation to awards. Some researchers have no or just a few publication activities. At the departmental level the head of department could form research groups, where there is support to non- publishing but active researchers in order to assist to publish either individually or in groups.
- Staff recruitment and retention should meet with international standards. At the moment, the staff to student's ratio is quite high and will undoubtedly negatively impact on quality assurance and other tangible outputs from the University.
- The University deserves more than praise for the ultramodern and brand new Central Research Laboratories. There may be a need for a robust policy on its usage. Particular attention should be paid to the fee being charged for the use by students and procedures for sending students there for research activities and analyses.
- A University as old as KNUST would necessarily have aging equipment that would require replacement in addition to procuring new and modern equipment for the rising population of the students. An organised method should be pursued for taking stock of such old and dilapidated machines and the acquisition of new and modern ones both for the image of the University and to meet the hue and cry of the students for adequate and regular practical or clinical experiences as required by the courses they take. More equipment would create new possibilities for teaching and student work.
- While it is necessary to make special provision for the resources they demand, the University must go out of its way to popularise the programmes, engage the local and international communities on their advocacy, and ensure that the products are accepted into the labour market.
- The growing number of international students both at the undergraduate and post graduate levels demand that the University continuously put more effort into their welfare especially accommodation and other needs that would promote the University and bring in more students.
- The Student support services are working well and we notice the establishment of the MasterCard Foundation on campus. The University may wish to explore further other useful benefits that could flow out of the Foundation to the students as incidental advantages of having such a prestigious organisation establish camp on the grounds of NKUST.
- The University should establish a career advising function at the college level to advise the students with regard to job possibilities and to track them after graduation. This is to help the students to use their qualifications from the university and to get jobs. At the same time this

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

139



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

ensures that the academic work at the college are current and up to date. The tracking of the University's alumni should provide the rate of employment of the University's graduate at any particular time.

- The University may wish to take advantage of the readiness of industry to now open their doors to, and collaborate with institutions of higher learning, to establish a science park to interface with and promote the many science and technology based programmes on campus. This would further extend the need for the town and gown to meet on many fronts in order to demystify the notion of ivory towerism as propagated by many universities.
- The University is no doubt aware of its aging population of its very senior academics, especially the professorial cadre. Perhaps a policy should be made to take care of so many implications arising of this situation. These may include, but not limited to, serious mentoring, hiring and using young and agile lecturers and attaching them to older professors.
- The University may wish to review its policy on the minimum number of staff making up an academic department with a view to determining what should be done to small departments. Are there good reasons to have department with less than 5-7 academics at KNUST? Academic staff would be more challenged with regard to productivity and team work if they were amalgamated with other colleagues at the same college or at other colleges. With regard to teaching, one college can offer services to other colleges and cover important teaching fields at the same time. Researchers would also have and enjoy many more possibilities for collaboration, partnership, use of facilities, etc, at a bigger department. A university does not really need several departments in the same field distributed in several colleges across its campus.

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.



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



**UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA**



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



2.8 University Moulay Ismail, Morocco

2.8.1 Composition of the review team

- Prof. Etienne Ehile, Secretary General Association of African Universities, Ghana
- Prof. Patricia Pol, Professeur at the Université Paris-Est Créteil, France
- Prof. Amany El Sharif, Manager of NAQAAE Training (National Authority of Quality Assurance and Accreditation of Education), Egypt

2.8.2 Introduction to the report

The methodology used during the visit to the Moulay Ismail University that took place 3-4 July 2018 was the following:

I) A number of interviews for the following sectors:

1. Academic staff members (11)
2. Students (2 from the master program and 4 under graduate students)
3. Stakeholders (20)

Unscheduled interviews during the visits were also performed.

II) Tour of the University campus

The experts' team visited different facilities in University's buildings, including:

- Libraries, amphitheatres, laboratories, computer halls, staff rooms, workshop labs,

III) Inspection of documents provided by the institution

Remarks:

- I. Very few number of participants in the interviews.
- II. The institutions selected a master programme not an under graduate regular programme.

2.8.3 Institution's general information

The Université Moulay Ismail 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; no tuition fees for students are applied. The thematic focus of the University is on Science and Technology, Management and Business Administration & Arts, Languages and Humanities. It contains four faculties with an open access (88% of the students) and five selective schools. The total number of students is 58517, of which 27738 are female. Seventy-seven-point fifty five (77,55%) of the students have age range of 18-25 y. Ninety percent (90%) are at bachelor level, 3,3% at short cycle level (Technology university degree), 5,3% at master level (master's degree and engineering degree) and 1,4% at doctorate level. The University has been faced with a big increase of students since 2011-2012 (75%).

- There is a total number of 1433 staff member (academic and administrative) and only 374 of them are females.





Moulay Ismail University's governance structure is comprised of a number of authoritative bodies, some of which include both the President and Vice-Presidents of the University 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. The Board meets formally at least four times in each academic year. The Chair of the Board is the President of Moulay Ismail University appointed by Royal nomination.

2.8.4 African Quality Rating Mechanism Validation at Institutional Level

2.8.4.1 Governance and Management

a. Institutional Strengths

- I. High leadership of the new president positively impacts governance
- II. Development of a clear international policy as part of the strategy of the institution
- III. Creation of a department "Audit and control" at the presidency level

b. Areas of Concern

- I. The institution does not have a clearly formalized vision, mission and values with a view to better development of the institution.
- II. Absence of mechanisms to evaluate administrative staff in line with performance agreements with relevant authorities.
- III. Weak representation of women in the governance structure.
- IV. No harmonization of data between different users of the system
- V. Delay in delivery of data to presidential office

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. Develop and formalize a well-defined vision, mission and values.
- II. Adopt a policy for engagement of women in the governance structure.
- III. Formulate a job description for administrative staff and strengthen their management capacities to improve their performance
- IV. Setting a strategy for communication between different departments
- V. Develop Key Performance Indicators.

Table 1: Governance and Management

Reference Number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
1.1	The institution has a clearly stated vision, mission, and values with specific goals and priorities.	4	3

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





1.2	The institution has specific strategies in place for monitoring achievement of institutional goals and identifying problem areas.	4	3
1.3	Clear accountability structures for responsible officers are in place.	3	3
1.4	Where appropriate, staff, students and external stakeholders are represented in governance structures. Governance structures are representative in terms of gender.	4	3
1.5	The institution has developed quality assurance policies and procedures.	2	2
1.6	Appropriate mechanisms are in place to evaluate staff in line with performance agreements with relevant authorities.	2	2
1.7	The institution has put a management information system in place to manage student and staff data, and to track student performance.	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.	3	2
1.9	The institution has a policy and standard procedures in place to ensure staff and student welfare.	3	2
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		28/9=3.11	23/9=2.55

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.8.4.2 Infrastructure

a. Institutional Strengths

- I. The Institution has a sufficient number of lecture halls and amphitheatres
- II. The institution has enough laboratory facilities.
- III. The institution is working on expansion of food court area.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. No students' dorms are provided by the institution.
- II. Not enough medical services for students and staff within the campus and no ambulance vehicle.

N.B. In Morocco, the dorms are provided by a specific public institution. Dorms are also provided by private stakeholders at UMI.

c. Opportunities for improvement

- I. Institution should support students better in their accommodation and play part in supervision on the students' dorms.
- II. Care must be paid to improve health care services.

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





Table 2: Infrastructure

Reference Number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
2.1	The institution has sufficient lecturing spaces to accommodate student numbers taking the institutional mode of delivery into account.	2	2
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.	2	2
2.3	Academic and Administrative Staff have access to computer resources and the internet.	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	3
2.5	The institution has sufficient laboratory facilities to accommodate students in science programmes, taking institutional mode of delivery into account.	2	2
2.6	Laboratory equipment is up to date and well maintained.	2	2
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
2.8	The institution makes provision for managing and maintaining utilities and ensuring that appropriate safety measures are in place.	3	2
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		20/8=2.5	19/8=2.38

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.8.4.3 Finances

a. Institutional Strengths

- I. Budgetary plan is clearly defined and automated.
- II. Good capacities to attract European funding for international cooperation in teaching and research

b. Areas of Concern

- I. Not enough procedures set up to attract funding from industry or corporate sectors.
- II. The institution doesn't support deserving students financially.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. Institution needs to increase self-financing activities to improve the functioning of the Institution.
- II. Strengthen policy to financially support deserving students.

Table 3: Finance

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





Reference Number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
3.1	The institution has access to sufficient financial resources to achieve its goals in line with its budget and student unit cost.	2	2
3.2	The institution has procedures in place to attract funding, including from industry and the corporate sector.	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
3.4	The institution provides financial support to deserving students (institutional bursaries and/or scholarships).	1	1
3.5	Information about financial aid and criteria for its allocation is provided to students and other stakeholders.	3	2
3.6	The institution publishes income and expenditure statements.	3	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		13/6=2	12/6=2

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.8.4.4 Teaching and Learning

a. Institutional Strengths

- I. The institution, through the schools, has a clear policy for adapting curricula to the labor market (internship, lecturers coming from industry).
- II. An international office well oriented by its roles.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. There is not enough feedback between students and teachers.
- II. No evaluation of programmes' outcomes nor annual report on courses and programme evaluation.
- III. Academic staff overload of work.
- IV. The Institution has not yet put into action policies to promote teaching and learning innovation.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. Increase rate of recruitment of qualified staff
- II. Measuring students' feedback
- III. Formalize annual programme reports to assess the achievement rate and set corrective actions.

Table 4: Teaching and Learning

Reference Number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by	Assessment Value by Experts
------------------	------------------------------	---------------------	-----------------------------

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

University			
4.1	The institution encourages and rewards teaching and learning innovation.	1	1
4.2	The institution has procedures in place to support the induction to teaching, pedagogy, counseling and the upgrading of staff teaching and learning skills through continuing education and lifelong learning.	1	1
4.3	Students have sufficient opportunity to engage with staff members in small groups, individually or via electronic platforms.	2	2
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.	1	1
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.	2	2
4.6	The institution has developed a policy or criteria for staff recruitment, deployment, development, succession planning and a system of mentorship and/or apprenticeship.	3	3
4.7	Student support services, including academic support and required counseling services are provided, in line with the institutional mode of delivery.	3	2
4.8	The institution has mechanisms in place to support students to become independent learners, in line with the institutional mode of delivery.	2	2
4.9	The institution has a devoted office to promote international cooperation and enhance Intra-Africa mobility of students and staff.	3	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		18/9=2	17/9=1.89

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.8.4.5 Research, Publication and Innovation

a. Institutional Strengths

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

146



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA

EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



- I. The Institution has a research policy, African development is one of its targets
- II. The institution has established linkages to promote international joint research and publications

b. Areas of Concern

- I. Absence of policy on Innovation, Intellectual Property Ownership and Technology Foresight.
- II. Poor relation with industry in the fields of research, training & financial support to the university.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. Establish procedures to develop a partnership between industrial sectors and relevant academic programs.
- II. Establish a policy on Innovation, Intellectual Property Ownership and Technology Foresight.

Table 5: Research, Publication and Innovation

Reference Number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
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	3
5.2	The institution has a policy and/or strategy on Innovation, Intellectual Property Ownership and Technology Foresight.	1	1
5.3	The institution has demonstrated success in attracting research grants from national or international sources and in partnership with industry.	2	2
5.4	The institution has procedures in place to support academic staff to develop and enhance their research skills, including collaborative research and publication.	4	3
5.5	Staff and students publish their research in accredited academic journals and apply for patents (where relevant).	3	3
5.6	Researchers are encouraged and supported to present their research at national and international conferences.	4	4
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.	2	2
5.8	The institution encourages, and rewards research	2	2





	whose results are used by society		
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.	1	1
5.10	The institution has established linkages to promote international joint research and publications	3	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		24/10=2.4	24/10=2.4

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.8.4.6 Community / Societal Engagement

a. Institutional Strengths

The institution offers relevant short courses based on identified needs and supporting identified economic opportunities.

b. Areas of Concern

Weak engagement of students with communities through their academic work.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. Consolidate the bond with the community by organizing different activities.
- II. Mobilization of financial resources through the provision of services to the socio-professional world and to the grassroots community,
- III. Create alumni league for more engagement with the community

Table 6: Community/Societal Engagement

Reference Number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
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	3	3
6.2	The institution encourages departments and staff to develop and implement strategies for community engagement.	3	3
6.3	Students are required to engage with communities through their academic work.	3	2
6.4	The institution has forged partnerships with other education sub-sectors to enhance the quality of education in the country and region.	3	3





THE AFRICA-EU PARTNERSHIP

6.5	The Institution disseminates information on its community engagement activities to the local community.	3	3
6.6	The institution offers relevant short courses to the community/broader society based on identified needs and supporting identified economic opportunities.	4	4
6.7	The institution makes its facilities available (where possible) to the local community in support of community and socio-economic development activities.	2	2
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		21/7=3	20/7=2.86

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.8.4.7 Rating Summary at Institutional level

Table 7: Rating Summary at Institutional Level

Major standard	Aggregated Value by University	Aggregated Value by Experts
Governance and management	3.11	2.55
Infrastructure	2.5	2.38
Finance	2	2
Teaching and Learning	2	1.89
Research, Publication and Innovation	2.4	2.4
Societal Engagement	3	2.86
Total	15.01/6=2.5	14.05/6=2.35

<1 = Poor; 1.0-1.99 = Insufficient; 2.0-2.79 = Satisfactory; 2.8-3.5 = Good; and >3.5 = Excellent

- By the University as SATISFACTORY Quality
- By the experts as SATISFACTORY Quality

2.8.5 African Quality Rating Mechanism Validation at Programme Level

The selected programme for the AQRM mechanism was Business Management: Master of audit and control (research orientation)

2.8.5.1 Programme Planning and management

a. Programme Strengths

- The program meets national accreditation criteria involving self-evaluation procedures and up-to-date contents
- Enough resources are allocated to support the program
- The mode of delivery takes account of the needs and challenges of all targeted students
- Staff teaching in the program has appropriate type and level of qualification including professionals coming from the socio-economic sector

b. Areas of Concern

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

149



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



Lack of involvement of the stakeholders in the review of the programme

c. Opportunities for improvement

- I. Enhance the cooperation with stakeholders to review and up-date the programme
- II. Ensure a formalization of the evaluation of the courses by the students

Table 8: Programme Planning and Management

Reference point	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment value by University	Assessment value by experts
7.1	The programme is aligned with the overall institutional mission and vision.	3	3
7.2	The programme meets national accreditation criteria.	4	4
7.3	The institution allocates sufficient resources to support the programme.	4	4
7.4	There is a programme coordinator(s) responsible for managing and ensuring quality of the programme.	3	3
7.5	The mode of delivery takes account of the needs and challenges of all targeted students.	4	4
7.6	Staff teaching on the programme have the appropriate type and level of qualification.	3	3
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
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	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		28/8=3.51	27/8=3.38

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.8.5.2 Curriculum Development

a. Programme strengths

- I. The curriculum, aiming at training researchers in a field where there is still a lack of specialists in Africa, is built upon a balance of major common modules (1st year) with specialization during the 2nd year including internship or clinical study with a clear definition of expected learning outcomes
- II. The regulated number of students (maximum of 30), selected through very rigorous procedures, facilitates the achievement of learning outcomes
- III. Very high level of employability (95%)

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





b. Areas of Concern

- I. Difficulties to find internship
- II. Very high student workload related to an important level of contact hours
- III. Low collaboration with stakeholders to up-to- date the curriculum and adapt to support African development

c. Opportunities for improvement

- I. Develop a cooperation policy with stakeholders and other universities in Africa to adapt the curriculum to African needs when necessary
- II. Follow up the international cooperation and diversify the partnership

Table 9: Curriculum Development

Reference point	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment value by University	Assessment value by experts
8.1	The curriculum clearly specifies target learners and learning outcomes/competencies for each module/course and for the programme as a whole.	3	3
8.2	The curriculum is regularly updated to take account of new knowledge and learning needs to support African development.	1	1
8.3	Modules/courses are coherently planned and provide a sequenced learning pathway for students towards attainment of a qualification.	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	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
8.6	Curriculum development has been informed by thorough research and consultation with relevant stakeholders including public sector planners, industry and other employers	2	2
8.7	The curriculum reflects positive African values, gender sensitivity and the needs of society.	3	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		19/7=2.71	18/7=2.57

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.8.5.3 Teaching and Learning

a. Programme Strengths

- I. The programme will be a pilot to develop a credit system and a diploma supplement defined in terms of competences
- II. The learning material dedicated to research has been designed with the purpose of engaging students both intellectually, ethically and Practically





b. Areas of Concern

- I. Programme review procedures don't include material review and improvement
- II. Lack of innovative teaching and learning materials

c. Opportunities for improvement

Develop a policy of innovative teaching and learning and involve more students in pedagogical issues

Table 10: Teaching and Learning

Reference point	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment value by University	Assessment value by experts
9.1	Teaching and learning are based on explicit learning outcomes which are consistent with programme and course aims.	3	3
9.2	A clear strategy is in place to identify the learning materials needed to support programme delivery.	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	3
9.4	The learning materials have been designed with the purpose of engaging students both intellectually, ethically and practically.	3	3
9.5	Programme review procedures include materials review and improvement.	2	2
9.6	Innovative teaching and learning materials are provided for students.	2	2
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		16/6= 2.67	16/6= 2.67

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.8.5.4 Assessment

a. Programme Strengths

- I. Clear information about mode of assessment is provided for all modules
- II. A variety of assessment methods are used in the programme

b. Areas of Concern

- I. No system is in place for external examiners
- II. Compensation between modules might involve a lack of specific competences needed in the area

c. Opportunities for improvement

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





- I. Continue the policy involving teamwork and student commitment for continuous assessment
- II. Analyze the possibility of including external examiners in the process

Table 11: Assessment Rating

Reference point	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment value by University	Assessment value by experts
10.1	The institution has systems in place for external examiners.	3	3
10.2	Clear information about mode of assessment is provided for all courses/modules making up the programme.	4	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
10.4	The level of challenge of assessments is appropriate to the specific programme and targeted students.	3	3
10.5	A variety of assessment methods are used in the programme.	4	4
10.6	Marking procedures ensure consistency and accuracy and the provision of feedback to students.	3	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		17/6=2.83	17/6=2.83

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.1.5.5 Programme Results

a. Programme Strengths

- I. Completion rates and employability are very high
- II. The programme is very attractive (30 selected upon 4 000 candidates) and allows national and international recruitment of high quality
- III. Teaching is well connected with research

b. Areas of Concern

- I. Lack of feedback from the students during the program
- II. Lack of feedback on the achievement of the graduates and their employers

c. Opportunities for improvement

- I. Develop an active alumni association in connection with the mission of the University
- II. Consider the development of a junior consultancy company to enhance links with the socio-economic stakeholders and make the students more connected with the use of research in the practice of firms.





Table 12: Program results: University versus External Validation

Reference point	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment value by University	Assessment value by experts
11.1	Student progress is monitored throughout the programme and early warning is provided for students at risk.	2	2
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
11.3	Quality student feedback is provided.	3	1
11.4	Expert peers and/or professional bodies review the relevance and quality of learning achieved by students.	1	1
11.5	There is established linkage with potential employers that facilitate graduate employment.	3	3
11.6	Tracer studies of graduates and their employers are conducted to obtain feedback on achievement of graduates.	2	2
11.7	The programme has an effective research plan with suitable implementation, evaluation and feedback mechanisms.	3	3
11.8	Research and consultancy is undertaken in the subject area to solve industrial problems and support the social and economic development.	2	2
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		19/8=2.37	17/8=2.13

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.8.5.5 Rating summary at programme level

University Rating versus the External Validation

Table 13: Rating summary at Programme level

Major Standard	Aggregated Value by University	Aggregated value by Experts
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	2.37	2.13
Total	14.09/5= 2.819	13.58/5=2.716

<1 = Poor; 1.0-1.99 = Insufficient; 2.0-2.79 = Satisfactory; 2.8-3.5 = Good; and >3.5 = Excellent

Overall quality at programme level is rated:

- By the University as GOOD Quality

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP

- By the experts as SATISFACTORY Quality

2.8.6 Conclusions and recommendations

The evaluation of Université Moulay Ismail in Morocco was carried out during 3-4 July 2017.

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 Programme, 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 rates of non-completion, versus schools regulated by a selective entrance, high levels of completion and of employability, and very good ratios of students to academic and administrative staff. 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 sustainable development (*un développement pérenne*) are:

- I. to go on developing a quality culture and a culture of projects in all the components of the institution (Faculty and schools),
- II. to enhance the scientific policy and its international dimension,
- III. to involve more the students in the decision processes and the evaluation of teaching and learning
- IV. to consolidate the cooperation policy, in particular with the economic sector, in the region of Meknès, as well as in the whole Morocco and beyond, in the fields where the University is recognized as a main provider of high quality graduates and researchers.
- V. 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 to date and visionary leadership, leading the 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.



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA

EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



2.9 Ndejje University, Uganda

2.9.1 Composition of the review team

The AQRM validation of the self-rating instrument and External assessment was done through teams of experts and was based on the Self-Assessment Report of the programme by the relevant peers. The membership consisted of three (3) persons as follows:

- Prof. Andy Gibbs, QA Expert, United Kingdom
- Dr. Beatrice Achieng' Odera-Kwach, Senior Assistant Commission Secretary, Commission for University Education, Kenya
- Ms Nodumo Dhlamini, Director ICT Service and Knowledge Management, AAU, Ghana.

2.9.2 Introduction to the report

A tentative programme and list of evidences required for the AQRM Mission to Ndejje University was prepared and sent to the institution ahead of the scheduled visit on 15th to 16th June 2017.

Day One

The team of experts arrived in Kampala, Uganda on the 14th June 2017. A brief meeting to familiarize with expectations and the schedule of the verification was held at the hotel at 6pm on 14th June 2017. The team agreed on modalities of the verification exercise.

Day Two

On 15th June at 8.30 am the Team paid a courtesy call on the Vice Chancellor and University Management, upon arrival at the University. The VC informed the team about the strategic direction of the University for the next ten (10) years. A group photograph was taken with the VC, Experts and Senior Management.

This was followed by a meeting with the Dean of the Business Administration Programme including the QA Director and other members of the QA subcommittee on the modalities of conducting the verification.

After a health break the team of experts held a meeting with the members of the Faculty of Business Administration and Management.

The Team inspected Ndejje University, Kampala Campus, the Graduate School (where the meetings were held and documents verification undertaken), Faculty of Business Administration and Management, Extra Mural Centre, Quality Assurance Directorate, the Students Representative Guild.

The team visited a sample of lecture rooms, seminar rooms, libraries, staff offices and administrative offices in all the centres.

After the inspections, the Team met with the QA committee for the AQRM to verify documentation provided. A meeting with the University stakeholders was also held.

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





After the tour the team made a summary of the evaluation of the facilities, student and staff support services and the overall academic and non-academic staff profiles for the Faculty of Business Administration and Management Programme under evaluation.

Day 3.

During the second day of the verification the Team held a meeting with the Students. This was followed by a consultative meeting of the Team to recap the day’s activities and prepare a summary of observations and recommendations for the oral feedback to the University Management in an exit session on the general outcome of the AQRM assessment exercise.

The oral feedback was presented to the University management subsequently in the later part of the day.

2.9.3 Institution’s general information

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 Church of Uganda Dioceses in Buganda Region and 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 programmes (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 respectively.

2.9.4 African Quality Rating Mechanism Validation at Institutional Level

2.9.4.1 Governance and Management

a. Institutional Strengths

- I. The Mission and Vision statements and the Core Values of the University was displayed in a majority of the premises
- II. The legal framework (Legal Notice No.11 of 2009, The Universities and Other Tertiary Institutions Act, 2001; “The Ndejje University Charter Notice, 2009) of the University provides for the establishment, rules and responsibilities of the University Foundation Consortium; Board of Trustees; Chancellor; University Council and its Committees including Finance Board, Tender Board; Planning and Development Board; Senate and Academic departments; governing board, senate. Composition of membership is defined in the legal framework.
- III. The Governance Structure provides a centralized and top down form of governance which comprises the;

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

- Consortium (Six Dioceses of Buganda)
 - Board of Trustees (Sitting Bishops of the Dioceses)
 - Chancellor
 - University Council
 - Top Management Committee
 - Central Management Committee
 - Senate;
 - Deans Forum;
 - Faculty Board;
 - Department; and
 - Students Guild.
- IV. The Staff, Students and external stakeholders are represented in the University Council as per the Charter and other governance structures of the University in terms of gender;
 - V. There is a detailed questionnaire for student evaluation;
 - VI. The University has established well developed quality assurance policies and procedures and established a Quality Assurance Directorate;
 - VII. There is a clear policy on diversity of staff and students, representation of women and disabled;
 - VIII. Representation of international students (164) from 10 countries in the University, with majority (117) coming from South Sudan;
 - IX. There is a management information system for data capture, however there is need to build a strong reporting system for quality assurance.

b. Areas of concern

- I. The Vision statement is clearly stated however the mission statements does not address the thematic focus of the institution such as science and technology, management and business administration, arts, languages & humanities and agriculture.
- II. The Mission statement in the University Charter is not the same as the one displayed in the University premises and on the university website:
To provide Christian based high quality and innovative teaching, research and outreach service,
Website – to offer excellent, innovative and cost-effective university programmes through sound scholarship, research and conducive study environment, preparing God-fearing students for their future careers, while promoting Christian principles and values.
- III. The University Council has representation of members of the Board of Trustees, there is no clear separation of powers between the two organs;
- IV. There is no clear administrative and academic structure of the University, there is no clear accountable structures of the academic and administrative officers such as the office responsible for ICT.
- V. Students are not members of the Senate;

c. Opportunities of improvement

- I. Mission and Vision statements and the Core Values of the University should be revised to indicate the thematic focus of in the University;
- II. There should be separate administrative and academic organogrammes with clear accountability structures for responsible officers;
- III. Students should be represented in the Senate to allow them to participate in decision making in relation to their education.

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

158



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



Table 1: Governance and Management

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
1.1	The institution has a clearly stated vision, mission, and values with specific goals and priorities.	4	3
1.2	The institution has specific strategies in place for monitoring achievement of institutional goals and identifying problem areas.	4	2
1.3	Clear accountability structures for responsible officers are in place.	4	2
1.4	Where appropriate, staff, students and external stakeholders are represented in governance structures. Governance structures are representative in terms of gender.	4	3
1.5	The institution has developed quality assurance policies and procedures.	4	3
1.6	Appropriate mechanisms are in place to evaluate staff in line with performance agreements with relevant authorities.	3	3
1.7	The institution has put a management information system in place to manage student and staff data, and to track student performance.	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	3
1.9	The institution has a policy and standard procedures in place to ensure staff and student welfare.	3	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		33/9=3.66	25/9=2.78

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.9.4.2 Infrastructure

a. Institutional Strengths

- I. The University has adequate facilities including a sports complex at the Main Campus in Luweero.
- II. The University owns buildings and land in Kampala city including the Kampala Campus, the Faculty of Business Administration and Management and the Graduate School.
- III. The University has sufficient lecture spaces to accommodate students. However, the spaces are in multiple sites in Kampala town and the Main Campus.

b. Area of Concern

- I. Some of the rented Kampala Campus facilities were not built for educational purposes;
- II. In some of the buildings there is no provision for the students with special needs in the Kampala Campus, Faculty of Business Administration and Management and the Postgraduate Centre;

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





- III. The library services and facilities in the two town centers that is the Graduate Centre and Faculty of Business Administration and Management are not up to university level standard, the space provided is inadequate and the reading books are outdated;
- IV. Lack of fire safety facilities such as fire extinguishers in most of the buildings.
- V. The bandwidth in the University is inadequate

c. Opportunities for improvement

- I. A physical development master plan for the institution should be developed to map out the buildings to properly project the ambience of a University;
- II. Enhance broadband width to increase internet connectivity and access; and
- III. Upgrade fire safety facilities such as fire extinguishers.

