





Harmonisation for African Higher Education Quality Assurance and Accreditation 2

HAQAA 2 Initiative



Harmonisation of African Higher Education Quality Assurance and Accreditation

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











How to write a review report

- Who is the report for?
- What is the report for?
- What does the report need to say? What messages does it need to contain?
- What's the best way to say this clearly to the intended audience?



Who is the report for? Who is the main audience?

- The review report is the main outcome of the review panel's work and contains your findings and conclusions
- Agency reviews: "A report with findings and recommendations for improvement..no compliance judgements..."
- Consultancy visits: "The...review report take(s) on a more 'developmental' tone..."
- In both cases no requirement to publish the report



What is the report for?

- No compliance judgements and no "formal consequences to the review process."
- Gives a level of flexibility that we don't normally have! What will be useful for the agency under review? What about an agency having a consultancy visit? They will be at different stages of development and maturity
- Nevertheless, if the reports are to be useful, they must all be:





Fair

Evidencebased

Meaningful

Understandable



What does that mean?

- Comprehensive: all standards must be covered: i.e. Parts B and C of the ASG-QA
- Fair: consistent application of the

Evidence based

- Meaningful: Analysis and conclusions must be clear
- Understandable: the language must be appropriate for the audience



Structure of the report

- Executive summary
- Introduction
- Background to the review
- Review process
- Self-assessment report
- Site visit
- FINDINGS
- Additional observations
- CONCLUSIONS
- Summary of commendations
- Overall conclusions and recommendations



Findings

- Each standard in parts B and C of the ASG-QA should be discussed separately and should include:
- Description: General overview of the situation (refer to the SAR)
- Evidence: a short description of the evidence the panel saw in relation to the standard (documents/meetings)
- Analysis: Evaluation of the agency's alignment with the standard (based on the evidence received)
- Conclusion: the link between evidence and analysis should be mutually supportive



Findings

Discussion of each standard should lead to a conclusion, including:

- RECOMMENDATIONS
- The explanation of why the recommendation is important should be clear in the analysis. In a developmental review, the panel might want to offer some support
- COMMENDATIONS
- Indicating ways that these might be enhanced if possible



In summary

Brief description of how the agency meets the standard

Explain how you tested it (evidence): analysis

Conclusion:
does the
agency's
approach
align with the
standard?



Questions?



Questions are the path to learning



Group work

Cases

- Standard B2:
 Designing
 external QA
 mechanisms fit
 for purpose
- Standard C4: Independence of QAA

Grouping

- 2 francophone and 2 anglophone groups
- All groups will look at both standards

Structure

- Each group nominate a speaker and a notetaker
- A facilitator
 will be present
 to provide
 support if
 needed

Time

- 25 minutes group work
- 15 minutes plenary feedback



What should the groups do?

Consider...

- Any commendations?
- What recommendations would you make given the information in the report?
- Try to draft the commendations and the recommendations in a developmental way

Be prepared to

- Feedback one commendation (if relevant)
- Feedback one recommendation is the recommendation necessary to meet the standard or will it lead to improvement?



Plenary

Questions

• Thoughts

Discussion















THANK YOU!



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











Quality Assurance in Higher Education