Table 2: Infrastructure

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
2.1	The institution has sufficient lecturing spaces to accommodate student numbers taking the institutional mode of delivery into account.	3	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.	3	1
2.3	Academic and Administrative Staff have access to computer resources and the internet.	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.	2	2
2.5	The institution has sufficient laboratory facilities to accommodate students in science programmes, taking institutional mode of delivery into account.	3	3
2.6	Laboratory equipment is up to date and well maintained.	4	3
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.	2	1
2.8	The institution makes provision for managing and maintaining utilities and ensuring that appropriate safety measures are in place.	3	2
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		23/8=2.87	18/8=2.25

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.9.4.3 Finance

a. Institutional Strengths

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

- I. University has a good reputation making it attractive to students, their families and enterprises which would like to work with them;
- II. University has joined regional university associations and continental university associations for the purpose of increasing its visibility and networking opportunities;
- III. Ndejje University is known as a “sports power house” and has won several national and regional championships. The performance of Ndejje University in sports has increased the visibility of the university;
- IV. Staff report a good working environment;
- V. Budgets are devolved at department and faculty levels;

b. Areas of Concern

- I. As a private non-profit university in Uganda, Ndejje University was facing numerous challenges related to limited support from the government of Uganda – as compared to public universities in Uganda;
- II. Ndejje university charges low fees and cannot increase them because of the history related to that it was initially established in a war-ravaged area of Uganda and was meant to be accessible to poor within that community;
- III. Students enrolling for Science Technology Engineering and Maths (STEM) programmes were dwindling. Enrollment was only evident in the Faculty of Engineering & Survey that teachers Engineering courses, Engineering Mathematics;
- IV. The University is facing stiff competition from local private and public universities. The growth of numerous un-accredited universities is the biggest worry to the university;
- V. University management considers its employees as partners in the development of the university and achievement of various quality standards however staff and stakeholders felt that the university could manage ideas generation more effectively; and
- VI. The rationale for prioritization of University activities is not apparent to many staff.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. A new strategic plan for 2017/27 aims to consolidate existing activities and selectively expand programme provision;
- II. Harvest ideas from staff and stakeholders, all of whom expressed ideas about prioritizing and maximizing resource provision;
- III. Continue to focus on Quality and accreditation by external bodies and external networking to emphasize market leading position; and
- IV. In addition to engineering courses the University should consider introducing other science based subjects;
- V. Training quality science teachers, staff development in general and implementing retention schemes are critical for the University.

Table 3: Finance

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
3.1	The institution has access to sufficient financial resources to achieve its goals in line with its budget and student unit cost.	2	3

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



3.2	The institution has procedures in place to attract funding, including from industry and the corporate sector.	2	2
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
3.4	The institution provides financial support to deserving students (institutional bursaries and/or scholarships).	2	1
3.5	Information about financial aid and criteria for its allocation is provided to students and other stakeholders.	1	1
3.6	The institution publishes income and expenditure statements.	1	1
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		11/6=1.83	11/6=1.83

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.9.4.4 Teaching and Learning

a. Institutional Strengths

- I. Ndejje University is keen to build a formidable STEM Graduate Program to respond to the country’s needs;
- II. RUFORUM is supporting Ndejje University through scholarships for Doctoral Training. The AAU has involved Ndejje University in the AQRM exercise and also in the Database of African Theses and Dissertations project;
- III. There is a good working environment; and
- IV. The Christian values which are embedded are appreciated.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. Staff development opportunities for staff are minimal;
- II. A large number of academic staff at the University are Master’s degree holders which may limit the University’s desire to deliver niche post graduate programmes;
- III. The student-staff ratio (SSR) difficult to determine;
- IV. Evaluation of teaching and learning is scant and not systematically linked to improvement of institutional approaches nor staff development. Evaluation of teaching, learning and students’ experiences is “weak”. The evaluations by students when done seem to focus on the person and not the holistic experiences of the students;
- V. The Human Resources Unit at Ndejje university has put in place a staff performance management system;
- VI. No promotion of mobility of the University’s staff or students across Africa and beyond; and
- VII. The new student that Ndejje aims to produce will be a “knowledge searcher” with skills of using information and communication technology sensibly. Staff development and physical infrastructure cannot currently support this

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. Training staff with Masters degrees to doctorate level;
- II. Mechanisms to support student independent learning such as improving internet bandwidth, academic advising and counseling services;

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





- III. Improve intra-Africa mobility of student; and
- IV. Feedback form and evaluative methods need to be strengthened and linked to staff development plans.

Table 4: Teaching and Learning

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
4.1	The institution encourages and rewards teaching and learning innovation.	3	2
4.2	The institution has procedures in place to support the induction to teaching, pedagogy, counseling and the upgrading of staff teaching and learning skills through continuing education and lifelong learning.	3	2
4.3	Students have sufficient opportunity to engage with staff members in small groups, individually or via electronic platforms.	2	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.	2	3
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.	3	3
4.6	The institution has developed a policy or criteria for staff recruitment, deployment, development, succession planning and a system of mentorship and/or apprenticeship.	2	2
4.7	Student support services, including academic support and required counseling services are provided, in line with the institutional mode of delivery.	4	4
4.8	The institution has mechanisms in place to support students to become independent learners, in line with the institutional mode of delivery.	3	2
4.9	The institution has a devoted office to promote international cooperation and enhance Intra-Africa mobility of students and staff.	3	4
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		25/9= 2.77	25/9=2.78

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.9.4.5 Research, Publication and Innovation

a. Institutional Strengths

- I. Developed the Ndejje University Research and Innovations Policy;

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





THE AFRICA-EU PARTNERSHIP

- II. Policies guiding undergraduate and postgraduate research developed;
- III. An annual interdisciplinary Journal of Ndejje University;

b. Areas of Concern

- I. Research policy not implemented fully;
- II. The University faculty are not aware of the research policy which is available on the Ndejje University website, <http://www.ndejjeuniversity.ac.ug/docs/research/NdejjeUniversity-Research-And-Innovations-Policy.pdf>;
- III. No thematic research areas for the University established;
- IV. No evidence of research undertaken by staff and published in other accredited academic journals;
- V. No evidence of attracting research grants from national and international sources and partnership with industry;

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. Implement the Research and Innovations Policy;
- II. The University should write proposals to attract funds for research from national, regional, international sources and industry; and
- III. Create an online repository of knowledge generated in the University.

Table 5: Research, Publication and Innovation

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
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.	4	2
5.2	The institution has a policy and/or strategy on Innovation, Intellectual Property Ownership and Technology Foresight.	3	2
5.3	The institution has demonstrated success in attracting research grants from national or international sources and in partnership with industry.	1	1
5.4	The institution has procedures in place to support academic staff to develop and enhance their research skills, including collaborative research and publication.	4	2
5.5	Staff and students publish their research in accredited academic journals and apply for patents (where relevant).	1	1
5.6	Researchers are encouraged and supported to present their research at national and international conferences.	4	2



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION



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	2
5.8	The institution encourages and rewards research whose results are used by society	2	1
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.	1	1
5.10	The institution has established linkages to promote international joint research and publications	2	2
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		25/10=2.5	16/10=1.6

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.9.4.6 Community / Societal Engagement

a. Institutional Strengths

- I. The University engages with the community in some activities especially sports; and
- II. Short courses that bridge the gaps for practicing employees, those still in formal education, those in employment lacking specific competencies and skill available at the university Extra Mural Centre

b. Areas of Concern

- I. No written policy on community engagement activities; and
- II. Dissemination of community engagement activities is not extensive.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. Develop and implement a policy on community engagement;
- II. Conduct research for community development; and

Table 6: Community / Societal Engagement

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
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	3	3
6.2	The institution encourages departments and staff to develop and implement strategies for community engagement.	4	3
6.3	Students are required to engage with communities through their academic work.	3	3
6.4	The institution has forged partnerships with other education sub-sectors to enhance the quality of	2	3





THE AFRICA-EU PARTNERSHIP

	education in the country and region.		
6.5	The Institution disseminates information on its community engagement activities to the local community.	2	3
6.6	The institution offers relevant short courses to the community/broader society based on identified needs and supporting identified economic opportunities.	4	4
6.7	The institution makes its facilities available (where possible) to the local community in support of community and socio-economic development activities.	4	4
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		22/7=3.14	23/7=3.29

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.9.4.7 Rating Summary at Institutional Level

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 2.46, a difference of 0.33 points. However, it can be deduced that the institution still fell within the range of satisfactory quality.

Table 7: Rating Summary at Institutional Level

Major standard	Aggregated Value by University	Aggregated Value by Experts
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
Societal Engagement	3.14	3.29
Total	16.77/6 = 2.79	14.53/6 = 2.42

<1 = Poor; 1.0-1.99 = Insufficient; 2.0-2.79 = Satisfactory; 2.8-3.5 = Good; and >3.5 = Excellent

Overall quality at institutional level is rated:

- By the University as SATISFACTORY Quality
- By the experts as SATISFACTORY Quality

2.9.5 African Quality Rating Mechanism Validation at Programme Level

2.9.5.1 Programme Planning and Management

a. Institutional Strengths

- I. The Bachelor of Business Administration & Management Programme was aligned with the institution’s vision and mission;

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

166



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



- II. The programme was accredited by the National Council for Higher Education therefore complying with the national accreditation criteria;
- III. Adequate resources available to support the programme by the university;
- IV. Programmes are subjected to external review;
- V. Students who fail are given extra tutorials and support to ensure better performance.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. Out of 60 academic staff there were only six (6) PhD holders in the Faculty of Business Administration and Management. Majority of the staff held Masters degrees and there was no professor in the faculty to provide academic leadership;
- II. There was no evidence of tracer studies undertaken at the faculty;
- III. The improvement of professional skills for the academic staff was limited;
- IV. There was no state-of-the-art teaching and learning resources; such as adequate number of projectors, library resources;

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. There is need to encourage many of the academic staff to obtain the Ph.D. degree;
- II. Ndejje University should organize professional courses for academic staff to acquire relevant skills;
- III. Acquire state of the art teaching and learning resources.

Table 8: Programme Planning and Management

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
7.1	The programme is aligned with the overall institutional mission and vision.	4	4
7.2	The programme meets national accreditation criteria.	4	4
7.3	The institution allocates sufficient resources to support the programme.	3	4
7.4	There is a programme coordinator(s) responsible for managing and ensuring quality of the programme.	4	4
7.5	The mode of delivery takes account of the needs and challenges of all targeted students.	4	3
7.6	Staff teaching on the programme have the appropriate type and level of qualification.	3	3
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	4
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	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		29/8=3.62	29/8=3.63

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT





2.9.5.2 Curriculum Development

a. Institutional Strengths

- I. Every department has a curriculum coordinator who sits on the curriculum committee;
- II. Clear system of curricula review and accreditation; and
- III. Curricula refreshed every five years.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. Noted by employers that the job market is changing. The University must transform how it teaches students. Students must be taught to be innovative and create markets / jobs for themselves.
- II. The University does not prioritize establishing student exchange schemes so that the students get the required exposure;
- III. The University needs to consistently search for and share funding opportunities with its staff and students; and
- IV. The University could create more platforms for conversations with stakeholders. Stakeholders potentially have important suggestions for the university.

c. Areas for improvement

- I. Continue to build structured dialogue with employers, enterprises and other stakeholders to foster involvement in curriculum development
- II. Utilize existing involvement in external associations to develop exchange opportunities for both staff and student
- III. Engage the University community in discussions about fund raising, approaches to income generation and give feedback to the community on priorities and actions

Table 9: Curriculum Development

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
8.1	The curriculum clearly specifies target learners and learning outcomes/competencies for each module/course and for the programme as a whole.	4	4
8.2	The curriculum is regularly updated to take account of new knowledge and learning needs to support African development.	3	3
8.3	Modules/courses are coherently planned and provide a sequenced learning pathway for students towards attainment of a qualification.	4	4
8.4	The curriculum includes an appropriate balance of theoretical, practical and experiential knowledge and skills (where applicable) as well as core and elective	3	4





	areas		
8.5	The curriculum has been developed to maximize student career pathways, opportunities for articulation with other relevant qualifications, and employment prospects.	2	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
8.7	The curriculum reflects positive African values, gender sensitivity and the needs of society.	3	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		22/7=3.14	23/7=3.29

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.9.5.3 Teaching and Learning

a. Institutional Strengths

- I. Lecturers teach the required hours reported by students and relatives;
- II. Students value the input, availability and dedication of teachers;
- III. Internships are promoted as a means of learning; and
- IV. Some emphasis on transversal skills which builds student confidence for employment.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. Learning outcomes are only minimally applied in curriculum document. This will have severe impact on capacity to link with current pedagogical approaches and wider Higher Education reforms;
- II. Limited evidence of an outcomes based approach;
- III. Infrastructure supports outdated modes of delivery: Lectures, white boards, handouts;
- IV. Some mismatch between internship placements and subject discipline;
- V. Feedback (from a variety of sources) is not collected and used systematically to bring about curricula development and improvement; and
- VI. Lack of international focus.

c. Opportunities of improvement

- I. Apply an outcome based approach;
- II. Develop the infrastructure and estates development in line with contemporary methods; and the aspirations of university management;
- III. Develop a staff development policy;
- IV. Develop relationships with enterprises to ensure internships are in line with discipline outcomes;
- V. Systematize the learning of transversal skills linked to an employability strategy; and





- VI. 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 10: Teaching and Learning

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
9.1	Teaching and learning are based on explicit learning outcomes which are consistent with programme and course aims.	4	4
9.2	A clear strategy is in place to identify the learning materials needed to support programme delivery.	3	2
9.3	Learning materials have been clearly presented, include reference to the learning aims and outcomes and an indication of study time.	4	4
9.4	The learning materials have been designed with the purpose of engaging students both intellectually, ethically and practically.	3	3
9.5	Programme review procedures include materials review and improvement.	4	3
9.6	Innovative teaching and learning materials are provided for students.	3	2
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		21/6=3.5	18/6=3

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.9.5.4 Assessment

a. Institutional Strengths

- I. Good examples of coursework contributing to a significant portion of course assessment; and
- II. Student feedback is encouraged in the University and the students progress is always checked and they cannot proceed to the next level unless they fulfil the retakes or failed papers.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. Over reliance on formal examinations which brings associated issues related to constructive alignment, teacher and student workload;
- II. Marks are awarded by one person only which produces over reliance on external examiners and is also not objective; and
- III. No information on assessment outcomes available.

c. Opportunities of improvement

- I. An outcome based approach would address issues in assessment; and
- II. Introduce methods of verification for single marker assignments.

Table 11: Assessment

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
10.1	The institution has systems in place for external examiners.	4	4
10.2	Clear information about mode of assessment is provided for all courses/modules making up the programme.	4	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
10.4	The level of challenge of assessments is appropriate to the specific programme and targeted students.	4	4
10.5	A variety of assessment methods are used in the programme.	4	4
10.6	Marking procedures ensure consistency and accuracy and the provision of feedback to students.	3	2
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		23/6=3.83	22/6=3.67

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.9.5.5 Programme Results

a. Institutional Strengths

- I. Established processes for monitoring student progress and providing feedback;
- II. Established mechanisms for assisting weak students;
- III. Adequately provided for research in the subject area.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. There should be a system of establishing completion rates; and
- II. There was no evidence of tracer studies of graduates undertaken by the University.

c. Opportunities of improvement

- I. The University should undertake tracer studies of graduates to find out their destinations in the world of work, their output and views of employers and apply results to enrich curriculum revision and delivery.

Table 12: Programme Results

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
11.1	Student progress is monitored throughout the programme and early warning is provided for students at risk.	3	4
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.	4	0
11.3	Quality student feedback is provided.	4	4
11.4	Expert peers and/or professional bodies review the	4	3

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





	relevance and quality of learning achieved by students.		
11.5	There is established linkage with potential employers that facilitate graduate employment.	3	3
11.6	Tracer studies of graduates and their employers are conducted to obtain feedback on achievement of graduates.	3	2
11.7	The programme has an effective research plan with suitable implementation, evaluation and feedback mechanisms.	4	4
11.8	Research and consultancy is undertaken in the subject area to solve industrial problems and support the social and economic development.	4	2
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		29/8=3.63	22/8=2.75

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.9.5.6 Rating Summary at Programme Level

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

Table 13: Rating Summary at Programme Level

Major standard	Aggregated Value by University	Aggregated Value by Experts
Programme Planning and Management	3.62	3.62
Curriculum Development	3.14	3.28
Teaching and Learning	3.5	3
Assessment	3.83	3.67
Programme Results	3.63	2.75
Total	17.72/5= 3.54	16.33/5=3.26

<1 = Poor; 1.0-1.99 = Insufficient; 2.0-2.79 = Satisfactory; 2.8-3.5 = Good; and >3.5 = Excellent

Overall quality at institutional level is rated:

- By the University as GOOD Quality
- By the experts as GOOD Quality

2.9.6 Conclusions and recommendations

General Observations

- The University had prepared for the AQRM validation as expected; the list of evidence was 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 AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

- III. 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

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

Recommendations

- I. The University should develop a physical master plan for the University to adequately address the growth of the University;
- II. 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;
- III. Intra-Africa mobility of staff and students should be encouraged through partnerships and projects; and
- IV. 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.



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



**UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA**



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



2.10 Sudan University of Science and Technology

2.10.1 Composition of the review team

The assessment team consisted of

- Professor Ingegerd Palmér, former rector, Mälardalen University, Sweden
- Dr. Jefy Mukora, African expert from the Conselho Nacional de Avaliação da Qualidade do Ensino Superior (CNAQ), Mozambique.
- Mrs Gabrielle Hansen, Coordinator from the Association of African Universities.

The University contact person was Dr Rania A. Mohktar, Director of the External Relations Office.

2.10.2 Introduction to the report

The Sudan University of Science and Technology (SUST) was visited by the evaluation team on July 3-4, 2017. The team met with the University management under Vice Chancellor, Professor Rashid Ahmed M. Hussein and visited two of the three main university campuses, the West Campus and the South Campus. The programme chosen by the university for validation was B.Sc. and M.Sc. in Microbiology from the Faculty of Medical Laboratories.

2.10.3 Institution's general information

SUST originates from a technical school established at the beginning of the 20th century. It was accredited as the present University 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. The number of bachelor students is 36 720 (out of which 44 % are women), of master students 8216 (52 % women), of doctoral students 2913 (34 % women). There are 27 687 diploma students (35 % women) and 11 028 (49 % women) studying for higher diplomas. The criteria used for admission to the first level of studies is performance on national exams from secondary school.

The University is allotted a number of student placements from the government. For those students the fees are 115 US\$ at undergraduate level and 2000 US\$ at post-graduate level. The University is allowed to take on more students up till the numbers of government allotted placements. Those students pay a fee of 2000 US\$ at undergraduate level and 3000 US\$ at postgraduate level. International students pay 3000 US\$ and 7000 US\$ respectively. The total number of international students comprises 1.73% at undergraduate level and 3% at post-graduate level.

The university has no student loans scheme or scholarship and bursary schemes. These are provided by the government. The university provides no student housing. There is housing for students from outside Khartoum provided by governmental authorities.

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

174



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

The academic staff comprises 1404 persons. There are 90 full professors (out of which 11 % are women), 211 associate professors (19 % women), 419 senior lecturers (38 % women), 558 lecturers (47 % women) and 126 teaching assistants (38 % women). 50 % of academic staff hold a PhD, 39 % a master degree and 9.5 % a bachelor degree. There are 2 full-time international academic staff and a varying number around 50 of part-time international academic staff.

The University is legally regulated by the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research for Sudan. The University Council is the large 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 is a representative of the University Council and carries all its authorities.

The Senate is the principal academic authority of the University, responsible for all academic matters and welfare of the students. Members of the Senate are mainly academic staff and there are also two student representatives. There are a number of boards and committees such as the Board of Deans, Academic Committee and Finance Committee. There is a Students Union and an Alumni Association.

The Vice Chancellor is appointed by the government and the deans are appointed by the Vice Chancellor.

The main sources for funding of the University are student fees and from government (no distribution given).

About 75 % of the faculty members are involved in research activities. Twenty-five percent (25 %) of the staff research is considered relevant for the national development of Sudan. 90 000 US\$ per year is allocated by the University to research. In 2016 the University received 4 national grants amounting to 67 600 US\$ and 10 international grants (no amount given). In 2016, 337 rewarded academic articles and 19 books were published. Two patents were received.

In 2016, fifty seven (57) community outreach programmes were run. The UNESCO chair for Women, Science and Technology ran 18 programmes, IFC ran 4 and the Incubators ran 35.

2.10.4 African Quality Rating Mechanism Validation at Institutional Level

2.10.4.1 Governance and Management

a. Institution Strengths

- I. The University has clearly stated vision and mission, objectives and strategies. Colleges and departments have their own related visions, missions and objectives, publicly announced. Students showed knowledge of these.
- II. The research strategy is particularly good.
- III. Many policies are in place and the structure for quality assurance is strong.
- IV. The student representation in councils and committees is good.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. The progress of strategic development is not systematically monitored. Policies for gender and disabled are not in place.

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

175



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

- II. There are a number of management information systems but they are not connected to each other.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. Put an institutional monitoring scheme in place to follow-up on the implementation of strategies. Make changes in the implementation when need is discovered (could be in an objective or in the form for implementation).
- II. Make policies for gender and disabled and see to it that necessary improvements are made.
- III. Where necessary enhance management information systems and connect the available ones.

Table 1: Governance and Management

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
1.1	The institution has a clearly stated vision, mission, and values with specific goals and priorities.	4	4
1.2	The institution has specific strategies in place for monitoring achievement of institutional goals and identifying problem areas.	3	3
1.3	Clear accountability structures for responsible officers are in place.	4	4
1.4	Where appropriate, staff, students and external stakeholders are represented in governance structures. Governance structures are representative in terms of gender.	4	4
1.5	The institution has developed quality assurance policies and procedures.	4	4
1.6	Appropriate mechanisms are in place to evaluate staff in line with performance agreements with relevant authorities.	4	4
1.7	The institution has put a management information system in place to manage student and staff data, and to track student performance.	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.	1	1
1.9	The institution has a policy and standard procedures in place to ensure staff and student welfare.	3	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		30/9=3.33	30/9=3.33

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.10.4.2 Infrastructure

a. Institution Strengths

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



THE AFRICA-EU PARTNERSHIP

I. In many faculties, good lecturing spaces, good computer resources for staff and student and good international textbooks in the college’s libraries.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. Safety in science laboratories and maintenance of them
- II. Students' knowledge of safety regulations.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. Improve the safety culture among students and staff.
- II. Develop periodical maintenance procedures.
- III. Subscribe to relevant international research databases.
- IV. Create separate study spaces for students, for studying on their own and together and for group assignments. Such study spaces are necessary for developing students as independent learners.

Table 2: Infrastructure

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
2.1	The institution has sufficient lecturing spaces to accommodate student numbers taking the institutional mode of delivery into account.	3	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.	3	3
2.3	Academic and Administrative Staff have access to computer resources and the internet.	4	4
2.4	Students have access to computer resources and the internet at a level appropriate to the demands of the institutional mode of delivery.	4	4
2.5	The institution has sufficient laboratory facilities to accommodate students in science programmes, taking institutional mode of delivery into account.	3	3
2.6	Laboratory equipment is up to date and well maintained.	3	2
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
2.8	The institution makes provision for managing and maintaining utilities and ensuring that appropriate safety measures are in place.	2	2
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		25/8= 3.13	24/8=3

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION



2.10.4.3 Finance

a. Institution Strengths

- I. The University creates considerable own income, through accepting more students than allotted by the government and offering training courses to companies, communities and other Universities.
- II. Good industrial relations bring joint projects and income from training staff.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. Funding for research from various sources

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. Encourage research staff to apply for funding from national, regional and international sources. Create a support structure for making applications. i.e. set up a group of staff to provide information on available funding sources (and for which specific research areas), their various objectives and requirements, time and procedures for applying.
- II. Provide support in writing of applications.
- III. Use existing and develop new industrial and community relations for funding of projects.

Table 3: Finance

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
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
3.2	The institution has procedures in place to attract funding, including from industry and the corporate sector.	2	2
3.3	Clearly specified budgetary procedures are in place to ensure allocation of resources reflects the vision, mission and goals of the institution.	4	4
3.4	The institution provides financial support to deserving students (institutional bursaries and/or scholarships).	3	3
3.5	Information about financial aid and criteria for its allocation is provided to students and other stakeholders.	4	4
3.6	The institution publishes income and expenditure statements.	0	0
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		16/6=2.7	16/6=2.7

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.10.4.4 Teaching and Learning





a. Institution Strengths

- I. The University provides training in teaching, pedagogy and counselling for all academic staff. It is mandatory for new staff.
- II. The relations between students and academic teachers are very good.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. Student/staff ratio in some colleges and consequently teacher's workload.
- II. Students should become independent learners.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. Increase student/staff ratio
- II. Develop the students as independent learners. To do that the University needs to be fully aware that the teaching, and thus the teachers, have to change. Use electronic support (e.g. through a learning platform), give students assignments to do on their own, stimulate students to work in groups. This will need spaces for students to work on their own or in groups.

Table 4: Infrastructure

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
4.1	The institution encourages and rewards teaching and learning innovation.	3	3
4.2	The institution has procedures in place to support the induction to teaching, pedagogy, counseling and the upgrading of staff teaching and learning skills through continuing education and lifelong learning.	3	3
4.3	Students have sufficient opportunity to engage with staff members in small groups, individually or via electronic platforms.	3	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.	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.	3	3
4.6	The institution has developed a policy or criteria for staff recruitment, deployment, development, succession planning and a system of mentorship and/or apprenticeship.	4	4
4.7	Student support services, including academic support and required counseling services are provided, in line with the institutional mode of delivery.	2	3





4.8	The institution has mechanisms in place to support students to become independent learners, in line with the institutional mode of delivery.	1	1
4.9	The institution has a devoted office to promote international cooperation and enhance Intra-Africa mobility of students and staff.	4	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		25/9=2.8	25/9=2.8

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.10.4.5 Research, Publication and Innovation

a. Institution Strengths

- I. The University has a very good research strategy for 2017-2020, with an implementation plan.
- II. The University has partnerships with industries.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. Funding for research

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. Encourage research through providing teachers time for research and give various awards.
- II. Make sure that the good research strategy is implemented, by monitoring the implementation and make necessary changes.

Table 5: Research, Publication and Innovation

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
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.	3	3
5.2	The institution has a policy and/or strategy on Innovation, Intellectual Property Ownership and Technology Foresight.	3	2
5.3	The institution has demonstrated success in attracting research grants from national or international sources and in partnership with industry.	3	2
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	3
5.5	Staff and students publish their research in accredited academic journals and apply for patents (where relevant).	3	3





THE AFRICA-EU PARTNERSHIP

5.6	Researchers are encouraged and supported to present their research at national and international conferences.	3	3
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	3
5.8	The institution encourages and rewards research whose results are used by society	3	3
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.	4	4
5.10	The institution has established linkages to promote international joint research and publications	3	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		30/10=3.1	28/10=2.9

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.10.4.6 Community / Societal Engagement

a. Institution Strengths

- I. Engagement with community, including rural areas in community programs. The UNESCO chair for Women, Science and Technology is a strong asset for community engagement and support.
- II. Training programs for firms and communities.
- III. Nationally important training in engineering areas for new universities in the country

b. Areas of Concern

- I. Students' involvement in community service programs.
- II. Funding for community engagement.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. Improve contacts with agencies supporting community or industrial development
- II. Consider making a policy on students' involvement in service programmes for communities and industries.

Table 6: Community / Societal Engagement

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
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	3



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION



THE AFRICA-EU PARTNERSHIP

6.2	The institution encourages departments and staff to develop and implement strategies for community engagement.	4	4
6.3	Students are required to engage with communities through their academic work.	4	4
6.4	The institution has forged partnerships with other education sub-sectors to enhance the quality of education in the country and region.	4	4
6.5	The Institution disseminates information on its community engagement activities to the local community.	4	4
6.6	The institution offers relevant short courses to the community/broader society based on identified needs and supporting identified economic opportunities.	4	4
6.7	The institution makes its facilities available (where possible) to the local community in support of community and socio-economic development activities.	4	4
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		28/7=4	27/4=3.86

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.10.4.7 Rating Summary at Institutional Level

Table 7

Major Standard	Aggregated Value by University	Aggregated Value by Experts
Governance and Management	3.33	3.33
Infrastructure	3.13	3
Finances	2.67	2.67
Teaching and Learning	2.8	2.8
Research, Publication and Innovation	3.10	2.8
Societal Engagement	4	3.86
Total	19.03/6=3.2	18.46/6=3.07

<1 = Poor; 1.0-1.99 = Insufficient; 2.0-2.79 = Satisfactory; 2.8-3.5 = Good; and >3.5 = Excellent

Overall quality at institutional level is rated:

- By the University as GOOD Quality
- By the Experts as GOOD Quality

2.10.5 African Quality Rating Mechanism Validation at Programme Level

2.10.5.1 Programme Planning and Management

a. Institution Strengths

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

182



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA

EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION



I. The academic staff is well qualified. The students do practical training in external laboratories (e.g. hospitals). Technology is used in teaching. The teaching is in English from the third year. Good international textbooks are used.

b. Areas of Concern

N/A

c. Opportunities for Improvement

N/A

Table 8: Programme Planning and Management

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
7.1	The programme is aligned with the overall institutional mission and vision.	4	4
7.2	The programme meets national accreditation criteria.	3	3
7.3	The institution allocates sufficient resources to support the programme.	4	4
7.4	There is a programme coordinator(s) responsible for managing and ensuring quality of the programme.	3	3
7.5	The mode of delivery takes account of the needs and challenges of all targeted students.	4	4
7.6	Staff teaching on the programme have the appropriate type and level of qualification.	4	4
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	4
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	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		29/8= 3.63	29/8=3.63

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.10.5.2 Curriculum Development

a. Institution Strengths

I. Regular joint work on developing the curriculum in line with external needs and research findings

b. Areas of Concern

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





- I. Learning outcomes are not program-specific
- II. African values and gender sensitivity are not obvious in the curriculum.

c. Opportunities for Improvement/Recommendations

- I. Develop program-specific learning outcomes.
- II. The students expressed wishes for more advanced courses and more advanced laboratory equipment

Table 9: Curriculum Development

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
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
8.2	The curriculum is regularly updated to take account of new knowledge and learning needs to support African development.	3	3
8.3	Modules/courses are coherently planned and provide a sequenced learning pathway for students towards attainment of a qualification.	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	3	3
8.5	The curriculum has been developed to maximize student career pathways, opportunities for articulation with other relevant qualifications, and employment prospects.	3	3
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
8.7	The curriculum reflects positive African values, gender sensitivity and the needs of society.	3	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		22/7=3.14	21/7=3

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.10.5.3 Teaching and Learning

a. Institution Strengths

- I. The academic staff is very engaged in teaching and give good support to the students.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. Learning outcomes are not program-specific





c. Opportunities for Improvement

I. The department should consider developing more independent learning for the students. E.g. by using technology and developing innovative learning materials.

Table 10: Teaching and Learning

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
9.1	Teaching and learning are based on explicit learning outcomes which are consistent with programme and course aims.	4	3
9.2	A clear strategy is in place to identify the learning materials needed to support programme delivery.	3	3
9.3	Learning materials have been clearly presented, include reference to the learning aims and outcomes and an indication of study time.	4	4
9.4	The learning materials have been designed with the purpose of engaging students both intellectually, ethically and practically.	3	3
9.5	Programme review procedures include materials review and improvement.	3	3
9.6	Innovative teaching and learning materials are provided for students.	1	1
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		18/6=3	17/3=2.83

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.10.5.4 Assessment

a. Institution Strengths

- I. External examiners regularly evaluate examination tasks and assessments.
- II. Assessment is used to ensure that students meet with specified learning outcomes.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. Assessment is traditional

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. Develop assessment methods to support independent learning by the students.

Table 11: Assessment

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
10.1	The institution has systems in place for external examiners.	4	4

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





10.2	Clear information about mode of assessment is provided for all courses/modules making up the programme.	4	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.	3	3
10.4	The level of challenge of assessments is appropriate to the specific programme and targeted students.	3	3
10.5	A variety of assessment methods are used in the programme.	3	3
10.6	Marking procedures ensure consistency and accuracy and the provision of feedback to students.	3	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		20/6=3.33	20/6=3.33

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.10.5.5 Programme results

a. Institution Strengths

- I. Student progress is monitored and there is an early warning system for students at risk of study failure.
- II. Expert peers and/or professional bodies regularly review the relevance and quality of learning achieved by students.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. Sufficient and systematic links with employers and alumni

c. Opportunities for Improvement/Recommendations

- I. Make tracer studies of graduate’s professional work at regular intervals
- II. Identify potential employers for graduates and develop systematic contacts with them.

Table 12: Programme results

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
11.1	Student progress is monitored throughout the programme and early warning is provided for students at risk.	4	4
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
11.3	Quality student feedback is provided.	2	3
11.4	Expert peers and/or professional bodies	3	3

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





	review the relevance and quality of learning achieved by students.		
11.5	There is established linkage with potential employers that facilitate graduate employment.	0	3
11.6	Tracer studies of graduates and their employers are conducted to obtain feedback on achievement of graduates.	0	1
11.7	The programme has an effective research plan with suitable implementation, evaluation and feedback mechanisms.	3	3
11.8	Research and consultancy is undertaken in the subject area to solve industrial problems and support the social and economic development.	3	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		18/8=2.25	23/8=2.88

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.10.5.6 Rating Summary at Programme Level

Major Standard	Aggregated Value by University	Aggregated Value by Experts
Programme Planning and Management	3.63	3.63
Curriculum Development	3.14	3
Teaching and Learning	3	2.83
Assessment	3.33	3.33
Programme Results	2.25	2.88
Total	15.35/5=3.07	15.67/5=3.13

<1 = Poor; 1.0-1.99 = Insufficient; 2.0-2.79 = Satisfactory; 2.8-3.5 = Good; and >3.5 = Excellent

Overall quality at programme level is rated:

- By the University as GOOD Quality
- By the experts as GOOD Quality

2.10.6 Conclusions and recommendations

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





**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

University's operations, with a monitoring scheme to follow up on the implementation. The team wishes the University good fortune with its efforts to improve.

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.



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



**UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA**



EUA

European University Association



ENQA

EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



2.11 Zimbabwe Open University

2.11.1 Composition of the review team

- Professor Goolam Mohamedbhai, Former Vice-Chancellor, University of Mauritius.
- Professor Margret Flieder, Protestant University of Applied Sciences Darmstadt, Germany (European Expert).
- Dr Violet Makuku, Project Officer, Association of African Universities, Ghana.

2.11.2 Introduction to the report

The filling in of the questionnaire was coordinated by the Directorate for Quality Assurance (QA). An Internal Audit Team made up of trained QA auditors from various Faculties and other units was set up. Members of the team then visited the units covered by the various areas of the questionnaire, met the relevant unit heads and staff, collected data, sought evidence and then applied the ratings. The team jointly moderated the ratings and reported to the Director, QA who then sent out the questionnaire to the AAU. The questionnaire was not vetted by senior management or by the unit heads (e.g. Deans of Faculty).

At the meeting of the Experts with senior management and unit heads, several of them queried the ratings which they felt did not reflect the true institutional situation, and suggested modifications. The QA Director explained that in line with QA audit principle, evidence must be produced to support any rating. The ratings as assigned by ZOU in the questionnaire have not been modified. However, the comments made were noted by the Experts during the verification process.

With regard to the selection of the three best Departments/Subject Areas requested at the end of Part 1 of the questionnaire, the following were identified by the Internal Audit Team using the data collected and based on the popularity of the programmes and performance during internal quality audits. The Faculties were not invited to submit their views. The three best Departments/Subject Areas are:

1. Education Management
2. Business Administration
3. Development Studies

Concerning the choice of the programme for Part 3 of the questionnaire, ZOU in fact chose 3 programmes, namely master's in business administration (MBA), BSc in Nursing and BSc in Agriculture Management, and filled in section 3 of the Questionnaire for all these three programmes. The respective programmes were the closest to the subject areas that were highlighted in the questionnaire, namely, Business Management, Medicine and Crop Science. Since ZOU assigned the highest rating to its MBA programme, it was agreed that this would be the programme to be validated.

Visit of Validation Team

The visit took place over two full days on 22 and 23 June 2017. As the Acting Vice-Chancellor was away, the validation team was hosted by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Corporate Planning and Business

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

189



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA

EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

Development), Professor G. Kabanda, who was present throughout the meetings on the first day as the various sections of the questionnaire were discussed with the staff concerned. These meetings were very productive and provided a good insight into the functioning of the University and the various challenges encountered, as well as the innovative approaches used in ODL.

On Day 1 there was no slot allocated for the Experts to consult the evidence documents and verify the ratings. This was therefore done at the end of the programme of Day 1. It was a very tedious task. The documents had been placed in various files but there was no index to indicate which documents were in which files. Soft copies of the ZOU Quality Management System policies, procedures, forms and work instructions together with a laptop, projector and screen were also provided in the VC's Boardroom that was allocated to the Experts. In a number of cases it was not possible to trace the documents, although no doubt they existed in files. Because of the shortage of time, only the most important documents were consulted. The verification proceeded till very late in the evening.

The second day was devoted mainly to site visits. First, a visit was made to the Harare-Chitungwizqa Regional Campus located on the third floor of the former Harare Post Office building where meetings were held with a group of academic staff and, separately, a group of students. The staff offices, ICT Laboratory, tutorial rooms, Counselling Laboratory, etc. were also visited. There was also a demonstration on the use of myVista by one of the students. The next visit was to the Harare City Library, part of which is used as library by the Regional Campus. Then the team went to the Belvedere Teachers Technical College that the Regional Campus uses over weekends for tutorials and also for examinations. Because of the decentralised nature of ZOU, a visit to one of the Regional Campuses outside Harare would have proved very useful but this was not possible because of time constraint.

In the afternoon, a final meeting was held with senior management and heads of unit where the Chair gave an oral feedback on the validation. Among the issues covered were: the need for a gender policy at ZOU; to ensure that teaching and learning materials are available to students in distant rural areas that have no Internet penetration or even electricity; to closely monitor the dropout rates of students; to pay special attention to plagiarism in dissertations; to create a Centre or Directorate for Community Engagement; and to undertake a thorough review of the current MBA programme before offering specialised MBAs. The report was well-received by ZOU.

2.11.3 Institution's general information

The origin of 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

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

190



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

Directorate and a Centre for Research and Innovation. It has a Quality Assurance Directorate and it has adopted and implements the International Standard for Quality Management, ISO 9001: 2008.

ZOU operates through 10 Regional Campuses, one in each of the country's 10 Provinces. There is also a Virtual Campus in Harare for students enrolled from outside Zimbabwe. Each Regional Campus, headed by a Regional Director, provides the learning environment for the students. It is the place where tutoring takes place, and where students can meet in groups and have access to computers and Internet. Each Regional Campus also has a library. ZOU's headquarters, the National Centre, is located in a multi-storey building located in the centre of Harare city, which it has acquired on a rent-to-buy agreement. ZOU has also acquired the premises housing 7 of the 10 Regional Campuses.

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. The immediate past Vice-Chancellor was Professor Primrose Kurasha, the first woman Vice-Chancellor in Zimbabwe, who passed away in February 2017 while in service. The Council is in the process of selecting a new Vice-Chancellor.

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. However, several academic staff are already registered for a PhD degree, and some are nearing completion, many at ZOU itself as ZOU waives tuition fees for its staff. ZOU also employs a large number of part-time teaching staff, approaching 1,000.

ZOU uses technology, print materials and face-to-face tutoring for its teaching and learning. A major recent technological development at ZOU is the introduction of the Moodle-based e-Learning platform, myVista, which facilitates teaching and learning by the students at any time, wherever they may be, as long as they have access to Internet. Most of ZOU's programmes are gradually migrating to myVista.

The prescribed period for completing a 4-year bachelor's degree is 8 years. Any student who fails to complete the programme in that period, for whatever reason, is considered a drop-out. The undergraduate cohort that enrolled in 2007 and finished in 2014 had a drop-out rate of 80%; for the 2008-2015 cohort, it was 81% and the 2009-2016 cohort 68%. These are unacceptably high figures. However, the explanation given was that over the period 2007-2008, the country experienced severe economic and political challenges resulting in massive hyperinflation and unemployment, leading to the closure of most of the country's higher education institutions. It was only in 2009 that the situation

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

191



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



**UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA**



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



started to stabilise. Hence, most of the students who registered in 2007 and 2008 have been unable to complete their programme in 8 years and are considered dropouts.

The main sources of funding of ZOU are government grant (62%) and student tuition fees (38%). The tuition fees are US\$ 440 for undergraduate and US\$ 780 for postgraduate domestic students. Very few of the students benefit from scholarships or loan schemes. ZOU, being a distance education institution, has no student residence.

2.11.4 African Quality Rating Mechanism Validation at Institutional Level

2.11.4.1 Governance and Management

a. Institutional Strengths

- I. ZOU has a good Strategic Plan (2015-2020), which is used to produce a Results-Based Annual Plan each year to establish performance targets for all units.
- II. ZOU has a Quality Policy Manual and well-articulated quality assurance policies and procedures, and it has adopted and implements the International Standard for Quality Management, ISO 9001:2008. It also has a Quality Assurance Directorate, with trained quality auditors in its various Regional Campuses.
- III. The institution has an effective staff appraisal system in place.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. ZOU does not have a gender policy. Although gender parity has been achieved among the students, only 25% of the academic staff are female.
- II. The institution does not involve external stakeholders and students at all levels of its governance, for example at the level of Departments.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. ZOU should establish a gender policy.
- II. The institution should involve external stakeholders and students in its various academic boards at departmental level.
- III. A new Vice-Chancellor will be appointed soon and this will provide an opportunity for the institution to address some of its challenges using a fresh approach.

Table 1: Governance and Management

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
1.1	The institution has a clearly stated vision, mission, and values with specific goals and priorities.	4	4
1.2	The institution has specific strategies in place for monitoring achievement of institutional goals and identifying problem areas.	4	4
1.3	Clear accountability structures for responsible officers are in place.	4	3





1.4	Where appropriate, staff, students and external stakeholders are represented in governance structures. Governance structures are representative in terms of gender.	3	2
1.5	The institution has developed quality assurance policies and procedures.	4	4
1.6	Appropriate mechanisms are in place to evaluate staff in line with performance agreements with relevant authorities.	4	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	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.	3	3
1.9	The institution has a policy and standard procedures in place to ensure staff and student welfare.	4	4
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		34/9=3.78	30/9=3.33

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.11.4.2 Infrastructure

a. Institutional Strengths

- I. ZOU has acquired a multi-storey building in Harare for its headquarters on a rent-to-buy agreement.
- II. The setting up of Regional Campuses in the ten provinces of Zimbabwe ensures that students throughout the country can access ZOU’s facilities. Also, ZOU has acquired the premises housing seven of its ten Regional Campuses.
- III. A major development has been the introduction of the Moodle-based e-Learning platform, myVista, which significantly improves teaching and learning by the students.
- IV. ODL will play an increasingly important role in increasing access to higher education of the bulging youth of Zimbabwe.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. ZOU does not have any laboratories of its own for its science-based programmes, such as Agriculture and Nursing. It is obliged to use the laboratory facilities of other institutions, for example the Agricultural Research Stations and Provincial Hospitals in different parts of Zimbabwe, on agreed arrangements.
- II. The reading space and materials in the libraries are not sufficient for the growing student population of ZOU.
- III. Not all students, especially those in the rural areas, have access to affordable Internet, which is the medium increasingly being used by ZOU.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





- I. ZOU should make an effort to acquire the premises of the three Regional Campuses which it currently rents.
- II. The institution should expand, renovate or even build its own libraries.
- III. ZOU should improve its availability of laboratory facilities, especially in Agriculture and Nursing.

Table 2: Infrastructure

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
2.1	The institution has sufficient lecturing spaces to accommodate student numbers taking the institutional mode of delivery into account.	4	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	3
2.3	Academic and Administrative Staff have access to computer resources and the internet.	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.	2	2
2.5	The institution has sufficient laboratory facilities to accommodate students in science programmes, taking institutional mode of delivery into account.	1	1
2.6	Laboratory equipment is up to date and well maintained.	1	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	2
2.8	The institution makes provision for managing and maintaining utilities and ensuring that appropriate safety measures are in place.	3	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		21/8=2.62	18/8=2.25

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.11.4.3 Finance

a. Institutional Strengths

- I. ZOU has a good finance department with well-qualified staff.

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

- II. Over the past couple of years, the institution has balanced its annual budget and has published audited income and expenditure accounts.
- III. The institution has a robust accounting system and has clear budgetary procedures in place.
- IV. ZOU covers the tuition fees of all its staff who register for its programmes.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. The current sources of funding are only government and students’ fees, with no third-stream funding.
- II. The economic difficulties the country is currently facing could pose financial challenges for the institution.
- III. Hardly any students benefit from institutional bursaries or scholarships.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. ZOU should increase its funding from other sources, e.g. industry, business, etc.
- II. The establishment of an Endowment Fund is at the concept stage at present. Steps should be taken to speed up the process of establishing the Fund.

Table 3: Finances

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
3.1	The institution has access to sufficient financial resources to achieve its goals in line with its budget and student unit cost.	2	2
3.2	The institution has procedures in place to attract funding, including from industry and the corporate sector.	2	1
3.3	Clearly specified budgetary procedures are in place to ensure allocation of resources reflects the vision, mission and goals of the institution.	4	4
3.4	The institution provides financial support to deserving students (institutional bursaries and/or scholarships).	2	1
3.5	Information about financial aid and criteria for its allocation is provided to students and other stakeholders.	2	1
3.6	The institution publishes income and expenditure statements.	4	4
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		16/6=2.67	13/6=2.17

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.11.4.4 Teaching and Learning

a. Institutional Strengths

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

195



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA

EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



- I. ZOU is able to utilise different types of creative interaction (e.g. e-Learning platform, WhatsApp, sms, etc.) with the students for teaching and learning.
- II. In areas where it has no expertise, the institution makes use of subject specialists from other higher education institutions.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. ZOU must carefully monitor its student dropout rates as the rates for the past three cohorts (2007-2009) were unacceptably high, although there were mitigating circumstances.
- II. Not all students are able to access the e-Learning platform, and this disadvantages them.
- III. ZOU employs a large number of part-time academic staff but not all of them have experience in the use of ODL.
- IV. The proportion of academic staff having a PhD is quite low and this has an impact on the quality of teaching and learning.
- V. The workload of academic staff is quite high.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. A significant number of academic staff are enrolled for a PhD, several of them at ZOU as they benefit from free tuition.
- II. ZOU needs to recruit more full-time academic staff to improve its staff: student ratio and reduce the staff teaching load.
- III. As internationalisation is quite weak at ZOU, the institution needs to set up a dedicated office for internationalisation which should in particular encourage intra-Africa staff and student mobility.
- IV. ZOU must encourage and reward innovative teaching and learning.

Table 4: Teaching and learning

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
4.1	The institution encourages and rewards teaching and learning innovation.	2	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.	3	2
4.3	Students have sufficient opportunity to engage with staff members in small groups, individually or via electronic platforms.	2	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.	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	3	3

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





	these policies take account the contribution of higher education to socio-economic development.		
4.6	The institution has developed a policy or criteria for staff recruitment, deployment, development, succession planning and a system of mentorship and/or apprenticeship.	3	3
4.7	Student support services, including academic support and required counselling services are provided, in line with the institutional mode of delivery.	4	3
4.8	The institution has mechanisms in place to support students to become independent learners, in line with the institutional mode of delivery.	3	3
4.9	The institution has a devoted office to promote international cooperation and enhance Intra-Africa mobility of students and staff.	2	1
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		24/9=2.67	21/9=2.33

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.11.4.5 Research, Publication and Innovation

a. Institutional Strengths

- I. ZOU has a Centre for Research and Innovation, although it was not possible to obtain details on the research activities of that Centre.
- II. As most of the postgraduate students are in-service, their research dissertation would to a large extent focus on issues related to their environment and therefore be of relevance to socio-economic development.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. In 2016, ZOU had only 11 PhD students, representing less than 0.1% of its student population.
- II. The institution hardly attracts any national, regional or international research grants.
- III. There is no structured programme for developing and enhancing research skills of academic staff.
- IV. Plagiarism in taught Master’s dissertations appears to be on the increase.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. The new national vision for promoting research, innovation and enterprise development provides opportunities for ZOU to be more active on that front.
- II. Academic staff should be trained to enable them to access regional and international research grants.
- III. ZOU must increase its number of PhD students.





- IV. Additional efforts must be made by ZOU to curb plagiarism among its students; it can learn from experiences from other universities around the world.
- V. ZOU’s website must provide information about the activities of its Centre for Research and Innovation.

Table 5: Research, Publication and Innovation

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
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.	3	3
5.2	The institution has a policy and/or strategy on Innovation, Intellectual Property Ownership and Technology Foresight.	2	2
5.3	The institution has demonstrated success in attracting research grants from national or international sources and in partnership with industry.	1	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.	2	2
5.5	Staff and students publish their research in accredited academic journals and apply for patents (where relevant).	2	2
5.6	Researchers are encouraged and supported to present their research at national and international conferences.	2	2
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.	1	0
5.8	The institution encourages, and rewards research whose results are used by society	3	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.	2	1
5.10	The institution has established linkages to promote international joint research and publications	0	1
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		18/10=1.8	15/10=1.5

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





2.11.4.6 Community / Societal Engagement

a. Institutional Strengths

- I. ZOU’s Centre for Professional Development offers short courses to communities, for example farmers.
- II. The institution has forged partnerships with several colleges, nationally and regionally, for their quality improvement.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. The institution does not disseminate information on its community engagement activities to the wider public.
- II. ZOU has insufficient infrastructural facilities to enable it to engage effectively with the community.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. As the institution acquires more buildings of its own, it will be able to make its facilities available to the community.
- II. ZOU’s website needs to provide information about the institution’s community engagement activities, including those of its Centre for Professional Development.

Table 6: Community / Societal Engagement

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
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	3	3
6.2	The institution encourages departments and staff to develop and implement strategies for community engagement.	3	3
6.3	Students are required to engage with communities through their academic work.	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
6.5	The Institution disseminates information on its community engagement activities to the local community.	1	0
6.6	The institution offers relevant short courses to the community/broader society based on identified needs and supporting identified economic opportunities.	3	3





THE AFRICA-EU PARTNERSHIP

6.7	The institution makes its facilities available (where possible) to the local community in support of community and socio-economic development activities.	1	1
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		16/7= 2.29¹	15/7=2.14

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

1 ZOU mistakenly calculated this value as 2.7

2.11.4.7 Rating Summary at Institutional Level

The ratings of the major standards given by ZOU and by external evaluation are shown in the Table below.

Table 7: Rating Summary at Institutional Level

Major Standard	Aggregated Value by University	Aggregated value by Experts
Governance and Management	3.78	3.33
Infrastructure	2.62	2.25
Finance	2.67	2.17
Teaching and Learning	2.67	2.33
Research, Publication and Innovation	1.8	1.5
Societal Engagement	2.29	2.14
Total	15.83/6= 2.64	13.72/6= 2.29

<1 = Poor; 1.0-1.99 = Insufficient; 2.0-2.79 = Satisfactory; 2.8-3.5 = Good; and >3.5 = Excellent.

Overall quality at Institutional level is rated:

- By the University as SATISFACTORY Quality
- By the experts as SATISFACTORY Quality

As can be seen from the above Table, the ratings of external evaluation of all the major standards are lower than those of ZOU. To some extent, this is due to the fact that in several cases it was not possible to see the supporting evidence.

The differences range from 7% to 19%. The largest differences are for Finance (19%) and Research, Publication and Innovation (17%). In the case of Finances, the concerns are that ZOU does not appear to have any strategy in place to attract private sector funding, and hardly provides any bursaries or scholarships to deserving students. With regard to Research, Publication and Innovation, no evidence was found of the institution having attracted significant research grants from regional or international sources, nor of institutional funding provided to researchers to engage in, for example, addressing the challenges of attaining the Sustainable Development Goals. Also, there was very little information about ZOU’s Centre for Research and Innovation.

Overall, however, 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.

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

200



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION



2.11.5 African Quality Rating Mechanism Validation at Programme Level

This section draws from part 3 of the AQRM questionnaire submitted by ZOU for its selected programme master’s in business administration (MBA). It covers the five focus areas mentioned earlier under section 1. Under each focus area, a Table is presented showing the self-rating scored by ZOU against the various standards for that focus area, and the rating scores of external evaluations, followed by strengths, areas of concern and opportunities for improvement. The methodology used in the assessment is exactly the same as for the institution (see section 5), the objective being to arrive at an overall quality rating for the programme.

2.11.5.1 Programme Planning and Management

a. Programme Strengths

- I. There is a big demand for the programme. ZOU admits over 200 students every year.
- II. Most (about 80%) of the curriculum has been migrated to the e-Learning platform myVista, which increases its accessibility. In fact, the MBA was the first programme of ZOU to go online.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. The programme makes use of a large number of part-time staff, many of whom are not familiar with the e-Learning platform. This limits their tutoring effectiveness.
- II. Many students are finding it difficult to use e-Learning or cannot afford to download the teaching materials from myVista.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. There are possibilities of offering the MBA with specialisation in different areas e.g. Banking & Finance, Human Resources, Marketing, etc.
- II. ZOU must continue to provide hard copies of the modules to students who experience difficulty in using the e-Learning platform.
- III. The fact that the MBA is run mainly online, it can be accessed by students in other African countries. Already, a significant number of students from Zambia are registered on the programme.

Table 8: Programme Planning and Management

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
7.1	The programme is aligned with the overall institutional mission and vision.	4	4
7.2	The programme meets national accreditation criteria.	4	4
7.3	The institution allocates sufficient resources to support the programme.	2	2
7.4	There is a programme coordinator(s) responsible for managing and ensuring quality of the programme.	4	4
7.5	The mode of delivery takes account of the	3	2

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





	needs and challenges of all targeted students.		
7.6	Staff teaching on the programme have the appropriate type and level of qualification.	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.	2	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	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		25/8=3.13	22/8=2.75

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.11.5.2 Curriculum Development

a. Programme Strengths

- I. The curriculum is broad-based and therefore accessible to a large number of learners, both in-service and fresh graduates.
- II. The fact that most students are in-service enables them to acquire experiential learning which improves their learning experience.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. The programme has not been regularly reviewed so the curriculum may be out-of-date.
- II. An increase in plagiarism has been noticed in the research dissertations.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. The programme needs to be formally reviewed in line with the current procedure at ZOU.
- II. ZOU, in addition to the Turnitin antiplagiarism software that it uses, should increase its vigilance in detecting plagiarism, and could learn from experiences from other universities.

Table 9: Curriculum Development

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
8.1	The curriculum clearly specifies target learners and learning outcomes/competencies for each module/course and for the programme as a whole.	3	3
8.2	The curriculum is regularly updated to take account of new knowledge and learning needs to support African development.	2	1
8.3	Modules/courses are coherently planned and provide a sequenced learning pathway for	3	3





	students towards attainment of a qualification.		
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	3	3
8.5	The curriculum has been developed to maximize student career pathways, opportunities for articulation with other relevant qualifications, and employment prospects.	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	1	1
8.7	The curriculum reflects positive African values, gender sensitivity and the needs of society.	2	1
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		17/7=2.43	14/7=2

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.11.5.3 Teaching and Learning

a. Programme Strengths

- I. The use of the e-Learning platform has helped to convert the physical classroom to an online classroom, which is convenient to the students.
- II. The online modules are student-centred and user-friendly and appreciated by the majority of the students.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. The facilities available at the rented venues are not always available, suitable or conducive for proper teaching and learning at postgraduate level.
- II. Some mature students have difficulty in the use of the online platform.
- III. Affordable Internet is not easily accessible to all students, especially for those in rural areas.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. ZOU should acquire its own buildings in all the Regional Campuses to avoid the inconveniences of using rented premises.
- II. More teaching aids, such as projection facilities, must be made available in all Regional Campuses.

Table 10: Teaching and learning

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
9.1	Teaching and learning are based on explicit learning outcomes which are consistent with	3	3

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





	programme and course aims.		
9.2	A clear strategy is in place to identify the learning materials needed to support programme delivery.	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	3
9.4	The learning materials have been designed with the purpose of engaging students both intellectually, ethically and practically.	4	3
9.5	Programme review procedures include materials review and improvement.	3	1
9.6	Innovative teaching and learning materials are provided for students.	4	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		20/6=3.33	16/6=2.67

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.11.5.4 Assessment

a. Programme Strengths

- I. Online marking using standard marking guides is used in all Regional Campuses. This ensures uniform and objective assessment.
- II. All the marked work (examinations, assignments, dissertations) are moderated to ensure objectivity.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. Not all of the part-time tutors are familiar with online marking on myVista.
- II. Some part-time staff supervising research dissertations are not experienced in research methods.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. All tutors should be trained in online marking.
- II. Training workshops on research dissertation supervision and research methods should be organised for all part-time supervisors.

Table 11: Assessment

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
10.1	The institution has systems in place for external examiners.	1	1
10.2	Clear information about mode of assessment is provided for all courses/modules making up the programme.	4	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.	3	3
10.4	The level of challenge of assessments is appropriate to the specific programme and targeted students.	4	4
10.5	A variety of assessment methods are used in the programme.	3	3
10.6	Marking procedures ensure consistency and accuracy and the provision of feedback to students.	3	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		18/6=3	18/6=3

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.11.5.5 Programme Results

a. Programme Strengths

- I. Students who have not performed well in the examinations are given appropriate advice.
- II. Because of the use of online marking, students are provided with the examination results in a timely way.

b. Areas of Concern

- I. Adequate supervision and assessment of research dissertations may become difficult with increasing numbers of students and an insufficient number of experienced supervisors.
- II. There are poor linkages between ZOU and industry, commerce and the public sector that employ the majority of the MBA graduates.

c. Opportunities for Improvement

- I. Guidelines should be produced to assist students in their choice of the research topic of their dissertation.
- II. The student and the supervisor of the dissertation should publish jointly any research paper resulting from the dissertation so as to improve the quality of the publication.
- III. Tracer studies of MBA graduates should be carried out in line with established ZOU procedures, especially before launching the specialised MBAs.
- IV. There should be more partnerships between ZOU and the productive sectors of Zimbabwe as these will enrich the quality of the programme.

Table 12: Programme Results

Reference number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
11.1	Student progress is monitored throughout the programme and early warning is provided for students at risk.	3	3

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

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.	2	1
11.3	Quality student feedback is provided.	4	3
11.4	Expert peers and/or professional bodies review the relevance and quality of learning achieved by students.	2	1
11.5	There is established linkage with potential employers that facilitate graduate employment.	3	2
11.6	Tracer studies of graduates and their employers are conducted to obtain feedback on achievement of graduates.	2	1
11.7	The programme has an effective research plan with suitable implementation, evaluation and feedback mechanisms.	2	2
11.8	Research and consultancy is undertaken in the subject area to solve industrial problems and support the social and economic development.	3	2
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		21/8=2.63	15/8=1.88

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.11.5.6 Rating Summary at Programme Level

Table 13: Rating Summary at Programme Level

Major Standard	Aggregated Value by University	Aggregated value by Experts
Programme Planning and Management	3.13	2.75
Curriculum Development	2.43	2.0
Teaching and Learning	3.33	2.67
Assessment	3.0	3.0
Programme Results	2.63	1.88
Total	14.52/5=2.90	12.30/5=2.46

<1 = Poor; 1.0-1.99 = Insufficient; 2.0-2.79 = Satisfactory; 2.8-3.5 = Good; and >3.5 = Excellent.

Overall quality at Programme level is rated:

- By the University as GOOD Quality
- By the experts as SATISFACTORY Quality

As can be seen from the above Table, 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.

2.11.6 Conclusions and recommendations

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

206



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



**UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA**



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP

- I. 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.
- II. 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).
- III. We took note of the three best Departments/Subject Areas identified by ZOU at the end of part 1 of the questionnaire. The selection was made by the Internal Audit Team but we were unable to verify whether these were indeed the best.
- IV. From the feedback obtained from ZOU, the shortage of time for completing the questionnaire proved to be a real constraint.
- V. For an institution such as ZOU, which is decentralised to all provinces of the country, visiting just one Regional Campus in the capital city centre was insufficient to obtain an overall picture of the institution. The allocated time of two days made it impossible to undertake any visit outside Harare. Three days should have been programmed for the visit.
- VI. The validation team should comprise at least three Experts so that the workload can be effectively distributed.
- VII. 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.
- VIII. 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.
- IX. From experience gained, clear guidelines for the institution should be prepared on how the validation process should be conducted and the visit arranged. The existing guidelines for the Experts may need to be revised.
- X. 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.



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA

EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP

2.12 Ecole Normale Supérieure Assia DJEBAR Constantine, Algérie (FRENCH)

2.12.1 Composition de l'équipe d'évaluation

- Prof. Etienne Ehile, Secrétaire général de l'Association des universités, Ghana
- Prof. Patricia Pol, Professeur à l'Université Paris-Est Créteil, France
- Prof. Amany El Sharif, Manager of NAQAAE Training (National Authority of Quality Assurance and Accreditation of Education), Egypt

**Please note that this report has been submitted in French*

2.12.2 Introduction

L'assurance qualité des établissements d'enseignement supérieur est un domaine essentiel pour revitaliser l'enseignement supérieur et la recherche en Afrique. La Commission de l'Union Africaine a donc lancé le développement d'un Mécanisme Africain d'Évaluation de la Qualité (AQRM) pour établir un système africain qui assurera la performance des établissements d'enseignement supérieur par rapport à un ensemble de critères communs, et pour aider les établissements à réaliser un exercice d'auto-évaluation pour soutenir le développement institutionnel de cultures de la qualité (AQRM 2014).

Méthodologie:

I) Le nombre total d'entretiens réalisés et le nombre de participants se répartissent comme suit :

1. Membres du personnel académique (28)
2. Étudiants (7)
3. Parties prenantes (3)
4. Personnel administratif (11)

Des entretiens non planifiés au cours des visites ont également été effectués.

II) Visite du campus universitaire

L'équipe d'experts a visité différents locaux dans tous les bâtiments de l'Université tels que :

- Bibliothèques, amphithéâtres, laboratoires, salles de classe, salles informatiques, cliniques, salles de personnel, résidence universitaire, ...

III) Inspection des documents fournis par l'institution

Remarques :

En raison de la période de clôture de l'année universitaire, le personnel disponible, les parties prenantes et les étudiants n'étaient pas toujours en nombre suffisant pendant les entretiens. Toutefois, l'équipe d'évaluateurs tient à remercier très chaleureusement l'établissement d'avoir tout mis en œuvre pour pouvoir travailler efficacement durant le week-end (vendredi en Algérie).

2.12.3 Présentation de l'université

L'école normale supérieure est autonome depuis sa création par décret n°81/254 du 05 Septembre 1981 et restructurée par le décret N° 05-500 du 29 Décembre 2005 fixant les missions et les règles

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

208



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA

EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

particulières d'organisation et de fonctionnement de l'école hors université. Le Décret exécutif N° 08-212 du 14 Juillet 2008 marque le passage de l'ENSC d'un statut d'établissement public à caractère administratif (EPA) à un statut d'Établissement Public Scientifique, Culturel et Professionnel (EPSCP)

L'école, qui compte 8 départements ne comprend aucune faculté. Elle n'est pas encore engagée dans le système Licence, Master Doctorat (LMD). En effet, conformément à l'organisation du système d'enseignement primaire, moyen et secondaire en Algérie, elle offre une formation donnant lieu à trois types de diplômes correspondant aux profils suivants ; enseignant d'école primaire, enseignant de cycle moyen (4 ans) et enseignant du cycle secondaire (3 ans).

L'Ecole a jusqu'en 2017, adopté le système classique, deux écoles doctorales ont été installées à savoir diplomation en magistère en anglais et école doctorale de mathématiques où le parcours comporte une licence Bac+ 4 ou Bac+5, un magistère et un doctorat sciences, toutefois elle a récemment monté, en 2017, un parcours de Master et Doctorat option Mathématiques.

Elle compte un effectif de 6514 étudiants (dont 90% de femmes), 243 enseignants et 215 membres du personnel administratif, technique et de maintenance. L'institution est présidée par un Directeur de l'école, nommé par décret présidentiel. Il est assisté par trois sous-directeurs adjoints nommés par arrêté ministériel de (1) La post-graduation et de la recherche scientifique, (2) des études de graduation et diplômes, de (3) La formation continue et des relations extérieures.

L'administration compte aussi un secrétaire général nommé par arrêté ministériel pour traiter les aspects administratifs et financiers.

En outre, huit (8) chefs de département sont chargés de la section des affaires pédagogiques et de la formation des étudiants des différentes filières. Le chef du département est assisté dans ses fonctions par un adjoint, au niveau de chaque département, siègent deux (2) comités, le premier se charge des affaires pédagogiques tandis que le second se préoccupe des affaires scientifiques.

2.12.4 African Quality Rating Mechanism Validation at Institutional Level

2.12.4.1 Gouvernance et gestion

a. Points forts identifiés

- I. Une volonté politique affirmée pour mettre en place les moyens nécessaires au fonctionnement d'une unité d'assurance qualité nouvellement créée.
- II. L'institution a une bonne représentation des femmes dans la structure de gouvernance.

b. Zones d'inquiétude

- I. Les parties prenantes ne sont pas représentées dans les structures de gouvernance
- II. L'institution, bien que disposant de structures et de mécanismes de réalisation et de suivi des objectifs (comités pédagogiques et scientifiques, conseil de direction, conseil d'administration) n'a pas de stratégie clairement formalisée (Concernant la formation initiale, le stage pratique renforcé par le dispositif du tutorat (suivi, séance de travail avec le maître d'application, permet d'évaluer la compétence professionnelle des futurs-enseignants, et donc s'assurer que la formation est hautement qualifiante) pour surveiller la réalisation de ses objectifs
- III. Politique moins formalisée pour le bien-être et la satisfaction des étudiants et du personnel
- IV. Insuffisance de communication entre le directeur et le personnel des départements

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

209



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



académiques.

- V. Insuffisance du système de gestion de l'information.

c. Des opportunités pour l'amélioration

- I. Effectuer l'analyse SWOT et élaborer un plan stratégique.
- II. Revitaliser le leadership pour renforcer la gouvernance et la gestion de l'institution.
- III. Impliquer les parties prenantes dans la structure de gouvernance afin d'améliorer la fonction institutionnelle.
- IV. Développer un système de gestion de l'information.
- V. Améliorer une structure dédiée à la coopération, y compris le développement sociétal

Tableau 1 : Gouvernance et gestion

Numéro de Reference	Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité	Valeur d'évaluation de l'université	Valeur d'évaluation d'experts
1.1	L'institution a une vision, une mission et des valeurs clairement définies avec des objectifs et des priorités spécifiques.	4	3
1.2	L'institution dispose de stratégies spécifiques pour assurer le suivi de la réalisation des objectifs de l'institution et identifier les domaines de problèmes.	3	2
1.3	Structures de responsabilité claires pour les fonctionnaires responsables mises en place.	4	3
1.4	Le personnel, les étudiants et les parties prenantes externes sont, le cas échéant, représentés dans les structures de gouvernance. Les structures de gouvernance sont représentatives en termes d'égalité entre les hommes et les femmes.	3	3
1.5	L'institution a mis en place des politiques et procédures d'assurance de la qualité.	2	2
1.6	Des mécanismes appropriés sont mis en place pour évaluer le personnel conformément aux accords de performance avec les autorités compétentes.	4	4
1.7	L'institution a mis en place un système d'information pour la gestion afin de gérer les données du personnel et des étudiants et assurer le suivi de la performance des étudiants.	4	3
1.8	L'institution dispose de politiques spécifiques pour assurer et appuyer la diversité du personnel et des étudiants, en particulier la représentation des femmes et des personnes handicapées.	1	2
1.9	L'institution a mis en place une politique et des procédures normalisées pour assurer le bien-	1	1

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by: 210





	être du personnel et des étudiants.		
Valeur Totale d'évaluation/ Valeur Moyenne d'évaluation		26/9=2.89	23/9=2.56

Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité : 0 = MEDIOCRE 1 = INSUFFISANT 2= SATISFAISANT 3 = BIEN 4 = EXCELLENT

2.12.4.2 Infrastructure

a. Points forts identifiés

- I. L'institution possède une infrastructure appropriée dans la nouvelle "Cité universitaire"
- II. L'institution dispose d'un nombre suffisant d'amphithéâtres dotés de différentes capacités adaptées aux besoins des étudiants et du personnel.
- III. L'établissement dispose d'installations de laboratoire pour accueillir les étudiants dans les disciplines scientifiques.

b. Zones d'inquiétude

- I. Faible accès Internet
- II. L'équipement des laboratoires n'est pas moderne.
- III. Aucune ambulance
- IV. Pénurie de MIS (système de gestion d'information)
- V. Insuffisance d'outils audiovisuels dans les salles de classe

c. Recommandations

- I. L'équipement des laboratoires scientifiques nécessite un renforcement
- II. L'accès Internet aux enseignants et étudiants est nécessaire.
- III. Ambulance à la disposition de l'institution, vu qu'elle est située dans une zone inhabitée (éloignée).
- IV. MIS (système de gestion de l'information) bien construit pour permettre à l'institution d'améliorer sa documentation.
- V. Salles de classe munies des outils audiovisuels requis pour améliorer l'enseignement et l'apprentissage.

Tableau 2 : Infrastructure

Número de Reference	Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité	Valeur d'évaluation de l'université	Valeur d'évaluation d'experts
2.1	L'institution dispose d'un nombre suffisant d'amphithéâtres pour accueillir les étudiants selon le mode de prestation de l'institution.	3	4
2.2	L'institution offre aux étudiants, un espace suffisant pour la formation / études y compris l'accès aux matériels didactiques électroniques tel que requis pour le mode de prestation de l'institution	3	3





**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

2.3	Le personnel enseignant et administratif a accès aux matériels informatiques et à l'Internet.	1	1
2.4	Les étudiants ont accès aux matériels informatiques et à l'Internet à niveau approprié aux demandes du mode de prestation de l'institution	2	2
2.5	L'établissement possède des équipements de laboratoire suffisants pour accueillir les étudiants des disciplines scientifiques selon le mode de prestation de l'institution.	3	3
2.6	Le matériel de laboratoire est moderne et bien entretenu	2	2
2.7	L'institution a une bibliothèque moderne pour appuyer la formation universitaire et veille à ce que l'accès aux mécanismes appropriés soit disponible selon le mode de prestation.	3	3
2.8	L'institution prévoit des fonds pour la gestion et la maintenance des services d'utilité publique et veille ce que les mesures de sécurité appropriées soient mises en place.	3	3
Valeur Totale d'évaluation/ Valeur Moyenne d'évaluation		20/8=2.5	21/8=2.63

Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité : 0 = MEDIOCRE 1 = INSUFFISANT 2= SATISFAISANT 3 = BIEN 4 = EXCELLENT

2.12.4.3 Finances

a. Points forts identifiés

- I. Le budget que reçoit l'institution du ministère de l'enseignement supérieur est suffisant.
- II. Tous les services sont offerts gratuitement aux étudiants.

b. Zones d'inquiétude

Aucune procédure formalisée pour attirer des fonds externes (à l'exception de quelques projets de coopération financés généralement par l'Institut Français en Algérie, la participation au programme Erasmus+, des échanges internationaux).

c. Recommandations

L'institution devrait s'organiser pour attirer plus de financement extérieur et renforcer ses capacités en matière d'appui au développement et à la gestion de projet.

Tableau 3: Finances

Numéro de Reference	Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité	Valeur d'évaluation de l'université	Valeur d'évaluation d'experts
---------------------	---	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

212



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA

EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



3.1	L'institution dispose de ressources financières suffisantes pour atteindre ses objectifs conformément à son budget et au coût unitaire par étudiant.	3	3
3.2	L'institution a mis en place des procédures pour attirer des financements y compris des secteurs industriels et des entreprises.	2	2
3.3	Des procédures budgétaires clairement définies sont mises en place pour s'assurer que l'allocation de ressources reflète la vision, la mission et les objectifs	2	3
3.4	L'institution apporte un soutien financier aux étudiants méritants (bourses d'étude offertes par l'institution)	3	n.a.
3.5	Des informations sur l'aide financière et les critères de son attribution sont fournies aux étudiants et aux autres représentants.	3	n.a.
3.6	L'institution publie les états des recettes et des dépenses.	1	n.a.
Valeur Totale d'évaluation/ Valeur Moyenne d'évaluation		14/6=2.33	8/6=2.6

Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité : 0 = MEDIOCRE 1 = INSUFFISANT 2= SATISFAISANT 3 = BIEN 4 = EXCELLENT

2.12.4.4 Enseignement et apprentissage

a. Points forts identifiés

L'institution dispose de mécanismes pour soutenir un apprentissage autonome.

b. Zones d'inquiétude

- I. La politique initiée pour encourager les innovations pédagogiques de l'enseignement et l'apprentissage reste insuffisante, malgré la création récente d'une cellule de eLearning et la mise en place de la plateforme (moodle) d'enseignement à distance
- II. La politique de formation continue des enseignants doit être renforcée.
- III. La communication entre les étudiants et les membres du personnel n'est pas assez soutenue
- IV. La prise en compte du feedback des étudiants est inégale
- V. Faible utilisation des nouvelles technologies dans l'enseignement et l'apprentissage
- VI. Les programmes ne sont pas régulièrement mis à jour

c. Recommandations

- I. Favoriser l'utilisation de nouvelles formes d'enseignement et d'apprentissage
- II. Créer des canaux de communication et de retour sur expérience adaptés entre les étudiants, les enseignants et l'administration
- III. Mettre en œuvre un plan de formation continue pour les enseignants de l'école
- IV. Envisager la mise en place d'une politique incitative pour encourager les innovations en

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

- V. matière d'éducation et de formation (appels à projets, prix, etc).
Travailler avec le ministère pour la mise à jour périodique des programmes académiques

Tableau 4 : Enseignement et apprentissage

Numéro de Reference	Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité	Valeur d'évaluation de l'université	Valeur d'évaluation d'experts
4.1	The institution encourages and rewards teaching and learning innovation.	0	1
4.2	The institution has procedures in place to support the induction to teaching, pedagogy, counseling and the upgrading of staff teaching and learning skills through continuing education and lifelong learning.	2	2
4.3	Students have sufficient opportunity to engage with staff members in small groups, individually or via electronic platforms.	4	2
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.	3	3
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	2	2
4.6	The institution has developed a policy or criteria for Staff recruitment, deployment, development, succession planning and a system of mentorship and/or apprenticeship.	3	3
4.7	Student support services, including academic support and required counseling services are provided in line with the institutional mode delivery	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.	3	3
4.9	The institution has a devoted office to promote international cooperation and enhance Intra-Africa mobility of students and staff.	2	2
Valeur Totale d'évaluation/ Valeur Moyenne d'évaluation		22/9=2.44	21/9=2.3

Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité : 0 = MEDIOCRE 1 = INSUFFISANT 2= SATISFAISANT 3 = BIEN 4 = EXCELLENT



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA

EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



2.12.4.5 Recherche, publication et innovation

a. Points forts identifiés

- I. Soutien financier aux enseignants pour la participation à de nombreux événements scientifiques
- II. Engagement vers une politique de recherche ciblée

b. Zones d'inquiétude

- I. Manque de suivi des publications internationales réalisées
- II. Aucune stratégie pour l'innovation, la propriété intellectuelle et la prospective technologique

c. Recommandations

- I. Augmentation du nombre de publications dans les revues indexées.
- II. Suivi des activités scientifiques des enseignants
- III. Offres de programmes de formation aux enseignants pour développer et améliorer leurs compétences dans le domaine de la recherche
- IV. Encouragement à développer des projets internationaux afin de promouvoir la recherche et les publications de niveau international
- V. Augmentation de la collaboration avec les enseignants des universités et donner plus de possibilités aux études de deuxième et troisième cycles (master et doctorats) au niveau de tous les départements

Tableau 5 : Recherche, publication et innovation

Numéro de Reference	Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité	Valeur d'évaluation de l'université	Valeur d'évaluation d'experts
5.1	L'établissement dispose d'une politique en matière de recherche et de publication, de stratégie et de programme. La politique de recherche met, entre autres, l'accent sur la recherche qui appuie le développement socioéconomique de l'Afrique.	3	3
5.2	L'établissement a une politique et / ou une stratégie pour l'innovation, l'appropriation de la propriété intellectuelle et la prospective technologique.	3	2
5.3	L'institution a réussi à attirer des subventions pour la recherche provenant de sources nationales ou internationales et à travailler en partenariat avec le secteur industriel.	2	2





5.4	L'institution a mis des procédures en place pour aider le personnel enseignant à développer et améliorer ses compétences dans le domaine de la recherche, notamment la recherche et la publication en collaboration.	3	3
5.5	Le personnel enseignant et les étudiants publient leurs travaux de recherche dans des revues universitaires accrédités et font des demandes de brevets le cas échéant).	1	1
5.6	L'institut encourage et aide les chercheurs à présenter leurs recherches lors des conférences nationales et internationales	3	3
5.7	L'institut encourage et assiste les chercheurs en leur facilitant l'accès au budget de recherche - développement et en leur permettant d'entreprendre des recherches pertinentes pour la résolution des problèmes auxquels l'Afrique est confrontée et pour la création d'opportunités économiques et de développement.	3	2
5.8	L'institution encourage et offre des prix pour les recherches dont les résultats sont utilisés par la société	0	0
5.9	L'institution dispose d'un mécanisme de partenariat avec le secteur industriel, tout en attirant, surtout, des ressources du secteur industriel. L'institution reçoit des demandes du secteur industriel pour des recherches spécifiques et pour l'appui à la formation.	1	n.a.
5.10	L'institution a établi des partenariats afin de promouvoir des recherches et des publications communes internationales.	1	2
Valeur Totale d'évaluation/ Valeur Moyenne d'évaluation		20 /10=2	18/10=1.80

Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité : 0 = MEDIOCRE 1 = INSUFFISANT 2= SATISFAISANT 3 = BIEN 4 = EXCELLENT

2.12.4.6 Engagement sociétal

a. Points forts identifiés

L'institution dispose d'une politique de stages pour les étudiants dans les écoles et les lycées de nature à enrichir leur formation et à terme, à impliquer la communauté locale.

b. Zones d'inquiétude

- I. Insuffisance de formations de courte durée définies en fonction des besoins de la communauté en fonction de l'analyse des besoins
- II. Faible participation des anciens étudiants dans les activités institutionnelles

c. Recommandations

Implication de toutes les parties prenantes dans les activités institutionnelles





**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

Tableau 6 : Engagement sociétal

Número de Reference	Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité	Valeur d'évaluation de l'université	Valeur d'évaluation d'experts
6.1	L'établissement a mis en place une politique et des procédures pour collaborer avec la communauté locale ou la société en général. La communauté sollicite souvent l'aide de l'institution pour des recherches universitaires spécifiques.	4	3
6.2	L'institution encourage les départements et le personnel à élaborer et à mettre en œuvre des stratégies de collaboration avec la société.	2	2
6.3	Les étudiants sont tenus de collaborer avec les communautés à travers leurs travaux universitaires.	2	2
6.4	L'établissement a noué des partenariats avec d'autres sous-secteurs de l'éducation pour améliorer la qualité de l'enseignement dans le pays et la région.	2	3
6.5	L'institution informe la communauté locale de ses activités de collaboration avec la communauté locale	3	2
6.6	L'établissement assure des formations pertinentes de courte durée pour la communauté / la société en général en fonction des besoins identifiés et en vue d'appuyer les opportunités économiques identifiées.	2	1
6.7	L'institution met ses équipements à la disposition (si possible) de la communauté locale en vue d'appuyer ses activités de développement socioéconomique et communautaires.	1	1
Valeur Totale d'évaluation/ Valeur Moyenne d'évaluation		16/7=2.29	14/7=2

Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité : 0 = MEDIOCRE 1 = INSUFFISANT 2= SATISFAISANT 3 = BIEN 4 = EXCELLENT

2.12.5 Resume de l'évaluation au niveau institutionnel

Tableau 7

Normes de référence	Evaluation de l'Université	Evaluation de l'équipe d'experts
Gouvernance et gestion	2.89	2.55
Infrastructures	2.5	2.6
Finances	2.33	2.6
Enseignement et formation	2.44	2.3
Recherche, Publications et Innovations	2	1.80

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

217



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA

EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



THE AFRICA-EU PARTNERSHIP

Engagement social	2.29	2
Total	14.45 / 6 = 2.40	13.85/6= 2.30

Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité : 0 = MEDIOCRE 1 = INSUFFISANT 2= SATISFAISANT 3 = BIEN 4 = EXCELLENT

La qualité de l'institution est évaluée:

- Selon la université, comme SATISFAISANTE
- Selon les experts, comme SATISFAISANTE

2.12.6 African Quality Rating Mechanism Validation at Programme Level

Validation du mécanisme africain d'évaluation de la qualité au niveau d'un programme.

Nom du programme : Histoire et Géographie

2.12.6.1 Planification et gestion du programme

a. Points forts identifiés

- I. Le programme répond aux critères nationaux d'accréditation
- II. Des ressources suffisantes sont allouées pour soutenir le programme
- III. Les enseignants impliqués dans le programme ont le type et le niveau de qualification requis.
- IV. Chaque programme comporte deux comités, l'un est dédié aux modalités d'accompagnement pédagogiques et l'autre aux programmes scientifiques.

b. Zones d'inquiétude

- I. Aucune évaluation régulière pour le programme (interne ou externe)
- II. L'enseignement classique utilisant le tableau noir et la craie est encore le mode principal de prestation d'un certain nombre d'enseignants.
- III. Les laboratoires manquent de certains équipements.
- IV. Pas de spécifications de programme bien formulées pour les résultats attendus de connaissances, de compétences et d'attitudes.

c. Recommandations

- I. Mettre en place une révision périodique des programmes de formation, grâce à la création récente du comité pédagogique national des écoles.
- II. Fournir des équipements modernes
- III. Prendre en compte les nouvelles technologies dans l'élaboration et la planification du programme.
- IV. Assurer la formalisation de l'évaluation des cours par les étudiants.

Tableau 8 : Planification et gestion du programme

Numéro de	Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité	Valeur d'évaluation	Valeur d'évaluation
-----------	---	---------------------	---------------------

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by: 218



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

Reference		de l'université	d'experts
7.1	Le programme est conforme à l'ensemble de la mission et de la vision de l'institution.	3	3
7.2	Le programme répond aux critères d'accréditation nationaux.	4	4
7.3	L'établissement alloue des ressources suffisantes pour appuyer le programme.	3	3
7.4	Il existe un coordonnateur du/des programme (s) responsable de la gestion et de la garantie de la qualité des programmes.	0	2
7.5	Le mode de prestation tient compte des besoins et des défis de tous les étudiants ciblés.	3	2
7.6	Les membres du personnel enseignant qui intervient sur le programme ont le type et le niveau de qualification requis.	3	3
7.7	Le programme est régulièrement soumis à un contrôle interne et externe de manière participative afin de refléter l'évolution au niveau du domaine d'étude.	2	2
7.8	La planification des programmes comprend une stratégie pour l'utilisation de la technologie d'une manière adaptée au programme, aux équipements disponibles, et aux étudiants cibles.	3	3
Valeur Totale d'évaluation/ Valeur Moyenne d'évaluation		21/8=2.63	22/8=2.75

Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité : 0 = MEDIOCRE 1 = INSUFFISANT 2= SATISFAISANT 3 = BIEN 4 = EXCELLENT

2.12.6.2 Elaboration du programme

a. Points forts identifiés

- I. Les modules sont planifiés de manière cohérente et reposent sur un équilibre approprié des compétences et des connaissances théoriques et pratiques.
- II. Le programme a été élaboré pour optimiser les parcours professionnels des étudiants, les possibilités d'articulation avec d'autres qualifications pertinentes et des perspectives d'emploi (taux d'emploi à 100%).

b. Zones d'inquiétude

- I. La mise à jour régulière du programme n'est pas assurée, la dernière révision date de 2008.
- II. La majorité des intervenants n'a pas la possibilité d'intervenir dans l'élaboration du programme
- III. Le temps assigné à la formation sur le terrain (stages en écoles) est relativement court pour préparer les étudiants à leur carrière.

c. Recommandations

- I. Encourager la participation systématique des parties prenantes à l'élaboration du programme.

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

219



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA

EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

- II. Actualiser régulièrement le programme en collaboration avec les professionnels du terrain
- III. Intégrer progressivement dans le programme de formation des étudiants des stages et des mises en pratique à partir des premières années d'études.

Tableau 9: Elaboration du programme

Numéro de Reference	Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité	Valeur d'évaluation de l'université	Valeur d'évaluation d'experts
8.1	Le programme d'études spécifie clairement les apprenants cibles et les résultats escomptés/compétences pour chaque module / cours et pour le programme dans son ensemble	3	3
8.2	Le programme d'études est régulièrement mis à jour pour prendre en compte les nouvelles connaissances et des besoins en termes de formation en vue d'appuyer le développement de l'Afrique.	1	1
8.3	Les modules / cours sont planifiés de manière cohérente et offrent un enseignement harmonieux aux étudiants en vue d'obtenir une qualification.	4	3
8.4	Le programme est basé sur un équilibre approprié des connaissances et des compétences théoriques, pratiques et expérientielles (selon le cas) ainsi que des domaines essentiels et facultatifs.	3	2
8.5	Le programme d'études a été élaboré pour maximiser le profil de carrière des étudiants, les possibilités d'assurer la cohérence avec d'autres qualifications pertinentes et les perspectives d'emploi.	4	4
8.6	Le programme d'études a été élaboré après des recherches et des consultations approfondies avec les parties prenantes concernées y compris les planificateurs du secteur public, le secteur privé et d'autres employeurs.	3	2
8.7	Le programme d'études reflète les valeurs africaines positives, la sensibilité à la question de l'égalité entre les hommes et les femmes et prend en compte les besoins de la société.	3	3
Valeur Totale d'évaluation/ Valeur Moyenne d'évaluation		21/7=3	18/7=2.57

Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité : 0 = MEDIOCRE 1 = INSUFFISANT 2= SATISFAISANT 3 = BIEN 4 = EXCELLENT

2.12.6.3 Enseignement et formation

a. Points forts identifiés

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

220



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



L'enseignement et l'apprentissage reposent sur des résultats d'apprentissage explicites qui sont compatibles avec les objectifs du programme.

b. Zones d'inquiétude

Insuffisance du matériel d'enseignement et d'apprentissage innovant

c. Recommandations

- I. Établir un programme de formation pour les enseignants pour un perfectionnement professionnel continu
- II. Améliorer l'utilisation des TIC dans le processus d'apprentissage.

Tableau 10: Enseignement et formation

Numéro de Reference	Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité	Valeur d'évaluation de l'université	Valeur d'évaluation d'experts
9.1	L'enseignement et la formation sont basés sur les résultats explicites de la formation qui sont conformes aux objectifs du programme et des cours.	3	3
9.2	Une stratégie claire est mise en place pour identifier le matériel didactique nécessaire à l'exécution du programme.	2	2
9.3	Le matériel didactique a été clairement présenté et fait référence aux objectifs et résultats de la formation et une indication sur le temps d'étude.	2	2
9.4	Le matériel didactique a été conçu dans le but de former les étudiants sur le plan intellectuel, moral et pratique	4	3
9.5	Les procédures d'examen du Programme comprennent l'évaluation et l'amélioration du matériel.	2	1
9.6	Le matériel didactique et d'apprentissage novateur est mis à la disposition des étudiants.	1	1
Valeur Totale d'évaluation/ Valeur Moyenne d'évaluation		14/6=2.33	12/6=2

Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité : 0 = MEDIOCRE 1 = INSUFFISANT 2= SATISFAISANT 3 = BIEN 4 = EXCELLENT

2.12.6.4 Évaluation

a. Points forts identifiés

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





Le programme comprend une variété de méthodes d'évaluation pour refléter le travail de l'étudiant

b. Zones d'inquiétude

- I. La conception des examens est purement individuelle et varie selon les enseignants
- II. L'institution n'invite pas d'examineurs externes
- III. Il n'existe pas de procédure pour assurer la cohérence d'ensemble des examens
- IV. Les commentaires des étudiants ne sont pas suffisamment analysés et pris en compte

c. Recommandations

- I. Etudier la possibilité d'intégrer dans les comités pédagogiques une commission « examen » afin d'établir des critères objectifs de dévaluation et d'élaboration des examens.
- II. Analyser et prendre en compte les feedbacks des étudiants

Tableau 11 : Évaluation

Numéro de Reference	Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité	Valeur d'évaluation de l'université	Valeur d'évaluation d'experts
10.1	L'institution a mis en place des systèmes pour les examinateurs externes.	0	0
10.2	Des informations claires sont fournies sur le mode d'évaluation pour tous les cours et modules du programme.	4	4
10.3	L'évaluation fait partie intégrante du processus d'enseignement et de formation et vise à s'assurer que les étudiants ont maîtrisé des résultats spécifiques.	4	3
10.4	Le niveau de difficulté des évaluations est adapté au programme spécifique et au groupe cible d'étudiants.	3	3
10.5	Le programme comprend une variété de méthodes d'évaluation	4	3
10.6	L'utilisation des procédures de marquage garantit la cohérence, l'exactitude et permet de fournir des informations aux étudiants.	2	2
Valeur Totale d'évaluation/ Valeur Moyenne d'évaluation		17/6=2.83	15/6=2.5

Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité : 0 = MEDIOCRE 1 = INSUFFISANT 2= SATISFAISANT 3 = BIEN 4 = EXCELLENT

2.12.6.5 Résultats du programme

a. Points forts identifiés

Taux de réussite élevé

b. Zones d'inquiétude

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

- I. Pas de mesure prise pour évaluer la satisfaction de l'étudiant
- II. L'institution n'invite pas d'experts et / ou des organismes professionnels pour évaluer la pertinence et la qualité de l'apprentissage des étudiants.
- III. Absence de contact voire de communication avec les anciens étudiants

c. Recommandations

- I. Impliquer les étudiants en tant qu'acteur principal de leur parcours pédagogique
- II. Établir une association d'anciens étudiants pour enrichir la réussite scolaire
- III. Renforcer les partenariats pour soutenir le développement économique et social

Tableau 12 : Résultats du programme

Numéro de Reference	Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité	Valeur d'évaluation de l'université	Valeur d'évaluation d'experts
11.1	Les progrès de l'étudiant sont suivis tout au long du programme et un système d'alerte rapide est prévu pour les étudiants risquant de décrocher.	2	2
11.2	Les taux de réussite par promotion sont conformes aux normes établies pour le domaine d'étude et la méthode de formation ; les stratégies visant à accroître les taux de réussite sont mises en place.	4	4
11.3	Un formulaire de qualité est mis à la disposition des étudiants pour recueillir leurs commentaires	0	0
11.4	Les experts, les pairs et / ou les organisations professionnelles examinent la pertinence et la qualité des formations suivies par les étudiants.	0	0
11.5	Des liens existent avec les employeurs potentiels afin de faciliter l'emploi des diplômés.	4	4
11.6	Des études de suivi des diplômés et de leurs employeurs sont menées pour obtenir des informations sur les résultats des diplômés.	1	1
11.7	Le programme dispose d'un plan de recherche efficace, d'une mise en œuvre appropriée et de mécanismes d'évaluation et de rétroaction.	3	2
11.8	Des recherches et des consultations sont entreprises dans le domaine d'étude afin de résoudre les problèmes industriels et d'appuyer le développement économique et social.	1	1
Valeur Totale d'évaluation/ Valeur Moyenne d'évaluation		15/8=1.88	14/8=1.75

Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité: 0 = MEDIOCRE 1 = INSUFFISANT 2= SATISFAISANT 3 = BIEN 4 = EXCELLENT

2.12.6.6 Resume de l'évaluation au niveau du programme

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

223



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



THE AFRICA-EU PARTNERSHIP

Major Standard	Aggregated Value by University	Aggregated value by Experts
Planification et gestion du programme	2.63	2.75
Elaboration du programme	3	2.57
Enseignement et formation	2.33	2
Évaluation	2.83	2.5
Résultats du programme	1.88	1.75
Total	12.67/5= 2.5	11.6/5=2.32

Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité : 0 = MEDIOCRE 1 = INSUFFISANT 2= SATISFAISANT 3 = BIEN 4 = EXCELLENT

La qualité du programme est évaluée:

- Selon la université, comme SATISFAISANTE
- Selon les experts, comme SATISFAISANTE

2.12.7 Conclusions et Recommendations

L'évaluation du Mécanisme africain de la qualité à l'Ecole Normale Supérieure Assia Djébar de Constantine (ENSC) en Algérie a été menée du 29 au 30 juin 2017. L'équipe des experts en visite se compose du Prof. Etienne Ehile (AUA), Prof. Patricia Pol (experte européenne) et Prof. AmanyElsharif (Experte africaine)

L'évaluation globale au niveau institutionnel a été considérée «SATISFAISANTE» à la fois par l'Université et par l'équipe d'experts.

En ce qui concerne le niveau du programme, l'évaluation globale a également été considérée comme "SATISFAISANTE" par l'Université et par l'équipe d'experts.

L'ENS de Constantine fait partie du réseau des Ecoles Normales Supérieures en Algérie dont la majeure partie du développement est fortement réglementée d'une part, par le Ministère de l'enseignement supérieur pour le volet formation académique et professionnelle et d'autre part, via le Ministère de l'Education pour la gestion de stages pratiques et l'affectation des diplômés sur poste. En formant les futurs enseignants pour les écoles d'enseignement primaire, moyen et secondaire, l'ENS a la spécificité d'être un établissement très sélectif et d'assurer 100% d'emplois, ce qui la différencie des formations traditionnelles des universités.

La gouvernance générale de l'établissement est solide et de nouvelles orientations stratégiques devraient permettre de renforcer son image d'excellence en Algérie ainsi que son autonomie. Une attention particulière toutefois doit se porter sur tous les mécanismes qui permettent d'améliorer la communication entre le personnel académique et le Directeur de l'école, ainsi qu'entre le personnel et les étudiants. Il est important par ailleurs que l'ENS puisse avancer, avec sa tutelle, vers le système LMD

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by: 224



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

afin de renforcer sa lisibilité internationale, d'améliorer les possibilités offertes aux étudiants pour des formation de 3^{ème} cycle et d'optimiser le potentiel des enseignants-chercheurs. Le choix de commencer avec les mathématiques devrait être intégré dans une vision plus large pour les dix prochaines années, en collaboration avec l'Université de Constantine III.

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

225



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



**UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA**



EUA

European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

2.13 Université of Kisangani, DR Congo

2.13.1 Composition of the review team

- Dr. Jochen Hellmann, Secretary General of the Franco-German University, Germany
- Dr. Violet Makuku, Project Officer, Association of African Universities, Ghana

2.13.2 Introduction

This report is the result of the evaluation of University of Kisangani, Kisangani (DR Congo), based on the African Quality Rating Mechanism (AQRM) approach.

The self-rating of the University was validated by international external reviewers through a site visit which took place from 20 to 21 July 2018. The self-evaluation report was prepared by the University based on the AQRM survey that was sent to the international expert team. Further information was provided after the physical visit and was incorporated in the report.

The international expert team (hereinafter named 'the team') consisted of:

- Dr. Jochen Hellmann, Secretary General of the Franco-German University, Germany
- Dr. Violet Makuku, Project Officer, Association of African Universities, Ghana

As the result of the visit, this Evaluation Report was prepared and should be published and disseminated among various stakeholders of the University community.

2.13.3 Institution's general information

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, the 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 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.

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

226



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



2.13.4 African Quality Rating Mechanism Validation at Institutional Level

2.13.4.1 Governance and Management

a. Institutional strengths

The institution has the ambition to improve and to position itself as one of the best if not the best higher education institution in the country. The institution is governed by capable and competent leaders who will not easily abandon their stated aspirations. We were provided all relevant data; the generally accepted accounting principles were in place.

b. Areas of concern

- I. External Stakeholders are not well represented in the governance structures.
- II. Researchers/lecturers seem to move ahead in their career very much based on seniority and not on individual merit.
- III. Gender equality is far from being achieved

c. Opportunities for improvement

- I. There should be an advisory board with stakeholders representing the labor market and the society as a whole.
- II. There should be Faculty advisory board members too who should be actively involved in relevant curriculum review and curriculum renewal.
- III. Academic staff should be evaluated according to research performance, but also by means of a system of rating of their academic teaching by students.
- IV. There should be a plan to improve career opportunities for women within the university.

Table 1: Governance and Management

Reference Number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
1.1	The institution has a clearly stated vision, mission, and values with specific goals and priorities.	4	3
1.2	The institution has specific strategies in place for monitoring achievement of institutional goals and identifying problem areas.	3	2
1.3	Clear accountability structures for responsible officers are in place.	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	1
1.5	The institution has developed quality assurance policies and procedures.	4	2
1.6	Appropriate mechanisms are in place to evaluate staff in line with performance agreements with relevant authorities.	3	1





1.7	The institution has put a management information system in place to manage student and staff data, and to track student performance.	3	2
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.	2	1
1.9	The institution has a policy and standard procedures in place to ensure staff and student welfare.	2	2
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		27/9 = 3	17/9 = 1.89

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.13.4.2 Infrastructure

a. Institutional strengths

Given the difficult conditions, the institution does what it can to provide lecturing spaces. There is a visible effort to improve the library equipment by scanning books to make them available electronically. Students are included in the effort to ensure campus security, which seems to be a good approach.

b. Areas of concern

Certainly, due to a comprehensive lack of financial means, electronic learning resources, hardware and internet connection as well as equipment in general leave much to be desired. In a couple of facilities a certain lack of cleanliness can be complained.

c. Opportunities for improvement

Campuses, faculties and departments should have the same levels of cleanliness, maintenance and resources so that an element of neglect is not sensed where preferential treatment is applied most favourably to the administrative facilities and selected faculties.

The institution should try to improve the equipment, particularly the electronic learning and research resources by cooperation projects with external and international partners, by subscribing to electronic scientific journals free of charge, by enhancing fundraising and by pointing out to the competent government authorities that the unsatisfactory equipment is the big obstacle to development. More and better paid technical staff should be recruited, otherwise the maintenance of equipment is at risk.

Although this seems a little bit off-topic, but only at first glance, we suggest that more attention should be paid to the general tidiness of all university premises. If everything were spick and span, that would generate positive feedback effects with regard to the general attitude of students, staff and stakeholders.

Places in student dormitories should be expanded and fire prevention in the existing dormitories improved by not locking fire extinguishers away and by continuously checking their expiry dates so as to replenish them.

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





Even under the difficult financial climate, efforts should be there to increase accommodation facilities. Public & Private Partnerships could be explored where the institution could partner with some external companies to construct hostels. They may sign an agreement that after completion of the structures the partners get a higher percentage from the students who will be paying to stay in these hostels and after some time they will be wholly owned by the institution.

Table 2: Infrastructure

Reference Number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
2.1	The institution has sufficient lecturing spaces to accommodate student numbers taking the institutional mode of delivery into account.	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.	2	1
2.3	Academic and Administrative Staff have access to computer resources and the Internet.	2	2
2.4	Students have access to computer resources and the internet at a level appropriate to the demands of the institutional mode of delivery	2	2
2.5	The institution has sufficient laboratory facilities to accommodate students in science programs, taking institutional mode of delivery into account.	3	2
2.6	Laboratory equipment is up to date and well maintained.	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.	2	2
2.8	The institution makes provision for managing and maintaining utilities and ensuring that appropriate safety measures are in place.	2	2
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		17/8=2.13	15/8=1.88

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.13.4.3 Finances

a. Institutional strenghts

The institution has a policy to attribute funds and to fill the many existing gaps as good as it can. The relevant data is published and transparent.

b. Areas of concern

The institution is clearly and heavily underfunded. There is no financial support to deserving students to speak of.





c. Opportunities for improvement

The institution should enhance its international contacts in order to attract international funds, try to work on joint ventures with industrial partners and put pressure on the government to improve the financial situation.

Table 3: Finances

Reference Number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
3.1	The institution has access to sufficient financial resources to achieve its goals in line with its budget and student unit cost.	2	1
3.2	The institution has procedures in place to attract funding, including from industry and the corporate sector.	2	2
3.3	Clearly specified budgetary procedures are in place to ensure allocation of resources reflects the vision, mission and goals of the institution.	2	3
3.4	The institution provides financial support to deserving students (institutional bursaries and/or scholarships).	1	1
3.5	Information about financial aid and criteria for its allocation is provided to students and other stakeholders.	3	2
3.6	The institution publishes income and expenditure statements.	3	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		13/6=2.17	10/6= 2

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.13.4.4 Teaching and learning

a. Institutional strengths

It is praiseworthy that the institution has a clear commitment to introduce the “LMD” system in line with European standards, i.e. the idea to organize the course of studies in a three-tier structure, to modularize learning units, to facilitate the transition from one programme to another, to assess learning progress and to define precise learning outcome goals.

Staff ratios comply with international standards. Teachers seem to be mostly, if not in all cases, aware of the necessity to continue the effort of self-improvement. Due to the strong government influence in programme design, the institution has not much maneuvering margin to improve curricula but seem to use the little leeway they have. The international office is very committed and efficient, although understaffed.





b. Areas of concern

Students are complaining about too little opportunity to communicate directly with teachers to consult on different areas of concern in their studies including more and clear feedback on the work that they do.

c. Opportunities for improvement

Students need to be systematically and meaningfully involved in the assessment of lecturers and programmes for meaningful improvement in teaching and learning to take place. Quality assurance system and procedures for lecturers and programme evaluations should be put in place and be monitored for better results to be realized.

There is great need for specialization as is demanded by the market e.g to have Botany and other specialised fields fields that students can pursue rather than programmes that are too general. Curriculum review and curriculum renewal are very urgent areas of concern which need to be done by all university stakeholders including management, deans, lecturers students and advisory board members who are specialists in the different areas of concern. Officially known and appointed advisory board members should always be actively involved in faculties for the sake of institutional development.

It is recommended to make more use of the talent of students who should be regarded as partners in the process of knowledge acquisition and not so much as the passive objects of instruction. Soft skills should be more in the focus and play a larger role in teaching. Awareness should be created among students that employment is not the one and only possibility for professional accomplishment and that to start up their own company could offer an equally positive long-term prospect. The entrepreneurial spirit, hitherto not very pronounced, should be enhanced in teaching and learning through the introduction of university wide courses on entrepreneurship, communication skills and other survival skills courses.

Table 4: Teaching and Learning

Reference Number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
4.1	The institution encourages and rewards teaching and learning innovation.	3	3
4.2	The institution has procedures in place to support the induction to teaching, pedagogy, counseling and the upgrading of staff teaching and learning skills through continuing education and lifelong learning.	3	2
4.3	Students have sufficient opportunity to engage with staff members in small groups, individually or via electronic platforms.	3	1
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.	3	3

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





4.5	The institution has policies/procedures in place to inform the development, implementation and assessment of programs offered by the institution and these policies take account the contribution of higher education to socio-economic development.	3	2
4.6	The institution has developed a policy or criteria for staff recruitment, deployment, development, succession planning and a system of mentorship and/or apprenticeship.	2	1
4.7	Student support services, including academic support and required counseling services are provided, in line with the institutional mode of delivery.	2	2
4.8	The institution has mechanisms in place to support students to become independent learners, in line with the institutional mode of delivery.	1	1
4.9	The institution has a devoted office to promote international cooperation and enhance Intra-Africa mobility of students and staff.	3	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		23/9=2.56	18/9=2

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.13.4.5 Research, publication and innovation

a. Institutional strengths

The policy described in the “Plan stratégique 2016 – 2020” is sound and well thought out. The university performs well in a couple of scientific fields (for example biodiversity). List of publications of researchers shows clear priority areas and solid research skills among faculty members.

b. Areas of concern

Unfortunately, many of the articles are not published in international peer reviewed journals. A number of researchers seem to be unable to publish their findings in English. The lack of budget makes it difficult to participate in international conferences.

The cooperation with industry is underdeveloped such that a lot more needs to be done in faculties and at institutional level in relation to this aspect.

c. Opportunities for improvement

It is strongly recommended to improve the level of performance in the English language. The institution is part of the francophone academic community, which can be considered in itself a good thing and even a strong point under the condition that the links with the French speaking world comes as an additional opportunity (and not as a limitation of contacts with the wider world). It is recommended to set a date by which every faculty member has to reach a determined level of English (the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages might be of use). The language question seems, aside from other problems such as the lack of funding, to be a key issue to achieve targets such as the promotion of international joint research.

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





Table 5: Research, publication and innovation

Reference Number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
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.	3	2
5.2	The institution has a policy and/or strategy on Innovation, Intellectual Property Ownership and Technology Foresight.	2	3
5.3	The institution has demonstrated success in attracting research grants from national or international sources and in partnership with industry.	3	2
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	2
5.5	Staff and students publish their research in accredited academic journals and apply for patents (where relevant).	2	2
5.6	Researchers are encouraged and supported to present their research at national and international conferences.	3	3
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.	2	2
5.8	The institution encourages and rewards research whose results are used by society.	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.	2	1
5.10	The institution has established linkages to promote international joint research and publications	3	2
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		25/10=2.5	21/10=2.1

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.13.4.6 Community / Societal Engagement

a. Institutional strengths

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





There is some commitment to improve cooperation with the local community. There are to some extent personal bonds and contacts with representatives of the civil society, partly through contact with alumni. A very positive achievement is the radio station on campus with a good transmitting range and an interesting offer to the broader public.

b. Areas of concern

Although the impression of the evaluation team is that the university strives for academic excellence (which is laudable) but not enough for a close relationship with the local and regional community, nor with society in general.

Relevant faculties (e.g. Faculty of Science and Agriculture) that could impact on the local communities' livelihoods have been identified and these could work directly with the communities to improve on different areas like utilizing the surrounding areas for more agriculture produce, cleanliness of the environment and the need for a cultural shift regarding schooling and the girl child to uplift females in the DRC.

c. Opportunities for improvement

It is strongly recommended to enhance a spirit of "Out of the academic Ivory tower". It should be examined, as a first step, how to establish a comprehensive (and perhaps mandatory) community service for students: It is crucial that students learn to be part of the civil society and to apply directly what has been learned.

A second recommendation in the same direction: Researchers have to learn that publishing in prestigious periodicals is of course a legitimate aim, but that it is furthermore necessary to "vulgarize" research findings in a comprehensible manner in order to exert direct impact on everyday life and therefore develop close ties with the population.

The radio station could be a highly useful tool for augmenting the physical activities through information dissemination regarding changing communities' perceptions of the girl child, cleanliness, harnessing the environment to improve livelihoods and survival skills of being hard workers. The university's community engagement by lecturers and students could also be broadcast for buy-in from other communities far away from the institution.

Table 6: Community / Societal Engagement

Reference Number	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment Value by University	Assessment Value by Experts
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.	3	1
6.2	The institution encourages departments and staff to develop and implement strategies for community engagement.	3	2
6.3	Students are required to engage with communities	3	1

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





	through their academic work.		
6.4	The institution has forged partnerships with other education sub-sectors to enhance the quality of education in the country and region.	3	1
6.5	The Institution disseminates information on its community engagement activities to the local community.	3	3
6.6	The institution offers relevant short courses to the community/broader society based on identified needs and supporting identified economic opportunities.	3	1
6.7	The institution makes its facilities available (where possible) to the local community in support of community and socio-economic development activities.	3	1
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		21/7=3	10/7=1.43

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.13.4.7 Rating Summary at Institutional Level

Table 7: Rating Summary at Institutional Level

Major standard	Aggregated Value by University	Aggregated Value by Experts
Governance and management	3.00	1.89
Infrastructure	2.13	1.88
Finance	2.17	2
Teaching and Learning	2.56	2
Research, Publication and Innovation	2.50	2.1
Societal Engagement	3.00	1.43
Total	15.36/6=2.56	11.3/6=1.88

<1 = Poor; 1.0-1.99 = Insufficient; 2.0-2.79 = Satisfactory; 2.8-3.5 = Good; and >3.5 = Excellent

- By the University as SATISFACTORY Quality
- By the experts as INSUFFICIENT Quality

2.13.5 African Quality Rating Mechanism Validation at Programme Level

2.13.5.1 Programme planning and management

Evaluated programme: Faculty of Science

a. Programme strengths

Teaching is clearly in line with national criteria; everything is correctly managed (considering the difficult conditions). The dean is committed and competent, as well as his close collaborators. Lecturers have a good level of academic experience; a competent team is doubtlessly in charge.

b. Areas of concern

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





Generational management should be taken more seriously: The impression is that it is not enough done to ensure that young lecturers join the team; even more troubling is the age (and the lack of) technical staff which is particularly important in science where the maintenance of equipment is vitally important.

c. Opportunities for improvement

Within the university, the faculty of science is one of the most valuable assets: The university is encouraged to do everything to improve the facilities and material resources in general. Especially alarming is the situation reported by students concerning the difficulties of accessing Internet. The evaluation team is completely aware of the difficult overall conditions but recommends strongly to find remedy in order to offer Internet access to students and staff alike. More and better remunerated technicians must be recruited.

Table 8: Programme Planning and Management

Reference point	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment value by University	Assessment value by experts
7.1	The programme is aligned with the overall institutional mission and vision.	3	3
7.2	The programme meets national accreditation criteria.	3	3
7.3	The institution allocates sufficient resources to support the programme.	2	2
7.4	There is a programme coordinator(s) responsible for managing and ensuring quality of the program.	3	3
7.5	The mode of delivery takes account of the needs and challenges of all targeted students.	3	2
7.6	Staff teaching on the programme have the appropriate type and level of qualification.	3	3
7.7	The programme is regularly subjected to internal and external review in a participatory manner to reflect developments in the area of study.	2	2
7.8	Programme planning includes a strategy for the use of technology in a manner appropriate to the program, facilities available, and target students.	2	2
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		21/8=2.63	20/8=2.5

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.13.5.2 Curriculum development

a. Programme strengths

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





The transition to the “LMD-system” is well under way, as is the necessary modularization of the single parts of the study courses. Within the framework of the recently adopted performance contract (March 2017), content and goals of study programmes are clearly depicted.

b. Areas of concern

There seems to be some need to get more flexibility and more speed into the procedure of adapting programmes to new challenges. The evaluators see a certain lack of specific training with a view to the job prospects of graduates: It does not make much sense to train only generalists, even if generalists are necessary for science and society. There should be taken care of those who need very specific skills for a chosen profession.

c. Opportunities for improvement

It is strongly recommended to consult stakeholders and particularly those representing the labor market in order to ensure that curricula correspond to labor demand and is relevant to address graduate employability and entrepreneurship. The proposed curricula committee must contain external members.

Table 9: Curriculum development

Reference point	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment value by University	Assessment value by experts
8.1	The curriculum clearly specifies target learners and learning outcomes/competencies for each module/course and for the programme as a whole.	3	3
8.2	The curriculum is regularly updated to take account of new knowledge and learning needs to support African development.	2	1
8.3	Modules/courses are coherently planned and provide a sequenced learning pathway for students towards attainment of a qualification.	2	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.	3	2
8.5	The curriculum has been developed to maximize student career pathways, opportunities for articulation with other relevant qualifications, and employment prospects.	2	2
8.6	Curriculum development has been informed by thorough research and consultation with relevant stakeholders including public sector planners, industry and other employers.	2	1
8.7	The curriculum reflects positive African values, gender sensitivity and the needs of society.	3	2
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		17/7=2.43	14/7=2





Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.13.5.3 Teaching and Learning

a. Programme strengths

The performance contract contains valuable elements of strategic improvement. To form excellent students in the field of sustainable natural resources is an appropriate (and reachable) goal.

b. Areas of concern

The learning materials suffer from the general lack of funds; the faculty is aware of the necessity to advance with respect to the practically non-existing distance learning, for which a prerequisite would be are more stable, quicker and more reliable Internet connection.

c. Opportunities for improvement

It is useful to emphasize again the recommendation to involve all the partners (stakeholders, students) in the process of improving the learning environment.

Table 10: Teaching and Learning

Reference point	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment value by University	Assessment value by experts
9.1	Teaching and learning are based on explicit learning outcomes which are consistent with programme and course aims.	3	2
9.2	A clear strategy is in place to identify the learning materials needed to support programme delivery.	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	2
9.4	The learning materials have been designed with the purpose of engaging students intellectually, ethically and practically.	3	1
9.5	Program review procedures include materials review and improvement.	2	1
9.6	Innovative teaching and learning materials are provided for students.	2	2
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		16/6=2.67	11/6=1.83

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.13.5.4 Assessment

a. Programme strengths

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





Some information about assessment was available, and there is no doubt that assessment in general is taken seriously.

b. Areas of concern

Although there seem to be a certain disinterest among faculty to improve in this field.

c. Opportunities for improvement

It is recommended to pay more attention to modern assessment methods especially with regard to specific needs of different programmes and to the assessment of learning outcomes adapted to specific professional aspirations.

Table 11: Assessment

Reference point	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment value by University	Assessment value by experts
10.1	The institution has systems in place for external examiners.	3	1
10.2	Clear information about mode of assessment is provided for all courses/modules making up the program.	3	2
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.	3	2
10.4	The level of challenge of assessments is appropriate to the specific program and targeted students.	3	2
10.5	A variety of assessment methods are used in the program.	3	2
10.6	Marking procedures ensure consistency and accuracy and the provision of feedback to students.	3	1
Total assessment value / Aggregated value: Aggregated Value		18/6=3	10/6=1.67

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.13.5.5 Programme results

a. Programme strengths

The requested data was available; the responsible persons have sufficient problem awareness to see the completion rate as an important success indicator. The core subject (biodiversity) is relevant for the social and economic development; excellent research is carried out in this field with a positive impact on the general situation of region and country.

b. Areas of concern

The point of view of students is not sufficiently included into the opinion-forming process. There is not enough accompanying research concerning the drop-out of students.

c. Opportunities for improvement

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





We encourage the faculty board to launch an independent study to assess volume and reasons for dropout and possible measures to improve the graduation success rate. Students and employers should be involved in the process.

More student-centredness is called for so that lecturers are readily available for students to consult and get physical feedback.

It is very important to check on all facets of the student’s life at the institution in order to build loyal alumni who can assist the institution in future.

Table 13: Programme results

Reference point	Standards for Quality Rating	Assessment value by University	Assessment value by experts
11.1	Student progress is monitored throughout the programme and early warning is provided for students at risk.	1	2
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.	2	2
11.3	Quality student feedback is provided.	1	1
11.4	Expert peers and/or professional bodies review the relevance and quality of learning achieved by students.	1	1
11.5	There is established linkage with potential employers that facilitate graduate employment.	2	1
11.6	Tracer studies of graduates and their employers are conducted to obtain feedback on achievement of graduates.	1	1
11.7	The programme has an effective research plan with suitable implementation, evaluation and feedback mechanisms.	2	2
11.8	Research and consultancy is undertaken in the subject area to solve industrial problems and support the social and economic development.	3	3
Total assessment value / Aggregated value		13/8=1.63	13/8=1.63

Rate on the basis of the following standards by assigning an assessment value (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) 0 = POOR 1 = INSUFFICIENT 2 = SATISFACTORY 3 = GOOD 4 = EXCELLENT

2.13.5.6 Rating summary at programme level

Table 13: Rating summary at Programme level

Major Standard	Aggregated Value by University	Aggregated value by Experts
Programme planning and Management	2.63	2.5
Curriculum development	2.43	2.0
Teaching and Learning	2.67	1.83
Assessment	3.00	1.67
Programme Results	1.63	1.63

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





THE AFRICA-EU PARTNERSHIP

Total	12.36/5=2.47	9.63/5=1.93
--------------	---------------------	--------------------

<1 = Poor; 1.0-1.99 = Insufficient; 2.0-2.79 = Satisfactory; 2.8-3.5 = Good; and >3.5 = Excellent

Overall quality at programme level is rated:

- By the University as SATISFACTORY
- By the experts as INSUFFICIENT

2.13.6 Conclusions and Recommendations

The total evaluation at the institutional level was "SATISFACTORY" for the University and "INSUFFICIENT" for the team of experts. The University rated itself at 2.56 while the team's rating came to 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 at 1.93. There was a significant 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 University of Kisangani, 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.

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

241



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP

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 programmes. Also, the assessment of learning outcomes should be tailored to specific career aspirations.

The expert team wishes University of Kisangani good luck in further effort to develop the quality culture at the university.

2.14 University Ouaga II, Burkina Faso (FRENCH)

2.14.1 Composition de l'équipe d'évaluation

- Constant Nkiama Ekisawa, Coordination Nationale d'assurance Qualité – République Du Congo
- Patricia Pol, Professeur at the Université Paris-Est Créteil, France
- Adeline Addy, Project Officer, Association of African Universities

**This report was provided in French*

2.14.2 Introduction

La Commission de l'Union Africaine en collaboration avec l'Association des Universités Africaines a lancé depuis 2010, le développement du Mécanisme Africain d'Evaluation de la Qualité (AQRM) afin d'établir un système africain qui veillera à ce que la performance des établissements d'enseignement supérieur soit mesurée par rapport à un ensemble de critères convenus, et aider les institutions à effectuer des exercices d'auto-évaluation pour soutenir le développement de la culture institutionnelle de la qualité.

A l'atelier tenu du 29 au 31 mars 2017 à Accra (Ghana), 15 institutions d'enseignement supérieur et universitaire ont été sélectionnées pour l'évaluation externe. Le référentiel AQRM faisant partie d'outil de l'évaluation a été expliqué aux participants. Par la même occasion, des experts européens et africains, à raison de trois personnes pour évaluer une ou deux établissements ont été également sélectionnés.

C'est dans ce cadre que nous avons été désignés pour effectuer une évaluation externe, comme convenu, du **15 au 16 juin 2017 à l'Université de Ouaga 2** à Ouagadougou (Burkina Faso)

Le but de notre mission a été d'avoir un regard externe sur le fonctionnement de l'institution (évaluation qualitative et quantitative de la qualité), de valider l'évaluation interne et de faire des recommandations pour l'amélioration continue.

Les termes de référence consistaient à :

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

242



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

1. Faire un tour sur le campus de l'Université pour inspecter les bâtiments, les installations et regarder l'environnement global,
2. Visiter les salles de classe, les laboratoires, les bibliothèques, les centres informatiques,
3. Evaluer la qualité de l'infrastructure et des ressources matérielles,
4. Evaluer la qualité des services de soutien aux étudiants et le profil général du personnel académique,
5. Inspecter les documents pertinents selon le cas,
6. Tenir des séances de travail avec la haute direction, le personnel académique, le personnel administratif et technique, les étudiants, le parent et le monde socio-professionnel (Haut Magistrat du Ministère de la Justice et le Président de Chambre de Commerce à Ouagadougou).

Pour rappel, l'équipe d'experts était composée de trois personnes, à savoir, Prof. Nkiama Ekisawa Constant, Prof. Pol Patricia et Madame Adeline Addy. Par consensus, le Prof. Nkiama Ekisawa Constant était désigné, Président et Rapporteur de l'équipe.

2.14.3 Présentation de l'université

L'Université de Ouaga II, a été créée par décret n°2007-834/PRES/PM/MESSRS/MEF du 12/12/2007. L'Université Ouaga II (UO2) a été érigée en Etablissement Public à caractère Scientifique, culturel et Technique (EPESCT) par décret n° 2008-442/ PRES/PM/MESSRS/MEF du 12/12/2007 du 15 juillet 2008. C'est également par décret n° 2008-516/ PRES/PM/MESSRS/MEF du 28 août 2008 que les statuts de l'Université de Ouaga II ont été adoptés. Ces résultats définissent les missions, l'organisation et le fonctionnement de l'université.

Ouaga II a de fait été créée à partir de deux facultés existantes de l'Université de Ouagadougou pour désengorger cette université confrontée à une très forte massification. Elle a pour objectif de contribuer à la résolution des problèmes de formation et de recherche au Burkina Faso, en particulier dans les domaines du droit, de l'économie et de la gestion, et à terme de Sciences et technologie.

Elle est constituée de deux (02) unités de formation et de recherche, de deux (02) instituts et d'une école doctorale. Il s'agit entre autres, de l'unité de formation et de recherche en Sciences économiques et de Gestion (UFR/SEG), de l'unité de formation et de recherche en sciences juridiques et politiques (UFR/SJP), de l'Institut universitaire de formation initiale et continue (IUFIC), de l'Institut de formation ouverte à distance (IFOAD) et de l'école doctorale conjointe aux deux facultés, de L'UFR/ST (Sciences et Techniques). Une Direction a été mise en place pour réfléchir sur les curricula en attendant la fin de la construction des bâtiments sur le nouveau site. Le financement est déjà acquis. L'Université a adapté l'organisation de sa formation en trois cycles, Licence (180 crédits) - Master (120 crédits) - Doctorat (LMD) en 2012.

L'Université Ouaga II (UO2), à l'instar des autres établissements d'enseignement supérieur publics, accuse depuis quatre (04) ans un retard dans l'organisation de chaque rentrée universitaire ; le calendrier universitaire n'est plus respecté. L'insuffisance d'infrastructures face à un effectif pléthorique d'étudiants, les obstacles dans la mise en œuvre du LMD, les difficultés rencontrées par les étudiants sur le plan social, les inscriptions à répétition, etc., limitent les efforts déployés pour la normalisation de l'année universitaire.

2.14.4 African Quality Rating Mechanim Validation at Institutional Level

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

243



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA

EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



2.14.4.1 Gouvernance et gestion

a. Points forts identifiés

- I. Capacité à définir le plan stratégique,
- II. Mise en place d'instruments de pilotage (tableau de bord, annuaire statistique, Guide de l'étudiant, régimes des études des Licences et des Masters),
- III. Mise en place d'une structure d'Assurance Qualité,
- IV. Représentativité de la communauté universitaire incluant les étudiants dans les instances de décision,
- V. Engagement du personnel académique, administratif, technique et ouvrier au fonctionnement de l'Université.

b. Zones d'inquiétude

- I. Autonomie de gestion limitée,
- II. Le plan stratégique est présenté dans un document très professionnel mais son appropriation par les acteurs de l'université est très faible,
- III. Retard dans la planification et dans la programmation de l'année académique,
- IV. Risque élevé de démotivation du personnel administratif, technique et ouvrier,
- V. Adaptation difficile face à la massification,
- VI. Insuffisance du personnel enseignant et de son encadrement,
- VII. Absence de gestion prévisionnelle de plan de carrière, des emplois,
- VIII. Absence de politique genre et d'accompagnement des handicapés.

c. Recommandations

- I. Consolider davantage le dialogue avec toutes les parties prenantes,
- II. Renforcer le cadre de concertation avec les autres organes d'intervention (CNOU, Centre National des Œuvres Universitaires),
- III. Investir en ressources humaines, matérielles et financières pour répondre à la massification croissante,
- IV. Renforcer le leadership,
- V. Elaborer une politique de prise en compte des diversités et des minorités.

Tableau 1: Gouvernance et gestion

Numéro de Reference	Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité	Valeur d'évaluation de l'université	Valeur d'évaluation d'experts
1.1	L'institution a une vision, une mission et des valeurs clairement définies avec des objectifs et des priorités spécifiques.	4	3
1.2	L'institution dispose de stratégies spécifiques pour assurer le suivi de la réalisation des objectifs de l'institution et identifier les domaines de problèmes.	4	2
1.3	Structures de responsabilité claires pour les fonctionnaires responsables mises en place.	4	3
1.4	Le personnel, les étudiants et les parties prenantes	3	3





	externes sont, le cas échéant, représentés dans les structures de gouvernance. Les structures de gouvernance sont représentatives en termes d'égalité entre les hommes et les femmes.		
1.5	L'institution a mis en place des politiques et procédures d'assurance de la qualité.	4	3
1.6	Des mécanismes appropriés sont mis en place pour évaluer le personnel conformément aux accords de performance avec les autorités compétentes.	4	2
1.7	L'institution a mis en place un système d'information pour la gestion afin de gérer les données du personnel et des étudiants et assurer le suivi de la performance des étudiants.	4	3
1.8	L'institution dispose de politiques spécifiques pour assurer et appuyer la diversité du personnel et des étudiants, en particulier la représentation des femmes et des personnes handicapées.	0	0
1.9	L'institution a mis en place une politique et des procédures normalisées pour assurer le bien-être du personnel et des étudiants.	2	2
Valeur Totale d'évaluation		29/9=3.22	21/9=2.33

Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité : 0 = MEDIOCRE 1 = INSUFFISANT 2= SATISFAISANT 3 = BIEN 4 = EXCELLENT

2.14.4.2 Infrastructure

a. Points forts identifiés

Existence d'un site universitaire en construction

b. Zones d'inquiétude

- I. Très mauvaises conditions de travail et d'études tant pour le personnel que pour les étudiants, en particulier pour le premier cycle de licence,
- II. Accès limité aux TIC, à l'internet,
- III. Difficulté d'occupation du site universitaire en construction depuis 10 ans où certaines bâtisses sont déjà érigées, mais commencent à se détériorer
- IV. Bibliothèque limitée en fond documentaire et également pour son actualisation et son informatisation,
- V. Exiguïté des locaux et inappropriés ainsi qu'inadaptés pour la fonctionnalité des activités convenables de l'Université.

c. Recommandations

- I. Investir dans les ressources pédagogiques, numériques, informatiques et de recherche,
- II. Prendre des mesures courageuses pour le déménagement sur le site universitaire,
- III. Améliorer la connectivité aux profits des enseignants et des étudiants,
- IV. Accélérer l'occupation du nouveau site de OUAGA II.

Tableau 2: Infrastructure

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

Numéro de Reference	Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité	Valeur d'évaluation de l'université	Valeur d'évaluation d'experts
2.1	L'institution dispose d'un nombre suffisant d'amphithéâtres pour accueillir les étudiants selon le mode de prestation de l'institution.	1	1
2.2	L'institution offre aux étudiants, un espace suffisant pour la formation / études y compris l'accès aux matériels didactiques électroniques tel que requis pour le mode de prestation de l'institution	1	1
2.3	Le personnel enseignant et administratif a accès aux matériels informatiques et à l'Internet.	2	1
2.4	Les étudiants ont accès aux matériels informatiques et à l'Internet à niveau approprié aux demandes du mode de prestation de l'institution	1	1
2.5	L'établissement possède des équipements de laboratoire suffisants pour accueillir les étudiants des disciplines scientifiques selon le mode de prestation de l'institution.	Non applicable	Non applicable
2.6	Le matériel de laboratoire est moderne et bien entretenu	Non applicable	Non applicable
2.7	L'institution a une bibliothèque moderne pour appuyer la formation universitaire et veille à ce que l'accès aux mécanismes appropriés soit disponible selon le mode de prestation.	1	1
2.8	L'institution prévoit des fonds pour la gestion et la maintenance des services d'utilité publique et veille ce que les mesures de sécurité appropriées soient mises en place.	3	2
Valeur Totale d'évaluation		9/8=1.12	7/8=0.87

Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité : 0 = MEDIOCRE 1 = INSUFFISANT 2= SATISFAISANT 3 = BIEN 4 = EXCELLENT

2.14.4.3 Finances

a. Points forts identifiés

- I. Structure financière bien organisée,
- II. Procédures financières bien définies,
- III. Transparence dans la publication du budget universitaire,
- IV. Franche collaboration avec la hiérarchie de l'université en ce qui concerne l'arbitrage,

b. Zones d'inquiétude

- I. Ressources financières insuffisantes pour le bon fonctionnement de l'Université et pour répondre à la massification qui se poursuit,
- II. Pression sociale de la communauté,

c. Recommendations

- I. Diversifier les financements par la création de certaines activités pour palier tant soit peu les besoins de l'Université (pédagogiques, scientifiques),

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

246



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA

EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

- II. Formaliser les projets de recherche, de financement devant permettre à l'université à réaliser et à atteindre ses objectifs en termes des recettes.

Tableau 3: Finances

Numéro de Reference	Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité	Valeur d'évaluation de l'université	Valeur d'évaluation d'experts
3.1	L'institution dispose de ressources financières suffisantes pour atteindre ses objectifs conformément à son budget et au coût unitaire par étudiant.	2	1
3.2	L'institution a mis en place des procédures pour attirer des financements y compris des secteurs industriels et des entreprises.	1	1
3.3	Des procédures budgétaires clairement définies sont mises en place pour s'assurer que l'allocation de ressources reflète la vision, la mission et les objectifs	3	3
3.4	L'institution apporte un soutien financier aux étudiants méritants (bourses d'étude offertes par l'institution)	Non applicable	Non applicable
3.5	Des informations sur l'aide financière et les critères de son attribution sont fournies aux étudiants et aux autres représentants.	Non applicable	Non applicable
3.6	L'institution publie les états des recettes et des dépenses.	4	4
Valeur Totale d'évaluation / Valeur Moyenne d'évaluation		10/6=1.66	9/6=1.50

Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité : 0 = MEDIOCRE 1 = INSUFFISANT 2= SATISFAISANT 3 = BIEN 4 = EXCELLENT

2.14.4.4 Enseignement et apprentissage

a. Points forts identifiés

- I. Mise en place d'un Institut de formation à distance,
- II. Volonté de définir un cadre pour l'élaboration des offres de formation,
- III. Harmonisation pour la mise en place du LMD l'adaptant aux normes régionales,
- IV. Lisibilité des offres de formation.

b. Zones d'inquiétude

- I. Détérioration de la qualité des enseignements compte tenu d'insuffisance des ressources pédagogiques,
- II. Taux de déperdition élevé en première année d'études,
- III. Instabilité permanente dans la programmation de l'année universitaire,
- IV. Insuffisance du personnel enseignant,
- V. Transition du système classique en système LMD moins défini et moins vulgarisé.

c. Recommandations

- I. Renforcer la démarche qualité
- II. Expérimenter l'évaluation des enseignements dans une des filières d'études,
- III. Renforcer la formation continue des enseignants,
- IV. Préparer la relève académique pour combler l'insuffisance des enseignants.

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

247



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA

EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

Tableau 4: Enseignement et apprentissage

Numéro de Reference	Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité	Valeur d'évaluation de l'université	Valeur d'évaluation d'experts
4.1	L'institution encourage et récompense les innovations dans le domaine de l'enseignement et de la formation	3	2
4.2	L'institution a mis des procédures en place pour soutenir les programmes d'initiation à l'enseignement, à la pédagogie, à l'assistance universitaire et au perfectionnement du personnel par le biais de la formation et de l'apprentissage continu et à vie	3	3
4.3	Les étudiants ont la possibilité de dialoguer avec les membres du personnel en petits groupes, individuellement ou via des plateformes électroniques	4	2
4.4	Étudiant : le nombre des membres du personnel et le volume du travail effectué par les enseignants sont conformes aux normes acceptables pour le mode particulier de prestation, et permettent de recueillir, en retour, les observations des étudiants.	2	1
4.5	L'institution met des politiques / procédures en place pour guider l'élaboration, la mise en œuvre et l'évaluation des programmes offerts par l'institution et ces politiques tiennent compte de la contribution de l'enseignement supérieur au développement socio-économique.	3	2
4.6	L'institution a élaboré une politique ou des critères pour le recrutement du personnel, le déploiement, le développement, la planification de la relève et un système d'encadrement et / ou de stage.	3	1
4.7	Les services d'Aide aux étudiants, notamment l'assistance universitaire et des services de consultation requis sont disponibles, conformément au mode de prestation de l'institution.	Non applicable	Non applicable
4.8	L'institution dispose de mécanismes d'aide aux étudiants qui leur permettent de devenir des apprenants autonomes, conformément au mode de prestation de l'institution.	3	2
4.9	L'institution dispose d'un bureau consacré à la promotion de la coopération internationale et au renforcement à la mobilité intra-africaine des étudiants et du personnel.	3	3
Valeur Totale d'évaluation / Valeur Moyenne d'évaluation		24/9=2.66	16/9=1.78

Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité : 0 = MEDIOCRE 1 = INSUFFISANT 2= SATISFAISANT 3 = BIEN 4 = EXCELLENT

2.14.4.5 Recherche, publication et innovation

a. Points forts identifiés

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

248



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



- I. Mise en place d'une école doctorale,
- II. Efforts positifs pour le développement des revues scientifiques,
- III. Publications scientifiques dans des revues tant nationales qu'internationales.

b. Zones d'inquiétude

- I. Inexistence d'une politique de recherche,
- II. Soutien insuffisant pour la relève académique,
- III. Insuffisance des fonds de financement pour la recherche.

c. Recommandations

- I. Formalisation de la politique de recherche,
- II. Renforcer le partenariat public-privé pour le financement de la recherche,
- III. Diversifier les ressources financières pour le financement de la recherche,
- IV. Elaborer les projets de recherche et les soumettre aux bailleurs des fonds,
- V. Renforcer les échanges universitaires en matière de recherche.

Tableau 5: Recherche, publication et innovation

Numéro de Reference	Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité	Valeur d'évaluation de l'université	Valeur d'évaluation d'experts
5.1	L'établissement dispose d'une politique en matière de recherche et de publication, de stratégie et de programme. La politique de recherche met, entre autres, l'accent sur la recherche qui appuie le développement socioéconomique de l'Afrique.	4	2
5.2	L'établissement a une politique et / ou une stratégie pour l'innovation, l'appropriation de la propriété intellectuelle et la prospective technologique.	4	2
5.3	L'institution a réussi à attirer des subventions pour la recherche provenant de sources nationales ou internationales et à travailler en partenariat avec le secteur industriel.	2	2
5.4	L'institution a mis des procédures en place pour aider le personnel enseignant à développer et améliorer ses compétences dans le domaine de la recherche, notamment la recherche et la publication en collaboration.	3	2
5.5	Le personnel enseignant et les étudiants publient leurs travaux de recherche dans des revues universitaires accrédités et font des demandes de brevets le cas échéant).	3	3
5.6	L'institut encourage et aide les chercheurs à présenter leurs recherches lors des conférences nationales et internationales	3	2
5.7	L'institut encourage et assiste les chercheurs en leur facilitant l'accès au budget de recherche - développement et en leur permettant d'entreprendre des recherches pertinentes pour la résolution des problèmes auxquels	3	2





**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

	l'Afrique est confrontée et pour la création d'opportunités économiques et de développement.		
5.8	L'institution encourage et offre des prix pour les recherches dont les résultats sont utilisés par la société	0	0
5.9	L'institution dispose d'un mécanisme de partenariat avec le secteur industriel, tout en attirant, surtout, des ressources du secteur industriel. L'institution reçoit des demandes du secteur industriel pour des recherches spécifiques et pour l'appui à la formation.	2	1
5.10	L'institution a établi des partenariats afin de promouvoir des recherches et des publications communes internationales.	2	1
Valeur Totale d'évaluation / Valeur Moyenne d'évaluation		26/10=2.60	17/10=1.70

Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité : 0 = MEDIOCRE 1 = INSUFFISANT 2= SATISFAISANT 3 = BIEN 4 = EXCELLENT

2.14.4.6 Engagement societal

a. Points forts identifiés

Présence relative dans les communautés de base

b. Zones d'inquiétude

Inexistence des stratégies de collaboration

c. Recommandations

- I. Renforcement des activités para-académiques de la communauté universitaire,
- II. Création de l'**Aluminai** pour l'accompagnement de l'Université dans son développement
- III. Mise en place des stratégies de collaboration avec les communautés de base.

Tableau 6: Engagement societal

Numéro de Reference	Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité	Valeur d'évaluation de l'université	Valeur d'évaluation d'experts
6.1	L'établissement a mis en place une politique et des procédures pour collaborer avec la communauté locale ou la société en général. La communauté sollicite souvent l'aide de l'institution pour des recherches universitaires spécifiques.	2	1
6.2	L'institution encourage les départements et le personnel à élaborer et à mettre en œuvre des stratégies de collaboration avec la société.	0	0
6.3	Les étudiants sont tenus de collaborer avec les communautés à travers leurs travaux universitaires.	0	0
6.4	L'établissement a noué des partenariats avec d'autres sous-secteurs de l'éducation pour améliorer la qualité de l'enseignement dans le pays et la région.	0	0

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

250



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA

EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



THE AFRICA-EU PARTNERSHIP

6.5	L'institution informe la communauté locale de ses activités de collaboration avec la communauté locale	1	1
6.6	L'établissement assure des formations pertinentes de courte durée pour la communauté / la société en général en fonction des besoins identifiés et en vue d'appuyer les opportunités économiques identifiées.	3	3
6.7	L'institution met ses équipements à la disposition (si possible) de la communauté locale en vue d'appuyer ses activités de développement socioéconomique et communautaires.	0	0
Valeur Totale d'évaluation / Valeur Moyenne d'évaluation		6/7=0.86	5/7=0.71

Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité: 0 = MEDIOCRE 1 = INSUFFISANT 2= SATISFAISANT 3 = BIEN 4 = EXCELLENT

2.14.4.7 Resume de l'évaluation au niveau institutionnel

Tableau 7

Major Standard	Aggregated Value by University	Aggregated value by Experts
Gouvernance et gestion	3,22	2,33
Infrastructures	1,12	0,87
Finances	1,66	1,50
Enseignement et formation	2,66	1,78
Recherche, Publications et Innovations	2,60	1,70
Engagement societal	0.86	0.71
Résumé de l'évaluation	12.12/6=2,02	8.89/6=1,48

Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité : 0 = MEDIOCRE 1 = INSUFFISANT 2= SATISFAISANT 3 = BIEN 4 = EXCELLENT

La qualité de l'institution est évaluée :

- Par l'université comme **SATISFAISANTE**
- Par les experts comme **INSUFFISANTE**

2.14.5 African Quality Rating Mechanim Validation at Programme Level

2.14.5.1 Planification et gestion du programme

a. Points forts identifiés

- I. Une offre de formation revue lors de la mise en place du LMD,
- II. Système de validation interne fonctionnel,
- III. Bonne traduction des offres de formation en termes de compétences

b. Zones d'inquiétude

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

251



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION



- I. Indisponibilité des enseignants,
- II. Difficulté de professionnalisation
- III. Retard dans l'organisation de chaque rentrée universitaire,
- IV. Le calendrier universitaire n'est plus respecté.

c. Recommandations

Concertation avec les autres organes d'intervention (CNOU) pour le meilleur fonctionnement de l'Université.

Tableau 8: Planification et gestion du programme

Numéro de Reference	Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité	Valeur d'évaluation de l'université	Valeur d'évaluation d'experts
7.1	Le programme est conforme à l'ensemble de la mission et de la vision de l'institution.	4	3
7.2	Le programme répond aux critères d'accréditation nationaux.	4	3
7.3	L'établissement alloue des ressources suffisantes pour appuyer le programme.	2	1
7.4	Il existe un coordonnateur du/des programme (s) responsable de la gestion et de la garantie de la qualité des programmes.	4	2
7.5	Le mode de prestation tient compte des besoins et des défis de tous les étudiants ciblés.	4	2
7.6	Les membres du personnel enseignant qui intervient sur le programme ont le type et le niveau de qualification requis.	3	3
7.7	Le programme est régulièrement soumis à un contrôle interne et externe de manière participative afin de refléter l'évolution au niveau du domaine d'étude.	4	2
7.8	La planification des programmes comprend une stratégie pour l'utilisation de la technologie d'une manière adaptée au programme, aux équipements disponibles, et aux étudiants cibles.	Non applicable	0
Valeur Totale d'évaluation / Valeur Moyenne d'évaluation		25/8=3.12	16/8=2

Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité : 0 = MEDIOCRE 1 = INSUFFISANT 2= SATISFAISANT 3 = BIEN 4 = EXCELLENT

2.14.5.2 Elaboration du programme

a. Points forts identifiés

Le programme d'études spécifie clairement les apprenants cibles et les résultats escomptés/compétences générales pour chaque module / cours et pour le programme dans son ensemble.

b. Zones d'inquiétude

- I. Des changements opérés par la mise en place du LMD qui ne sont pas toujours bien compris,
This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





- II. Le programme d'études n'est pas élaboré pour maximiser le profil de carrière des étudiants, les possibilités d'assurer la cohérence avec d'autres qualifications pertinentes et les perspectives d'emploi.

c. Recommandations

- I. Améliorer le programme d'études après des recherches et des consultations approfondies avec les parties prenantes concernées y compris les planificateurs du secteur public, le secteur privé et d'autres employeurs,
- II. Favoriser des périodes de stages ou des projets collectifs.

Tableau 9: Elaboration du programme

Numéro de Reference	Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité	Valeur d'évaluation de l'université	Valeur d'évaluation d'expert
8.1	Le programme d'études spécifie clairement les apprenants cibles et les résultats escomptés/ compétences pour chaque module / cours et pour le programme dans son ensemble	4	3
8.2	Le programme d'études est régulièrement mis à jour pour prendre en compte les nouvelles connaissances et des besoins en termes de formation en vue d'appuyer le développement de l'Afrique.	Pas effectif pour le moment	2
8.3	Les modules / cours sont planifiés de manière cohérente et offrent un enseignement harmonieux aux étudiants en vue d'obtenir une qualification.	4	3
8.4	Le programme est basé sur un équilibre approprié des connaissances et des compétences théoriques, pratiques et expérimentelles (selon le cas) ainsi que des domaines essentiels et facultatifs.	4	2
8.5	Le programme d'études a été élaboré pour maximiser le profil de carrière des étudiants, les possibilités d'assurer la cohérence avec d'autres qualifications pertinentes et les perspectives d'emploi.	3	2
8.6	Le programme d'études a été élaboré après des recherches et des consultations approfondies avec les parties prenantes concernées y compris les planificateurs du secteur public, le secteur privé et d'autres employeurs.	0	1
8.7	Le programme d'études reflète les valeurs africaines positives, la sensibilité à la question de l'égalité entre les hommes et les femmes et prend en compte les besoins de la société.	1	1
Valeur Totale d'évaluation / Valeur Moyenne d'évaluation		16/7=2.28	14/7=2

Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité : 0 = MEDIOCRE 1 = INSUFFISANT 2= SATISFAISANT 3 = BIEN 4 = EXCELLENT

2.14.5.3 Évaluation

a. Points forts identifiés

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





Des informations claires sont fournies sur le mode d'évaluation pour tous les cours et modules du programme.

b. Zones d'inquiétude

L'institution n'a pas encore mis en place des systèmes pour les examinateurs externes.

c. Recommandations

- I. Diversifier les méthodes d'évaluation au niveau des offres de formation
- II. Adapter l'évaluation au groupe d'étudiants.

Tableau 10: Évaluation

Numéro de Reference	Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité	Valeur d'évaluation de l'université	Valeur d'évaluation d'experts
10.1	L'institution a mis en place des systèmes pour les examinateurs externes.	0	0
10.2	Des informations claires sont fournies sur le mode d'évaluation pour tous les cours et modules du programme.	4	3
10.3	L'évaluation fait partie intégrante du processus d'enseignement et de formation et vise à s'assurer que les étudiants ont maîtrisé des résultats spécifiques.	4	3
10.4	Le niveau de difficulté des évaluations est adapté au programme spécifique et au groupe cible d'étudiants.	2	1
10.5	Le programme comprend une variété de méthodes d'évaluation	4	2
10.6	L'utilisation des procédures de marquage garantit la cohérence, l'exactitude et permet de fournir des informations aux étudiants.	Non applicable	2
Valeur Totale d'évaluation / Valeur Moyenne d'évaluation		14/6=2.33	11/6=1.83

Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité : 0 = MEDIOCRE 1 = INSUFFISANT 2= SATISFAISANT 3 = BIEN 4 = EXCELLENT

2.14.5.4 Résultats du programme

a. Points forts identifiés

Le cadre formé d'après le sondage est de bonne qualité sur le terrain et est même apprécié par les utilisateurs.

b. Zones d'inquiétude

- I. Les progrès de l'étudiant ne sont pas suivis tout au long du programme et un système d'alerte rapide n'est pas encore prévu pour les étudiants qui risquent de décrocher,
- II. Les experts, les pairs et / ou les organisations professionnelles n'examinent pas la pertinence et la qualité des formations suivies par les étudiants,
- III. Aucun lien n'existe avec les employeurs potentiels afin de faciliter l'emploi des diplômés.

c. Recommandations

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:





**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

- I. Renforcer le lien avec les employeurs potentiels afin de faciliter l'emploi des diplômés,
- II. Mettre en place les stratégies de suivi des diplômés.

Tableau 11: Résultats du programme

Numéro de Reference	Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité	Valeur d'évaluation de l'université	Valeur d'évaluation d'experts
11.1	Les progrès de l'étudiant sont suivis tout au long du programme et un système d'alerte rapide est prévu pour les étudiants risquant de décrocher.	0	0
11.2	Les taux de réussite par promotion sont conformes aux normes établies pour le domaine d'étude et la méthode de formation ; les stratégies visant à accroître les taux de réussite sont mises en place.	4	3
11.3	Un formulaire de qualité est mis à la disposition des étudiants pour recueillir leurs commentaires	0	0
11.4	Les experts, les pairs et / ou les organisations professionnelles examinent la pertinence et la qualité des formations suivies par les étudiants.	0	0
11.5	Des liens existent avec les employeurs potentiels afin de faciliter l'emploi des diplômés.	0	0
11.6	Des études de suivi des diplômés et de leurs employeurs sont menées pour obtenir des informations sur les résultats des diplômés.	0	0
11.7	Le programme dispose d'un plan de recherche efficace, d'une mise en œuvre appropriée et de mécanismes d'évaluation et de rétroaction.	1	1
11.8	Des recherches et des consultations sont entreprises dans le domaine d'étude afin de résoudre les problèmes industriels et d'appuyer le développement économique et social.	0	0
Valeur Totale d'évaluation / Valeur Moyenne d'évaluation		5/8=0.62	4/8=0.5

Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité: 0 = MEDIOCRE 1 = INSUFFISANT 2= SATISFAISANT 3 = BIEN 4 = EXCELLENT

2.14.5.5 Resume de l'évaluation au niveau du programme

Tableau 12

Major Standard	Aggregated Value by University	Aggregated value by Experts
Planification et gestion du programme	3,12	2,00
Elaboration du programme	2,28	2,00
Enseignement et formation	2,83	1,83
Évaluation	2,33	1,83
Résultats du programme	0,62	0,5

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

255



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP

Résumé de l'évaluation

11.18/5=2.23

8.16/5=1.63

Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité : 0 = MEDIOCRE 1 = INSUFFISANT 2= SATISFAISANT 3 = BIEN 4 = EXCELLENT

La qualité du programme est évaluée:

- Par l'université comme SATISFAISANTE
- Par les experts comme INSUFFISANTE

2.14.6 Conclusions et Recommendations

L'évaluation du Mécanisme Africain de la Qualité à l'Université de Ouaga II à Ouagadougou au Burkina Faso s'est déroulée du 15 au 16 juin 2017.

L'application du questionnaire a posé quelques difficultés au Comité du Pilotage de cette Institution universitaire. La principale difficulté résidait au niveau de la traduction littérale de l'anglais en français, proposée par l'AUA, de certaines questions, qui n'avaient pas la même compréhension pour tout le monde et qui parfois, ne s'adaptaient pas à la réalité du terrain.

L'évaluation totale au niveau institutionnel était « **SATISFAISANTE** » pour l'Université et « **INSUFFISANTE** » pour l'équipe d'experts. Quant au niveau du Programme, cette évaluation totale a été jugée aussi « **SATISFAISANTE** » par l'Université et également « **INSUFFISANTE** » par l'équipe d'experts.

L'Université de Ouaga II est totalement prise en charge par l'Etat Burkinabé. Les ressources financières allouées étant insuffisantes, ne permettent pas aux autorités académiques d'atteindre les objectifs qu'elles se sont fixés malgré l'élaboration du plan stratégique bien circonscrit en termes de politique de la relève du personnel académique, de la formation et de la recherche.

Un site universitaire est toujours en construction depuis 2007 et reste inoccupé malgré les quelques bâtisses qui sont érigées il y a de cela 10 ans. Les conditions de travail aussi bien pour le personnel que pour les étudiants sont très mauvaises. Les infrastructures en location ne répondent pas aux standards exigés pour le déroulement des cours, surtout pour les classes de première année. L'exiguïté des locaux attribués au personnel a un impact notable en termes d'efficacité et de rendement. Suite à plusieurs grèves à répétition, les chevauchements des années académiques ne permettent pas un déroulement normal des programmes. Dans ce contexte très difficile qui porte préjudice à la formation attendue des futurs cadres, l'université de Ouaga 2 a la réputation de se battre pour trouver des solutions et se forger une identité propre compte tenu de sa longue histoire avec Ouaga 1. Toutefois les pesanteurs politico-administratives ralentissent les évolutions.

Il est évident que l'Etat ne peut pas tout faire. Il faudrait un leadership plus fort pour mieux impliquer la communauté universitaire et diversifier les sources de financement, favoriser la mise en place d'un suivi des anciens diplômés, développer des projets de recherche avec des tiers.



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA

EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

2.15 University of Science and Technology of Masuku, Gabon (FRENCH)

2.15.1 Composition de l'équipe d'évaluation

- Constant Nkiama Ekisawa, Coordination Nationale d'assurance Qualité – République Du Congo
- Patricia Pol, Professeur at the Université Paris-Est Créteil, France
- Adeline Addy, Association des Universités Africaines

**The report is provided in French*

2.15.2 Introduction

Lors de l'atelier tenu du 29 au 31 mars 2017 à Accra (Ghana), quinze (15) institutions d'enseignement supérieur et universitaire ont été sélectionnées pour une évaluation externe. Le référentiel AQRM qui fait partie de l'outil d'évaluation a été expliqué aux participants. Par la même occasion, des experts européens et africains, à raison de trois personnes pour évaluer une ou deux établissements ont été également sélectionnés. C'est dans ce cadre que nous avons été désignés pour effectuer une évaluation externe, comme convenu, du 19 au 20 juin 2017, à l'Université des Sciences et Techniques de Masuku à Franceville (Gabon).

Le but de cette mission a été d'avoir un regard externe sur le fonctionnement de l'institution (évaluation qualitative et quantitative de la qualité), de valider l'évaluation interne et de faire des recommandations pour l'amélioration continue.

Les termes de référence consistaient à:

1. Faire un tour sur le campus de l'Université pour inspecter les bâtiments, les installations et regarder l'environnement global,
2. Visiter les salles de classe, les laboratoires, les bibliothèques, les centres informatiques,
3. Evaluer la qualité de l'infrastructure et des ressources matérielles,
4. Evaluer la qualité des services de soutien aux étudiants et le profil général du personnel académique,
5. Inspecter les documents pertinents selon le cas,
6. Tenir des séances de travail avec la haute direction, le personnel académique, le personnel administratif et technique, les étudiants, les parents et le monde socio-professionnel.

Lors de notre arrivée à Franceville, les étudiants étaient en grève depuis plus de deux semaines. L'origine était le non fonctionnement du restaurant universitaire mais aussi la mort d'une étudiante, qui n'avait pas survécu à l'accouchement suite à une négligence du corps médical de l'hôpital régional, selon eux.

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:

257



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA

EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

Les autorités académiques étant en négociation, notre cadre de travail était situé à l'hôtel HELICONIA MBAYA (à 2mn à pied de l'USTM) où un local loué à cet effet par l'Université avait été mis à notre disposition.

A la suite des discussions entamées avec les autorités administratives depuis le début du mouvement, et des échanges que nous avons eus avec eux, le lundi 19 juin 2017, la barricade a été levée et nous avons pu visiter les installations de l'Université le mardi 20 juin 2017 accompagnés des Présidents de la Mutuelle de la Faculté des Sciences et de l'Ecole polytechnique ainsi que du Vice-Recteur, Professeur Raphaël BIKANGA, et du Professeur Jacques Mavoungou, tous deux membres du comité de réflexion de la mise en place d'une Cellule Assurance-Qualité à l'USTM.

Le calendrier de travail des deux jours de visite est présenté en annexe du présent rapport.

Pour rappel, l'équipe d'experts était composée de trois personnes, à savoir, Prof. Nkiama Ekisawa Constant (RDC), Prof. Pol Patricia (France) et Madame Adeline Addy (AUA). Par consensus, le Prof. Nkiama Ekisawa Constant était désigné, Président et Rapporteur de l'équipe.

2.15.3 Présentation de l'université

L'Université des Sciences et Techniques de Masuku (USTM) est un établissement public d'enseignement supérieur, situé à Franceville dans la province du Haut-Ogooué, au Sud-Est du Gabon. Elle a été créée en octobre 1986, par le transfert de Libreville à Franceville, de la Faculté des Sciences et de l'Ecole Nationale Supérieure d'Ingénieurs de Libreville (ENSIL), devenue Ecole polytechnique de Masuku (EPM).

Son organigramme est composé d'un Conseil d'Administration, d'un Conseil d'Université, d'un Recteur, assisté de deux Vice-recteurs, le premier en charge des questions pédagogiques et de la recherche et le second s'occupant de l'administration et des relations interuniversitaires. Ce dernier est secondé par un Secrétaire Général, qui a en charge la scolarité, la bibliothèque centrale, les services d'informatique et de maintenance.

Les missions de L'Université des Sciences et Techniques de Masuku comprennent:

- la formation des cadres moyens et supérieurs (Ingénieurs et Docteurs) ;
- le perfectionnement des cadres en activité;
- la formation à la recherche;
- l'appui au développement.

L'USTM est aujourd'hui composée de trois établissements:

1. La Faculté des sciences comprenant les Départements de biologie, chimie, géologie, mathématiques et Informatique, Physique et Langues et Communications. Le nombre d'enseignants est de 77 dont 3 Professeurs Titulaires, 22 Maîtres de conférences, 31

Maîtres Assistants et 21 Assistants pour un effectif de 1415 étudiants,





**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

2. L'École polytechnique de Masuku (EPM) englobant les Départements de Sciences Générales de l'Ingénieur, d'Electromécanique, Génie Civil, Maintenance Industrielle-Informatique et d'Electronique – Informatique - Automatismes avec 35 enseignants dont

1 Maître de conférences, 8 Maîtres Assistants, 26 Assistants et 511 étudiants,

3. L'Institut National Supérieur d'Agronomie et de Biotechnologies (INSAB) ayant les Départements de Sciences Fondamentales de l'Ingénieur, d'Agroéconomie, Phytotechnologie et de Zootechnologie avec 37 enseignants dont 2 Professeurs Titulaires, 2 Maîtres de conférences, 9 Maîtres Assistants, 24 Assistants et 224 étudiants.



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



**UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA**



EUA

European University Association



ENQA

EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION

L'USTM ne délivre que des formations de cycle court (DEUG et DUT) jusqu'en 2007-2008 où le basculement dans le système LMD est intervenu, l'université a ensuite progressivement mis en place des formations de Licence, Master et Doctorat.

Pour accéder aux écoles d'Ingénieurs (EPM et INSAB), les bacheliers passent un concours à raison de 20 à 25 places pour la première année Ingénieurs et 25 à 30 places pour la première année Ingénieurs des Techniques. Les admis à ces concours sont boursiers de l'Etat Gabonais quelle que soit la moyenne au Baccalauréat. L'admission à la Faculté des Sciences est quant à elle, libre pour tout admis au Baccalauréat mais seuls ceux totalisant une moyenne supérieure à 9/20, sont boursiers.

L'entrée en master ne peut se faire que si la moyenne obtenue à la licence est supérieure à 12/20 et l'accès en doctorat est réservé aux étudiants de master qui ont une moyenne supérieure à 14/20. Plus de la moitié des étudiants reçoivent une bourse de l'Agence Nationale des Bourses du Gabon (ANBG).

En Janvier 2011, Un Conseil Scientifique et Pédagogique (CSP) a été mis en place, donnant lieu à la création de l'Ecole Doctorale en Sciences Fondamentales et Appliquées (ED-SFA) le 29 octobre 2015. La première soutenance d'une Thèse de Doctorat a eu lieu en décembre 2015.

Concernant les finances, l'Etat Gabonais est le principal donateur (93% du budget). Le Recteur de l'Université en est l'ordonnateur des crédits tandis que les Chefs d'établissements sont les ordonnateurs délégués.

2.15.4 African Quality Rating Mechanim Validation at Institutional Level

2.15.4.1 Gouvernance et gestion

a. Points forts identifiés

- I. Les structures de responsabilité pour les fonctionnaires sont mises en place,
- II. Le personnel, les étudiants et les parties prenantes externes sont, le cas échéant, représentés dans les structures de gouvernance,
- III. L'institution réfléchit depuis quelques mois sur la mise en place des politiques et procédures d'assurance de la qualité.

b. Zones d'inquiétude

- I. L'institution n'a pas encore élaboré son plan stratégique devant lui permettre de bien définir sa vision, ses missions et ses valeurs en vue d'un meilleur développement de son établissement,
- II. Les conseils d'Administration et d'Université ne se réunissent pas régulièrement, Faible cadre de concertation entre les trois structures (Rectorat, CNOU, Agence Nationale des bourses),
- III. L'inexistence d'une politique pour assurer le bien-être du personnel et des étudiants.



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

c. Recommendations

- I. Renforcement des capacités des acteurs en management des projets pour attirer les financements à l'Institution,
- II. Mettre à contribution les anciens étudiants en créant un réseau d'Alumni, en vue de participer matériellement, financièrement et moralement au fonctionnement de l'Institution,
- III. Renforcer le cadre de concertation entre les trois (3) structures autonomes en vue d'éviter les grèves à répétition qui perturbent le calendrier académique normal
- IV. Elaborer un plan stratégique s'avère indispensable pour mieux orienter et mieux définir les objectifs à atteindre et mobiliser l'ensemble de la communauté autour d'un projet dynamique,
- V. S'intéresser au plan de carrière des Administratifs et renforcer leurs capacités en management afin d'améliorer leurs performances et asseoir la gouvernance et la gestion de l'Institution,
- VI. Renforcer les capacités des acteurs en management des projets,
- VII. Mettre à contribution les anciens étudiants à la faveur d'un réseau d'Alumni.

Tableau 1: Gouvernance et gestion

Numéro de Reference	Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité	Valeur d'évaluation de l'université	Valeur d'évaluation d'experts
1.1	L'institution a une vision, une mission et des valeurs clairement définies avec des objectifs et des priorités spécifiques.	2	2
1.2	L'institution dispose de stratégies spécifiques pour assurer le suivi de la réalisation des objectifs de l'institution et identifier les domaines de problèmes.	1	2
1.3	Structures de responsabilité claires pour les fonctionnaires responsables mises en place.	3	3
1.4	Le personnel, les étudiants et les parties prenantes externes sont, le cas échéant, représentés dans les structures de gouvernance. Les structures de gouvernance sont représentatives en termes d'égalité entre les hommes et les femmes.	2	2
1.5	L'institution a mis en place des politiques et procédures d'assurance de la qualité.	1	1
1.6	Des mécanismes appropriés sont mis en place pour évaluer le personnel conformément aux accords de performance avec	0	2

3

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

	les autorités compétentes.		
1.7	L'institution a mis en place un système d'information pour la gestion afin de gérer les données du personnel et des étudiants et assurer le suivi de la performance des étudiants.	1	1
1.8	L'institution dispose de politiques spécifiques pour assurer et appuyer la diversité du personnel et des étudiants, en particulier la représentation des femmes et des personnes handicapées.	0	0
1.9	L'institution a mis en place une politique et des procédures normalisées pour assurer le bien-être du personnel et des étudiants.	1	0
Valeur Totale d'évaluation / Valeur Moyenne d'évaluation		11/9=1.22	13/9=1.44

Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité: 0 = MEDIOCRE 1 = INSUFFISANT 2= SATISFAISANT 3 = BIEN 4 = EXCELLENT

2.15.4.2 Infrastructure

a. Points forts identifiés

- I. L'Institution dispose d'un nombre suffisant d'amphithéâtres pour accueillir les étudiants selon leur mode de prestation
- II. L'inexistence de la massification permet à l'Institution d'offrir aux étudiants un espace suffisant pour la formation,
- III. L'Institution possède des bâtiments et des laboratoires pédagogiques pour accueillir les étudiants des disciplines scientifiques selon le mode de prestation.

b. Zones d'inquiétude

- I. Délabrement très prononcé de toutes les infrastructures de l'Université, en particulier les résidences et le restaurant universitaires,
- II. Faible capacité d'accueil de la cité universitaire pour les étudiants,
- III. Sous équipement du centre médical,
- IV. L'accès à l'internet et aux matériels informatiques est no seulement limi mais souvent inexistant pour étudiants, voire pour le personnel administratif,
- V. Mesures de sécurité inadéquates,
- VI. L'environnement insalubre, surtout visible au niveau de la cité universitaire,
- VII. Certains bureaux des Administratifs sont dans un état de délabrement prononcé et manquent d'outils informatiques.

c. Recommandations

4

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

- I. Une priorisation de certaines activités pour la gestion et la maintenance des services d'utilité publique,
- II. Un leadership devrait être engagé, à long terme, pour attirer les opérateurs économiques à construire les homes autour de l'Université d'autant plus que les étudiants qui s'y trouvent, proviennent de différentes provinces du pays,
- III. Une réflexion doit être menée pour assainir les espaces de formation et il est possible de mobiliser toute la communauté universitaire (y compris les étudiants) à y participer pour réduire les dépenses,
- IV. Des efforts devraient être fournis pour améliorer les TIC

Tableau 2: Infrastructure

Numéro de Reference	Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité	Valeur d'évaluation de l'université	Valeur d'évaluation d'experts
2.1	L'institution dispose d'un nombre suffisant d'amphithéâtres pour accueillir les étudiants selon le mode de prestation de l'institution.	2	3
2.2	L'institution offre aux étudiants, un espace suffisant pour la formation / études y compris l'accès aux matériels didactiques électroniques tel que requis pour le mode de prestation de l'institution	1	1
2.3	Le personnel enseignant et administratif a accès aux matériels informatiques et à l'Internet.	1	1
2.4	Les étudiants ont accès aux matériels informatiques et à l'Internet à niveau approprié aux demandes du mode de prestation de l'institution	0	0
2.5	L'établissement possède des équipements de laboratoire suffisants pour accueillir les étudiants des disciplines scientifiques selon le mode de prestation de l'institution.	1	1
2.6	Le matériel de laboratoire est moderne et bien entretenu	0	1
2.7	L'institution a une bibliothèque moderne pour appuyer la formation universitaire et veille à ce que l'accès aux mécanismes appropriés soit disponible selon le mode de prestation.	2	2
2.8	L'institution prévoit des fonds pour la gestion et la maintenance des services d'utilité publique et veille ce que les mesures de sécurité appropriées soient mises en place.	0	0

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

Valeur Totale d'évaluation / Valeur Moyenne d'évaluation	7/8=0.87	9/8=1.13
---	-----------------	-----------------

Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité: 0 = MEDIOCRE 1 = INSUFFISANT 2= SATISFAISANT 3 = BIEN 4 = EXCELLENT

2.15.4.3 Finances

a. Points forts identifiés

Le budget octroyé est clairement documenté

b. Zones d'inquiétude

- I. L'institution ne dispose pas de ressources financières suffisantes pour atteindre ses objectifs conformément à son budget réduit à 50% depuis 3 ans et au coût de l'étudiant, pourtant plus élevé dans les domaines scientifiques,
- II. Aucune procédure mise en place pour attirer les financements du monde des entreprises et socio-économique, national et international.

c. Recommandations

- I. Envisager le développement des activités d'autofinancement en complément de l'allocation que l'Etat octroie, pour améliorer le fonctionnement de l'Institution,
- II. Envisager la possibilité d'accorder de l'aide financière aux étudiants méritants mais dépourvus des moyens financiers,
- III. Formaliser au niveau de l'Université les financements apportés par les trois établissements et prévoir un un pourcentage pour l'université.

Tableau 3: Finances

Numéro de Reference	Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité	Valeur d'évaluation de l'université	Valeur d'évaluation d'experts
3.1	L'institution dispose de ressources financières suffisantes pour atteindre ses objectifs conformément à son budget et au coût unitaire par étudiant.	1	1
3.2	L'institution a mis en place des procédures pour attirer des financements y compris des secteurs industriels et des entreprises.	0	0
3.3	Des procédures budgétaires clairement définies sont mises en place pour s'assurer que l'allocation de ressources reflète la vision, la mission et les objectifs	2	2
3.4	L'institution apporte un soutien financier aux étudiants	0	0

6

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

	méritants (bourses d'étude offertes par l'institution)		
3.5	Des informations sur l'aide financière et les critères de son attribution sont fournies aux étudiants et aux autres représentants.	1	1
3.6	L'institution publie les états des recettes et des dépenses.	2	2
Valeur Totale d'évaluation / Valeur Moyenne d'évaluation		6/6=1	6/6=1

Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité: 0 = MEDIOCRE 1 = INSUFFISANT 2= SATISFAISANT 3 = BIEN 4 = EXCELLENT

2.15.4.4 Enseignement et apprentissage

a. Points forts identifiés

- I. Il y a un bon mécanisme d'apprentissage correspondant aux attentes des étudiants,
- II. Le taux d'encadrement des étudiants est meilleur et satisfaisant. Il en est de même pour le taux de réussite.

b. Zones d'inquiétude

- I. Il y a une surcharge de travail chez les enseignants qui exercent plusieurs activités administratives en dehors de l'enseignement et de la recherche ; cette surcharge s'est amplifiée avec l'obligation de développer de nouvelles formations, exemple l'existence de vingt-deux (22) nouveaux parcours à la faculté des sciences,
- II. L'Institution n'a pas encore mis en place des procédures pour soutenir les programmes d'initiation à l'enseignement, à la pédagogie et au perfectionnement du personnel,
- III. L'Institution n'a pas encore mis en place des procédures d'encouragement et des récompenses des innovations dans le domaine de l'enseignement et de la formation,
- IV. Il y a plusieurs parcours créés qui nécessitent une forte mobilisation des enseignants tant en qualité et qu'en quantité.

c. Recommandations

- I. Recourir de plus en plus à des enseignants qualifiés pour les parcours spécifiques,
- II. Faire de la gestion prévisionnelle du personnel enseignant et administratif et projeter dans le futur, le nombre des enseignants à former pour répondre à la relève académique,
- III. Formaliser les évaluations des enseignements.

Tableau 4: Enseignement et apprentissage

Numéro de Reference	Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité	Valeur d'évaluation de l'université	Valeur d'évaluation d'experts
---------------------	---	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------

7

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

4.1	L'institution encourage et récompense les innovations dans le domaine de l'enseignement et de la formation	0	0
4.2	L'institution a mis des procédures en place pour soutenir les programmes d'initiation à l'enseignement, à la pédagogie, à l'assistance universitaire et au perfectionnement du personnel par le biais de la formation et de l'apprentissage continu et à vie	0	0
4.3	Les étudiants ont la possibilité de dialoguer avec les membres du personnel en petits groupes, individuellement ou via des plateformes électroniques	2	2
4.4	Étudiant : le nombre des membres du personnel et le volume du travail effectué par les enseignants sont conformes aux normes acceptables pour le mode particulier de prestation, et permettent de recueillir, en retour, les observations des étudiants.	1	1
4.5	L'institution met des politiques / procédures en place pour guider l'élaboration, la mise en œuvre et l'évaluation des programmes offerts	1	1
4.6	L'institution a élaboré une politique ou des critères pour le recrutement du personnel, le déploiement, le développement, la planification de la relève et un système d'encadrement et / ou de stage.	3	3
4.7	Les services d'Aide aux étudiants, notamment l'assistance universitaire et des services de consultation requis sont disponibles, conformément au mode de prestation de l'institution.	0	0
4.8	L'institution dispose de mécanismes d'aide aux étudiants qui leur permettent de devenir des apprenants autonomes, conformément au mode de prestation de l'institution.	1	1
4.9	L'institution dispose d'un bureau consacré à la promotion de la coopération internationale et au renforcement à la mobilité intra- africaine des étudiants et du personnel.	1	1
Valeur Totale d'évaluation / Valeur Moyenne d'évaluation		9/9=1	9/9=1

Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité: 0 = MEDIOCRE 1 = INSUFFISANT 2= SATISFAISANT 3 = BIEN 4 = EXCELLENT

2.15.4.5 Recherche, publication et innovation

a. Points forts identifiés

- I. Fort développement des réseaux de recherche,
- II. Nombreuses publications dans les trois établissements,

8

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

III. Apports des établissements au financement de recherche

b. Zones d'inquiétude

- I. L'USTM ne dispose plus d'un fonds pour la recherche alloué jusqu'en 2010 alors même qu'elle a mis en place une Ecole Doctorale et dispose de chercheurs qualifiés, impliqués et prêts à s'impliquer davantage,
- II. L'Institution n'offre pas encore des prix pour les recherches dont les résultats sont utilisés par la communauté de base,
- III. La politique sur l'innovation et la propriété intellectuelle n'est pas encore formalisée,
- IV. Inutilisation à longue durée des instruments de recherche par manque des réactifs,

c. Recommandations

- I. Renforcer les capacités des chercheurs en management et en élaboration des projets de recherche,
- II. Mettre en place des procédures pour aider le personnel enseignant à développer et à améliorer ses compétences dans le domaine de la recherche,
- III. Renforcer le partenariat afin de promouvoir des recherches et des publications internationales communes,
- IV. Mutualiser les moyens financiers pour partager les coûts des instruments des laboratoires ainsi leur emploi pour les travaux pratiques et de recherche.

Tableau 5: Recherche, publication et innovation

Numéro de Reference	Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité	Valeur d'évaluation de l'université	Valeur d'évaluation d'experts
5.1	L'établissement dispose d'une politique en matière de recherche et de publication, de stratégie et de programme. La politique de recherche met, entre autres, l'accent sur la recherche qui appuie le développement socioéconomique de l'Afrique.	3	3
5.2	L'établissement a une politique et / ou une stratégie pour l'innovation, l'appropriation de la propriété intellectuelle et la prospective technologique.	2	2
5.3	L'institution a réussi à attirer des subventions pour la recherche provenant de sources nationales ou internationales et à travailler en partenariat avec le secteur industriel.	2	2

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA

European University Association



ENQA

EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

5.4	L'institution a mis des procédures en place pour aider le personnel enseignant à développer et améliorer ses compétences dans le domaine de la recherche, notamment la recherche et la publication en collaboration.	0	0
5.5	Le personnel enseignant et les étudiants publient leurs travaux de recherche dans des revues universitaires accrédités et font des demandes de brevets le cas échéant).	2	2
5.6	L'institut encourage et aide les chercheurs à présenter leurs recherches lors des conférences nationales et internationales	2	2
5.7	L'institut encourage et assiste les chercheurs en leur facilitant l'accès au budget de recherche - développement et en leur permettant d'entreprendre des recherches pertinentes pour la résolution des problèmes auxquels l'Afrique est confrontée et pour la création d'opportunités économiques et de développement.	0	2
5.8	L'institution encourage et offre des prix pour les recherches dont les résultats sont utilisés par la société	0	0
5.9	L'institution dispose d'un mécanisme de partenariat avec le secteur industriel, tout en attirant, surtout, des ressources du secteur industriel. L'institution reçoit des demandes du secteur industriel pour des recherches spécifiques et pour l'appui à la formation.	2	2
5.10	L'institution a établi des partenariats afin de promouvoir des recherches et des publications communes internationales.	2	2
Valeur Totale d'évaluation / Valeur Moyenne d'évaluation		15/10=1.5	17/10=1.7

Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité : 0 = MEDIOCRE 1 = INSUFFISANT 2= SATISFAISANT 3 = BIEN 4 = EXCELLENT

2.15.4.6 Engagement sociétal

a. Points forts identifiés

- I. L'Institution assure des formations pertinentes de courte durée pour la communauté / la société en général en fonction des besoins identifiés et en vue d'appuyer les opportunités économiques identifiées,
- II. La politique de recherche L'Institution met l'accent sur la recherche qui appuie le développement socioéconomique du pays (Gabon) et partant de l'Afrique.

b. Zones d'inquiétude

10

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

- I. Aucune participation de la communauté de base à l’assainissement de l’institution en termes des travaux de salubrité par exemple,
- II. Faible participation des anciens étudiants à la réhabilitation de leur ancienne institution.

c. Recommendations

- I. Concertation avec toutes les parties prenantes pour lutter contre l’insalubrité. Une sensibilisation de tous les acteurs s’avère nécessaire,
- II. Mobilisation des ressources financières à travers les offres des services en direction du monde socioprofessionnel et de la communauté de base,
- III. Renforcer les journées « portes ouvertes » afin d’attirer les financements au bénéfice de l’institution,
- IV. Organiser sur la base d’une réflexion menée, des foires d’exposition de produits de la recherche et les faire découvrir aux opérateurs économiques.

Tableau 6: Engagement societal

Numéro de Reference	Normes régissant l’évaluation de la qualité	Valeur d’évaluation de l’université	Valeur d’évaluation d’experts
6.1	L’établissement a mis en place une politique et des procédures pour collaborer avec la communauté locale ou la société en général. La communauté sollicite souvent l’aide de l’institution pour des recherches universitaires spécifiques.	1	1
6.2	L’institution encourage les départements et le personnel à élaborer et à mettre en œuvre des stratégies de collaboration avec la société.	2	1
6.3	Les étudiants sont tenus de collaborer avec les communautés à travers leurs travaux universitaires.	2	2
6.4	L’établissement a noué des partenariats avec d’autres sous-secteurs de l’éducation pour améliorer la qualité de l’enseignement dans le 1pays et la région.	2	2
6.5	L’institution informe la communauté locale de ses activités de collaboration avec la communauté locale	2	2
6.6	L’établissement assure des formations pertinentes de courte durée pour la communauté / la société en général en fonction des besoins identifiés et en vue d’appuyer les opportunités économiques identifiées.	2	2
6.7	L’institution met ses équipements à la disposition (si	3	3

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

	possible) de la communauté locale en vue d'appuyer ses activités de développement socioéconomique et communautaires.		
Valeur Totale d'évaluation / Valeur Moyenne d'évaluation		14/7=2	13/7=1.86

Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité: 0 = MEDIOCRE 1 = INSUFFISANT 2= SATISFAISANT 3 = BIEN 4 = EXCELLENT

2.15.4.7 Resume de l'évaluation au niveau institutionnel

Tableau 7

Major Standard	Aggregated Value by University	Aggregated value by Experts
Gouvernance et gestion	1,22	1,22
Infrastructures	0,87	1,12
Finances	1,00	1,00
Enseignement et formation	1,00	1,00
Recherche, Publications et Innovations	1,50	1,70
Collaboration avec la société	2,00	1,86
Résumé de l'évaluation	7.59/6= 1,26	7.9/6= 1.31

Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité: 0 = MEDIOCRE 1 = INSUFFISANT 2= SATISFAISANT 3 = BIEN 4 = EXCELLENT

La qualité de l'institution est évaluée:

- Par l'université comme **INSUFFISANTE**
- Par les experts comme **INSUFFISANTE**

2.15.5 African Quality Rating Mechanim Validation at Programme Level

2.15.5.1 Planification et gestion du programme

a. Points forts identifiés

- I. Taux d'encadrement des étudiants fort appréciable
- II. La technologie et les équipements disponibles sont adaptés aux différents programmes et aux étudiants cibles.

b. Zones d'inquiétude

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

- I. Faible taux de contrôle externe du programme et des ressources suffisantes ne sont pas alloué à ce programme,
- II. Il y a plus de parcours (au nombre de plus de 70) organisés pour un nombre insuffisant des enseignants surchargés.

c. Recommendations

- I. Un renforcement des capacités des enseignants en pédagogie universitaire est vivement souhaité, pour tenir compte de l’environnement psychologique de l’étudiant et de la mise en place du LMD qui devrait être plus centré sur des pédagogies actives,
- II. L’engagement dans le bilinguisme est vivement souhaité pour permettre aux futurs cadres de mieux se défendre quelles que soient les barrières linguistiques,
- III. L’institution doit veiller à la formalisation de l’évaluation des enseignements par les étudiants.

Tableau 8: Planification et gestion du programme

Numéro de Reference	Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité	Valeur d'évaluation de l'université	Valeur d'évaluation d'experts
7.1	Le programme est conforme à l'ensemble de la mission et de la vision de l'institution.	3	3
7.2	Le programme répond aux critères d'accréditation nationaux.	3	3
7.3	L'établissement alloue des ressources suffisantes pour appuyer le programme.	2	1
7.4	Il existe un coordonnateur du/des programme (s) responsable de la gestion et de la garantie de la qualité des programmes.	3	3
7.5	Le mode de prestation tient compte des besoins et des défis de tous les étudiants ciblés.	3	2
7.6	Les membres du personnel enseignant qui intervient sur le programme ont le type et le niveau de qualification requis.	3	3
7.7	Le programme est régulièrement soumis à un contrôle interne et externe de manière participative afin de refléter l'évolution au niveau du domaine d'étude.	1	1
7.8	La planification des programmes comprend une stratégie pour l'utilisation de la technologie d'une manière adaptée au programme, aux équipements disponibles, et aux étudiants cibles.	3	2
Valeur Totale d'évaluation / Valeur Moyenne d'évaluation		21/8=2.62	18/8=2.25

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité: 0 = MEDIOCRE 1 = INSUFFISANT 2= SATISFAISANT 3 = BIEN 4 = EXCELLENT

2.15.5.2 Elaboration du programme

a. Points forts identifiés

- I. Le programme est basé sur un équilibre approprié des connaissances et des compétences théoriques, pratiques et expérimentales,
- II. Le processus d'élaboration du programme d'étude se fait après consultation des parties prenantes.

b. Zones d'inquiétude

L'emploi de temps de l'étudiant est trop chargé et ne lui permet pas de s'adonner aux activités para académiques (culturelles et sportives),

c. Recommandations

- I. Tenir compte du personnel qualifié avant toute élaboration du programme d'études et réduire l'emploi des vacataires étant donné que l'Institution ne dispose pas des ressources financières car cela fait accumuler les retards académiques
- II. Mettre régulièrement à jour le programme d'études avec la collaboration des professionnels de terrain

Tableau 9: Elaboration du programme

Numéro de Reference	Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité	Valeur d'évaluation de l'université	Valeur d'évaluation d'experts
8.1	Le programme d'études spécifie clairement les apprenants cibles et les résultats escomptés/ compétences pour chaque module / cours et pour le programme dans son ensemble	3	3
8.2	Le programme d'études est régulièrement mis à jour pour prendre en compte les nouvelles connaissances et des besoins en termes de formation en vue d'appuyer le développement de l'Afrique.	2	2
8.3	Les modules / cours sont planifiés de manière cohérente et offrent un enseignement harmonieux aux étudiants en vue d'obtenir une qualification.	2	2
8.4	Le programme est basé sur un équilibre approprié des	3	3

14

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

	connaissances et des compétences théoriques, pratiques et expérimentales (selon le cas) ainsi que des domaines essentiels et facultatifs.		
8.5	Le programme d'études a été élaboré pour maximiser le profil de carrière des étudiants, les possibilités d'assurer la cohérence avec d'autres qualifications pertinentes et les perspectives d'emploi.	3	2
8.6	Le programme d'études a été élaboré après des recherches et des consultations approfondies avec les parties prenantes concernées y compris les planificateurs du secteur public, le secteur privé et d'autres employeurs.	3	2
8.7	Le programme d'études reflète les valeurs africaines positives, la sensibilité à la question de l'égalité entre les hommes et les femmes et prend en compte les besoins de la société.	1	1
Valeur Totale d'évaluation / Valeur Moyenne d'évaluation		17/7=2.43	15/7=2.14

Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité : 0 = MEDIOCRE 1 = INSUFFISANT 2= SATISFAISANT 3 = BIEN 4 = EXCELLENT

2.15.5.3 Enseignement et Apprentissage

a. Points forts identifiés

Le matériel didactique présenté fait référence aux objectifs et aux résultats de la formation ainsi qu'une indication sur la durée des études.

b. Zones d'inquiétude

- I. Le non renouvellement régulier des réactifs dans l'utilisation de certains matériels modernes reçus dans le cadre des partenariats,
- II. Une dégradation générale des conditions d'étude et de travail.

c. Recommandations

- I. Les séminaires, les journées scientifiques devraient être organisés en interne pour l'amélioration continue de la pédagogie,
- II. Les TIC doivent être utilisés dans le processus d'apprentissage.

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

Tableau 10: Enseignement et Apprentissage

Numéro de Reference	Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité	Valeur d'évaluation de l'université	Valeur d'évaluation d'experts
9.1	L'enseignement et la formation sont basés sur les résultats explicites de la formation qui sont conformes aux objectifs du programme et des cours.	2	2
9.2	Une stratégie claire est mise en place pour identifier le matériel didactique nécessaire à l'exécution du programme.	1	1
9.3	Le matériel didactique a été clairement présenté et fait référence aux objectifs et résultats de la formation et une indication sur le temps d'étude.	2	2
9.4	Le matériel didactique a été conçu dans le but de former les étudiants sur le plan intellectuel, moral et pratique	3	3
9.5	Les procédures d'examen du Programme comprennent l'évaluation et l'amélioration du matériel.	3	3
9.6	Le matériel didactique et d'apprentissage novateur est mis à la disposition des étudiants.	1	1
Valeur Totale d'évaluation / Valeur Moyenne d'évaluation		12/6=2	12/6=2

Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité : 0 = MEDIOCRE 1 = INSUFFISANT 2= SATISFAISANT 3 = BIEN 4 = EXCELLENT

2.15.5.4 Évaluation

a. Points forts identifiés

- I. Le programme comprend une variété de méthodes d'évaluation et reflète le travail réalisé par l'étudiant,
- II. Des marquages sont utilisés pour garantir la cohérence, l'exactitude afin de fournir des informations aux étudiants.

b. Zones d'inquiétude

La multiplication des évaluations peut affaiblir les performances de l'étudiant.

c. Recommandations

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

- I. Les ateliers, les séminaires devraient être organisés pour les enseignants par des spécialistes en évaluation dans le but de garantir la cohérence concernant les attributions des notes aux étudiants,
- II. Proposer des évaluations permettant une meilleure intégration de l'étudiant dans la société et sur le marché du travail.

Tableau 11: Évaluation

Numéro de Reference	Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité	Valeur d'évaluation de l'université	Valeur d'évaluation d'experts
10.1	L'institution a mis en place des systèmes pour les examinateurs externes.	2	2
10.2	Des informations claires sont fournies sur le mode d'évaluation pour tous les cours et modules du programme.	2	2
10.3	L'évaluation fait partie intégrante du processus d'enseignement et de formation et vise à s'assurer que les étudiants ont maîtrisé des résultats spécifiques.	3	3
10.4	Le niveau de difficulté des évaluations est adapté au programme spécifique et au groupe cible d'étudiants.	2	2
10.5	Le programme comprend une variété de méthodes d'évaluation	4	3
10.6	L'utilisation des procédures de marquage garantit la cohérence, l'exactitude et permet de fournir des informations aux étudiants.	3	3
Valeur Totale d'évaluation / Valeur Moyenne d'évaluation		16/6=2.67	15/6=2.50

Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité: 0 = MEDIOCRE 1 = INSUFFISANT 2= SATISFAISANT 3 = BIEN 4 = EXCELLENT

2.15.5.5 Résultats du Programme

a. Points forts identifiés

- I. Faible taux de déperdition tout au long des études,
- II. Bon taux de réussite,
- III. Des recherches et des consultations sont entreprises dans le domaine d'étude afin de résoudre les problèmes industriels et d'appuyer le développement économique et social.

b. Zones d'inquiétude

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

- I. L'attractivité des études en Sciences et techniques a fortement baissé à cause, sans doute, des mauvaises conditions de travail et de l'éloignement de l'Université, ne permettant pas aux étudiants défavorisés d'entreprendre des études,
- II. Faible suivi des diplômés et de leurs employeurs potentiels pour obtenir les informations sur les sortes de difficultés qu'ils rencontrent sur le terrain.

c. Recommendations

- I. Mettre à contribution les anciens étudiants, les utilisateurs dans le feedback de la formation dispensée,
- II. Organiser à intervalles réguliers (par exemple tous les 3 ans) une auto-évaluation des programmes sur base d'un référentiel approprié,
- III. Développer l'entrepreneuriat pour l'auto-prise en charge et favoriser le développement de "juniors entreprises".

Tableau 12: Résultats du programme

Numéro de Reference	Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité	Valeur d'évaluation de l'université	Valeur d'évaluation d'experts
11.1	Les progrès de l'étudiant sont suivis tout au long du programme et un système d'alerte rapide est prévu pour les étudiants risquant de décrocher.	2	2
11.2	Les taux de réussite par promotion sont conformes aux normes établies pour le domaine d'étude et la méthode de formation; les stratégies visant à accroître les taux de réussite sont mises en place.	3	3
11.3	Un formulaire de qualité est mis à la disposition des étudiants pour recueillir leurs commentaires	2	3
11.4	Les experts, les pairs et / ou les organisations professionnelles examinent la pertinence et la qualité des formations suivies par les étudiants.	3	3
11.5	Des liens existent avec les employeurs potentiels afin de faciliter l'emploi des diplômés.	2	2
11.6	Des études de suivi des diplômés et de leurs employeurs sont menées pour obtenir des informations sur les résultats des diplômés.	0	0
11.7	Le programme dispose d'un plan de recherche efficace,	1	2

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

	d'une mise en œuvre appropriée et de mécanismes d'évaluation et de rétroaction.		
11.8	Des recherches et des consultations sont entreprises dans le domaine d'étude afin de résoudre les problèmes industriels et d'appuyer le développement économique et social.	3	3
Valeur Totale d'évaluation / Valeur Moyenne d'évaluation		16/8=2	18/8=2.25

Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité : 0 = MEDIOCRE 1 = INSUFFISANT 2= SATISFAISANT 3 = BIEN 4 = EXCELLENT

2.15.5.6 Resume de l'évaluation au niveau du programme

Tableau 12

Major Standard	Aggregated Value by University	Aggregated value by Experts
Planification et gestion du programme	2,62	2,25
Elaboration du programme	2,43	2,14
Enseignement et formation	2,00	2,00
Évaluation	2,67	2,50
Résultats du programme	2,00	2,25
Résumé de l'évaluation	11.72/5= 2.34	11.14/5= 2.22

Normes régissant l'évaluation de la qualité: 0 = MEDIOCRE 1 = INSUFFISANT 2= SATISFAISANT 3 = BIEN 4 = EXCELLENT

La qualité du programme est évalué:

- Par l'université comme **SATISFAISANTE**
- Par les experts comme **SATISFAISANTE**

2.15.6 Conclusions et Recommendations

L'évaluation du Mécanisme Africain de la Qualité à l'Université des Sciences et Techniques de Masuku à Franceville au Gabon s'est déroulée comme prévu du 19 au 20 juin 2017. L'application du questionnaire a posé quelques difficultés au Comité de Pilotage de cette Institution universitaire. La principale difficulté résidait au niveau de la traduction littérale, de l'anglais en français, proposée par l'AUA, de certaines questions, qui n'avaient pas la même compréhension pour tout le monde et qui parfois, ne s'adaptait pas à la réalité du terrain. Malgré la situation de la grève rencontrée sur place, nous avons pu travailler dans la quiétude. L'évaluation totale au niveau institutionnel a été notée « **INSUFFISANTE** » aussi bien par l'Université que par l'équipe d'experts. Quant au niveau du

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION



**THE AFRICA-EU
PARTNERSHIP**

Programme, cette évaluation totale a été jugée également « **SATISFAISANTE** » par l’Université et l’équipe d’experts.

L’Université des Sciences et Techniques de Masuku à Franceville est financièrement prise en charge par l’Etat Gabonais, à Libreville, alourdissant les délais de prise de décision et limitant par là même son autonomie de fonctionnement. Toutes les autorités académiques, de la Haute Direction jusqu’au niveau des Départements, sont nommées par le Gouvernement. Les ressources financières allouées étant réduites à plus de 50% ces trois dernières années, les responsables de l’université ne peuvent pas atteindre les objectifs qu’ils se sont fixés en termes de politique de la relève du personnel académique, de la formation et de la recherche.

Les conditions de travail aussi bien pour le personnel que pour les étudiants sont très mauvaises et se dégradent de façon très inquiétante alors que l’USTM dispose d’un potentiel élevé. L’Université a en effet un beau campus universitaire mais les infrastructures sont dans un état de délabrement très avancé. La cité universitaire est insalubre et le restaurant ne fonctionnant plus, les coûts d’existence augmentent et mettent de nombreux étudiants en grande difficulté. Les grèves à répétition entraînent le chevauchement des années académiques qui s’étalent et portent préjudice à la formation attendue des futurs cadres.

Bien qu’il existe une forte documentation en termes de vision et de mission, le plan stratégique qui devait canaliser toutes ces actions et mobiliser la communauté est inexistant.

Il est évident que l’Etat ne peut pas tout faire. Nous estimons qu’un leadership dynamique porté par l’Autorité de l’Université, s’il est bien engagé, réfléchi, compris et partagé par l’ensemble de la communauté universitaire, peut attirer des financements extérieurs pouvant suppléer au budget octroyé par le Gouvernement. Par exemple, le développement des activités d’autofinancement, la création d’Alumini de tous les anciens diplômés de l’Université des Sciences et Techniques de Masuku, les projets de recherche diligentés par les tiers, l’implication de la communauté de base, etc.

Pour accompagner son développement, l’élaboration d’un plan stratégique s’avère un outil indispensable devant permettre à l’établissement de définir des priorités, puis des stratégies réalistes et de circonscrire un plan d’action opérationnel annuel.

This initiative is implemented on behalf of the European and African Union Commissions by:



DAAD

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



EUA
European University Association



ENQA
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION
FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION