



African Union

African Quality Rating Mechanism

CONSOLIDATED EVALUATION REPORT

(Nine Higher Education Institutions)



African Union

Department of Human Resources, Science and Technology

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY



African Quality Rating Mechanism
CONSOLIDATED EVALUATION REPORT
(Nine Higher Education Institutions)

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

July 2016

DISCLAIMER

The African Union Commission does not necessarily endorse or agree with the quality ratings presented in this document. The summarized results are based on the self-ratings of the nine higher education institutions and the external evaluation by the respective teams of experts who participated in the validation missions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction	7
2. Institutions that Participated in the AQRM Validation Exercise	9
3. Rating Criteria Used in AQRM	19
4. Results at Institutional Level	22
4.1 Governance and Management	22
4.2 Infrastructure	25
4.3 Finance	28
4.4 Teaching and Learning	30
4.5 Research, Publications and Innovations	33
4.6 Community/Societal Engagement	37
5. Results at Programme Level	41
5.1 Programme Planning and Management	41

5.2 Curriculum Development	44
5.3 Teaching and Learning at Programme Level	47
5.4 Assessment	49
5.5 Programme Results	51
6. Institutions Self-Rating Versus External Evaluation	55
7. Overall Quality of Participating Institutions	73
8. Conclusions	74
Annex 1: TOR for Quality Experts of AQRM Evaluation Mission	75
Annex 2: Checklist for AQRM Reference Points	77

PREFACE

The massive increase in demand for higher education and the corresponding enrolment expansion require the existence of an effective mechanism for quality assurance. Higher education institutions need to improve their internal quality assurance mechanisms and enhance their effectiveness in teaching and research through self-assessment and peer-review. Mechanisms for assuring quality must be put in place within institutions of higher learning to enable them undertake a critical self-analysis of their programmes with the aim of improving the quality of the education provision.

Global ranking systems of higher education institutions have not provided African higher education institutions with mechanisms that can help to enhance quality. These global systems also fail to take account of key measures of quality which would take African realities into consideration.

The African Quality Rating Mechanism (AQRM) has been developed as a tool to facilitate a culture of continuous quality improvement in African higher education institutions through self-evaluation exercises and external validation. The AQRM grants significant merit for enhancing the quality of higher education in Africa by nurturing the advancement of internal quality assurance practices in institutions. The tool offers a foundation for advancing harmonisation of African higher education and mutual recognition of degrees and academic qualifications. Moreover, the AQRM would establish a deepening commitment to quality across higher education systems, so that African universities will be strengthened for local relevance and global competitiveness.

I sincerely appreciate and commend those African Universities and their honorable Vice Chancellors, who volunteered to participate in the AQRM self-rating and validation exercise. It is also my pleasure to express gratitude to all of the quality experts that have successfully undertaken the AQRM evaluation and validation exercise in the 9 higher education institutions.

I hope that this report will provoke critical conversation around the issue of quality assurance and harmonisation in African higher education, and encourage participation of more universities in continental engagement on quality assurance.

I would like to encourage all African higher education institutions to use the African Quality Rating Mechanism (AQRM) as a key instrument to assess their quality and support the development of institutional cultures of quality.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'M. De Paul Ikounga', is written over a horizontal line. The signature is stylized and includes a large loop on the left side.

H.E. Dr. Martial De Paul Ikounga

Commissioner for Human Resources, Science and Technology

African Union Commission

1. INTRODUCTION

The African Union Commission developed the African Quality Rating Mechanism (AQRM) to assist higher education institutions in Africa to compare their own performance against a set of commonly agreed criteria through a self-evaluation exercise and to sustain the establishment of an organizational culture of quality. The AQRM was approved at the Conference of Ministers of Education of the African Union in 2007.

The AQRM is instrumental in helping institutions carry out self-evaluation exercises and assess themselves to support continuous quality improvement. It encourages African higher education institutions to utilise the quality rating mechanism as one way of maintaining constant quality enhancements to ensure overall improvement of quality.

The AQRM holds much prospect for improving the quality of higher education in Africa by fostering the development of internal quality assurance systems in institutions and by providing a means for external validation of quality assessment. It is an assessment tool that evaluates the performance of higher education institutions on different indicators. It considers both programme and institution levels, focusing on major criteria that include specific standards against which institutions can assess their own quality levels. The institutional level involves 49 specific indicators while the programme level rating mechanism comprises 35 indicators.

The African Quality Rating Mechanism (AQRM) is not a ranking instrument and it does not promote the listing of institutions in a league table. Rather, the AQRM allows for classification of institutions and programmes into five categories:

POOR Quality, **INSUFFICIENT Quality,** **SATISFACTORY Quality,**
GOOD Quality, or **EXCELLENT Quality.**

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

Following a pilot survey of self-rating that was carried out in 2010, revised questionnaires and rating instruments were designed using a five-point scale scoring. Based on lessons learnt from the first pilot stage, an institutional visit with external evaluators was introduced to validate the self-assessment reports of institutions. A validation exercise of AQRM rating was carried out between October and December 2014 by teams of experts in 9 higher education institutions, selected from the five geographic regions of the continent. Consequently AQRM validation reports of all the nine institutions were prepared by the respective assessors.

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

2. Institutions that Participated in the AQRM Validation Exercise

The second pilot AQRM rating exercise was carried out for purposes of validation of the AQRM at the end of 2014 by external reviewers in the following nine higher education institutions, selected from the five geographic regions.

Table 1: Institutions Participated in AQRM Validation Exercise

INSTITUTIONS PARTICIPATED IN AQRM VALIDATION EXERCISE			
No	Name of the Institution	Country	Region
1	Addis Ababa University (AAU)	Ethiopia	East
2	Botho University (BU)	Botswana	South
3	University of Cape Coast (UCC)	Ghana	West
4	University of Dar es Salaam (UDS)	Tanzania	East
5	University of KwaZulu-Natal (UKZN)	South Africa	South
6	International Institute for Water and Environmental Engineering, 2iE	Burkina Faso	West
7	Strathmore University (SU)	Kenya	East
8	University of Tlemcen (UT)	Algeria	North
9	University of Yaoundé II (UY)	Cameroon	Central

Below is a brief overview of the institutions.

Brief Overview - Addis Ababa University

Addis Ababa University (AAU), which was established in 1950 as the University College of Addis Ababa, is the oldest and the largest higher learning and research institution in Ethiopia. Since its inception, the University has been the leading centre in teaching-learning, research and community services.

Beginning with enrolment capacity of 71 students in 1950, AAU now has 51,793 students (35,984 undergraduate, 14,036 graduate and 1733 PhD students) and 6143 staff (2,449 academics and 3,699 support staff). In its 14 campuses, the University runs 70 undergraduate and 233 graduate programmes (74 PhD and 159 Masters), and various specializations in Health Sciences. Over 874,124 students have graduated from AAU since its establishment.

The University is led by a President who is assisted by four Vice Presidents: Academic Vice President, Vice President for Research and Technology Transfer, Vice President for Administration and Student Services, Vice President for Institutional Development. At present the University has 10 colleges, 4 institutes that run both teaching and research, and 6 research institutes that predominantly conduct research. Within these academic units, there are 55 departments, 12 centers, 12 schools, and 2 teaching hospitals.

Brief Overview - Botho University

Botho University was established in 1997 as a computing training institute that has rapidly evolved to become a multidisciplinary university, having been awarded the university status in 2013 by the then Tertiary Education Council of Botswana. It is the first local private university in Botswana. The University currently has four faculties; Business & Accounting, Computing, Engineering & Applied Sciences and Education & Distance Learning. In addition the university offers professional accounting qualifications including several short-term programmes that are suitable for career development. Graduate Studies have been introduced in Accounting, Computing and Education. All the programmes offered are approved by the Botswana Qualifications Authority.

Botho University has a number of international partnerships with renowned institutions such as NIIT (India), the UK Open University, Teesside University (UK), Ohio University (USA), Manipal University and Wayne State University. These partnerships enrich their curriculum and provide staff development and research opportunities.

Botho University aspires to be a centre of excellence, innovation and leadership in higher learning and a driver for positive social and economic change. The University has three campuses in Botswana with the main campus situated in Gaborone and the other two campuses in Francistown and Maun.

Brief Overview – University of Cape Coast

The University of Cape Coast is one of the public universities in Ghana. Established as a University College in December, 1962, it was mandated to train graduate teachers for second cycle institutions, teacher training colleges, and technical institutes. The University College was placed in a special relationship with the University of Ghana until 1st October 1971 when it assumed the status of full and autonomous University with the power to award its own degrees, diplomas and certificates by an Act of Parliament, Act 390.

With time, the University has expanded and diversified its academic programmes to include studies in Medicine, Nursing, Law, Business, Education and many others. Currently, academic programmes are offered at the Undergraduate, Masters, Doctorate, and Post-Doctoral levels. The University comprises four faculties, seven schools, three Institutes, 51 departments, seven centres and recently reorganized into five constituent colleges.

The thematic focus of the University of Cape Coast is multi-disciplinarily, with emphasis placed on Science and Technology, Management and Business Administration, Arts, Social Sciences, Languages, Law, Agriculture and Medicine. The University has a student population of 56,759 with 34,004 male and 22,755 female students in full-time, part-time and distance learning.

Brief Overview – University of Dar es Salaam

University of Dar es Salaam is a public University mainly financed by the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania. In 1961, the University College, Dar es Salaam, was launched as a College granted special relationship with the University of London to offer LLB degree. It became a Constituent College of the then University of East Africa in 1963.

The University of Dar es Salaam was established as a full-fledged University by the Act of Parliament No. 12 of 1970. Presently, the university is made up of two Constituent Colleges, six Campus Colleges, five Schools and four Institutes offering various degree programmes. The University has recently in 2011 undergone an elaborate evaluation by a visitation panel instituted by the Chancellor to mark its 50th year anniversary and a self-evaluation initiated by the Tanzanian Commission for Universities in 2013 for the purpose of re-accreditation.

The University vision is to become a leading centre of intellectual wealth spearheading Tanzania's and Africa's quest for sustainable and inclusive development by 2061. Its mission is to advance the economic, social and technological development of Tanzania and beyond through excellent teaching, research and public service using talented and motivated faculty, staff and students.

Brief Overview - University of KwaZulu-Natal

The University of KwaZulu-Natal was established in January 2004 as a result of the merger between the University of Durban-Westville and the University of Natal. It is a public higher education institution that provides academic programmes at Undergraduate, Honours, Masters, Doctorate, and Post Doctorate levels. The total student number is currently over 45,000. The University consists of four Colleges comprising 19 Schools with thematic focus that include Agriculture, Engineering, Science, Law, Management Studies, Humanities and Health Sciences. The university has 5 campuses.

The University of KwaZulu-Natal is home to the NIH-funded Centre for AIDS Programme of Research in South Africa (CAPRISA), the Wellcome Trust-funded Africa Centre for Health and Population Studies and the HHMI-funded KZN Research Institute for Tuberculosis and HIV (K-RITH). The University of KwaZulu-Natal is also the hub for the DST-NRF Centre for African Indigenous Knowledge Systems (AIKS).

The University aspires to be a positively transformed institution based on a clear understanding of its goals for broad and comprehensive change underpinned by shared values.

Brief Overview - International Institute for Water and Environmental Engineering, 2iE

The International Institute for Water and Environmental Engineering, 2iE is an institution of higher education and research that trains engineers specialized in the areas of water and sanitation, energy and electricity, civil engineering and hydraulics. 2iE was established in 2006 from the merger and restructuring of EIER (School of Rural Equipment Engineers) and ETSHER (School of Technicians of Hydraulics and Rural Equipment), that were created respectively in 1968 and 1970 by 14 West African states.

2iE has so far trained over 7,000 graduates (technicians, bachelors, masters, specialist masters and engineers) from more than 50 countries. The institute offers degree programmes face-to-face and distance learning. It also offers inter-university doctoral programmes.

The institute 2iE has one hundred faculty members and executives from twenty countries. The number of students in 2014-2015 was more than 2,000 from thirty nationalities. The engineering degrees are accredited by the French Commission of Engineering Titles (CTI) with a recognition within Europe (EUR ACE label).

Brief Overview - Strathmore University

The institution was established in 1961 in pre-colonial Kenya as an 'A' Level College for Science and Arts. In 1966, the first twenty-five students of Accountancy enrolled to start training towards the UK-based Association of Chartered Accountants' examinations. In 2002, Strathmore College was granted a Letter of Interim Authority by Kenya's Commission of Higher Education to start operations as a University consisting of a Faculty of Commerce and a Faculty of Information Technology. In 2004, the first cohort of undergraduates enrolled in both faculties fulfilled their four-year degree programmes and graduated in 2005. Subsequently, Strathmore University was awarded a Charter in keeping with the stipulations of the Universities Act on the 23rd of April, 2008.

Strathmore University is a chartered not-for-profit institution and offers undergraduate and post-graduate degree programmes. It comprises seven teaching departments, three research centres and one Faculty, and its thematic focus is in the fields of Management and Business Administration, Law, Finance & Applied Economics, as well as Information Technology.

Brief Overview - University of Tlemcen

The Aboubekr Belkaid University of Tlemcen is the result of a long evolution, created by the Decree of August 1989. The first higher education programme was offered by the institution in Basic Sciences and Biology (1974-1980). Currently the University has 8 faculties that offer 240 under-graduate and 80 post-graduate programmes as well several medical fields.

In recent years, several new structures have been created including a university-industry liaison office, a quality assurance unit, tutorials, a unit for students with disability, computer centers, language study center, and distance learning center. The university has established national and international cooperation that offers many possibilities for mobility of students, doctoral candidates and academic staff. The research activities of the university are growing since the early 2000s and several researchers have won awards at national and international level, and two are members of the African Academy of Sciences. Research centers with more than 70 laboratories are also created.

As of June 2014, University of Tlemcen has 40,238 students, including 3,800 PhD students. 60% of the student population is female. The number of academic staff is 1677 with 40% women. The university has 500 foreign students from 28 different nationalities.

Brief Overview - University of Yaoundé II

The University of Yaoundé II was founded in 1993. The number of students is around 40,000. The University has three campuses with two faculties (Faculty of Law and Political Sciences and Faculty of Economic Sciences and Management) and three institutes (Institute of International Relations, Institute of Science and Technique in Communication, and Institute of Demographic Research).

The University is headed by a Rector, who is assisted by three Vice Rectors. One Rector heads Research, Cooperation and Relations. The second heads the Inspection and Evaluation Unit while the third heads the Studies and ICT Unit. There are also the Directors of Academic Affairs and Cooperation, Development and Planning, Administrative Affairs and Finance, Welfare and Student Affairs as well as the Medical Centre. The total number of academic staff is 544.

3. Rating Criteria Used in AQRM

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

Table 2: AQRM Criteria

AQRM Criteria	
Major Areas at Institutional Level	Major Areas at Programme Level
i. Governance and Management	i. Programme Planning and Management
ii. Infrastructure	ii. Curriculum Development
iii. Finances	iii. Teaching and Learning
iv. Teaching and Learning	iv. Assessment
v. Research, Publication, & Innovation	v. Programme Results
vi. Societal Engagement	

For each focus area, the African Quality Rating Mechanism (AQRM) includes specific standards against which institutions can assess their own quality levels. The institutional level involves 49 specific indicators while the programme level rating mechanism comprises 35 indicators.

The AQRM is not a ranking instrument and it does not promote the listing of institutions in a league table. The AQRM allows for classification of institutions and programmes into five categories: 'poor quality'; 'insufficient quality'; 'satisfactory quality'; 'good quality'; and 'excellent quality'. But no comparisons between institutions or programmes is conducted. The rating mechanism is basically an instrument with the purpose of promoting the quality of higher education institutions in Africa.

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

0 = POOR PERFORMANCE

1 = INSUFFICIENT PERFORMANCE

2 = SATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE

3 = GOOD PERFORMANCE

4 = EXCELLENT PERFORMANCE

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

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

Table 3: Scoring of Quality Rating

Specification of Quality Rating	
Rating score less than 1.0	POOR Quality
Rating score between 1.0 and 1.99	INSUFFICIENT Quality
Rating score between 2.0 and 2.79	SATISFACTORY Quality
Rating score between 2.8 and 3.5	GOOD Quality
Rating score greater than 3.5	EXCELLENT Quality

4. Results at Institutional Level

The table 4 below shows the results of the external rating in the area of Governance and Management.

Table 4: External Ratings on Governance and Management

4.1 GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT – Ratings of External Evaluation										
No.	Standards for Quality Rating	AAU	BU	UCC	UDS	UKZN	2iE	SU	UT	UY
1.1	The institution has a clearly stated vision, mission, and values with specific goals and priorities.	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3
1.2	The institution has specific strategies in place for monitoring achievement of institutional goals and identifying problem areas.	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	3
1.3	Clear accountability structures for responsible officers are in place.	4	2	4	4	4	4	3	3	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	2	4	3	2	4	3	3

4.1 GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT – Ratings of External Evaluation

No.	Standards for Quality Rating	AAU	BU	UCC	UDS	UKZN	2iE	SU	UT	UY
1.5	The institution has developed quality assurance policies and procedures.	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	0
1.6	Appropriate mechanisms are in place to evaluate staff in line with performance agreements with relevant authorities.	3	3	3	4	4	3	4	1	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	3	4	4	3	4	3	1.5
1.8	The institution has specific policies in place to ensure and support diversity of staff and students, in particular representation of women and the disabled.	4	2	3	3	4	2	4	2	1
1.9	The institution has a policy and standard procedures in place to ensure staff and student welfare.	2	3	3	3	4	3	4	1	2
Aggregated Value		3.22	3.11	3.33	3.78	3.89	3.22	3.89	2.22	1.83

The table 5 below shows some of the identified strengths and weaknesses in the area of Governance and Management from the nine universities, as well as some recommendations for improvements.

Table 5: Identified Strengths and Weaknesses on Governance and Management

GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT		
Institutional Strengths	Areas of Concern	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Clear vision and mission statements. ☞ There is clear organization structure of the University. ☞ There is representation of staff, students and external stakeholders in governance structures. ☞ Availability of documentation on policy and practice of the University. ☞ Developed and established quality assurance policies and procedures. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ There was no evidence of staff union. ☞ Low representation of women in the governance structures. ☞ Poor management information system in the university. ☞ No clear accountability structures within the governance set up. ☞ There are no statutes governing the University. ☞ Absence of an international student office. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Women representation in the Governing Board should be encouraged. ☞ Ensuring more involvement of external stakeholders in governance and management. ☞ Develop strong information management system. ☞ Job specifications should be clearly defined for all responsible officers and staff.

The table 6 below shows the results of the external rating in the area of Infrastructure.

Table 6: External Ratings on Infrastructure

4.2 INFRASTRUCTURE – Ratings of External Evaluation										
No.	Standards for Quality Rating	AAU	BU	UCC	UDS	UKZN	2iE	SU	UT	UY
2.1	The institution has sufficient lecturing spaces to accommodate student numbers taking the institutional mode of delivery into account.	4	3	2	3	3.5	4	3	4	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	4	3.5	3	3	3	1
2.3	Academic and Administrative Staff have access to computer resources and the internet.	3	4	3	4	4	3	3	3	1
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	3	2	4	4	3	3	2	0.5

4.2 INFRASTRUCTURE – Ratings of External Evaluation

No.	Standards for Quality Rating	AAU	BU	UCC	UDS	UKZN	2iE	SU	UT	UY
2.5	The institution has sufficient laboratory facilities to accommodate students in science programmes, taking institutional mode of delivery into account.	3	3	2	4	4	3	3	3	-
2.6	Laboratory equipment is up to date and well maintained.	2	3	2	3	3.5	4	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	2	3	4	4	4	3	2	1
2.8	The institution makes provision for managing and maintaining utilities and ensuring that appropriate safety measures are in place.	2	3	2	3	3.5	3	3	2	1
Aggregated Value		2.75	3.00	2.25	3.63	3.75	3.38	3.00	2.63	1.08

The table 7 below shows some of identified strengths and weaknesses in the area of Infrastructure from the nine universities, as well as some recommendations for improvements.

Table 7: Identified Strengths and Weaknesses on Infrastructure

INFRASTRUCTURE		
Institutional Strengths	Areas of Concern	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Adequate library space in the main campus and the college libraries. ☞ Special provision for the students with special needs. ☞ The Library is appropriately well-resourced. ☞ Laboratories and workshops are adequately equipped. ☞ Staff offices are inadequate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Lack of safety facilities such as fire extinguishers in some buildings. ☞ Lack of a cafeteria for staff and students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Enhance broadband width to increase internet connectivity and access ☞ Provision of offices for academic staff. ☞ Provision of facilities for persons with special needs

The table 8 below shows the results of the external rating in the area of Finance.

Table 8: External Ratings on Finance

4.3 FINANCE – Ratings of External Evaluation										
No.	Standards for Quality Rating	AAU	BU	UCC	UDS	UKZN	2iE	SU	UT	UY
3.1	The institution has access to sufficient financial resources to achieve its goals in line with its budget and student unit cost.	3	2	2	3	3.5	3	3	4	2
3.2	The institution has procedures in place to attract funding, including from industry and the corporate sector.	3	1	2	3	3.5	4	3	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.	3	2	3	4	3.5	2	4	3	2
3.4	The institution provides financial support to deserving students (institutional bursaries and/or scholarships).	4	1	2	2	3.5	3	4	0	0
3.5	Information about financial aid and criteria for its allocation is provided to students and other stakeholders.	3	1	3	4	4	2	4	4	1
3.6	The institution publishes income and expenditure statements.	3	4	3	4	4	1	4	1	1.5
Aggregated Value		3.17	1.83	2.50	3.33	3.67	2.50	3.67	2.33	1.25

The table 9 below shows some of identified strengths and weaknesses in the area of Finance from the nine universities, as well as some recommendations for improvements.

Table 9: Identified Strengths and Weaknesses on Finance

FINANCE		
Institutional Strengths	Areas of Concern	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Stable source of funds from Government. ☞ Income generating activities to ensure sustainable funding. ☞ Established fund raising office. ☞ Careful financial management of University's resources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ No clear budget procedures. ☞ No audited accounts. ☞ Other sources of income not clearly indicated. ☞ High administrative cost. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Develop budget procedures. ☞ Audit and publish University accounts. ☞ Establish endowment fund and other stable sources of income to ensure sustainability. ☞ Need to increase University's allocation of funds for research ☞ Continue to improve internally generated revenue.

The table 10 below shows the results of the external rating in the area of Teaching and Learning .

Table 10: External Ratings on Teaching and Learning

4.4 TEACHING AND LEARNING – Ratings of External Evaluation										
No.	Standards for Quality Rating	AAU	BU	UCC	UDS	UKZN	2iE	SU	UT	UY
4.1	The institution encourages and rewards teaching and learning innovation.	3	3	3	3	3.5	4	3	1	1
4.2	The institution has procedures in place to support the induction to teaching, pedagogy, counselling and the upgrading of staff teaching and learning skills through continuing education and lifelong learning.	4	3	3	4	3.5	3	3	0	1
4.3	Students have sufficient opportunity to engage with staff members in small groups, individually or via electronic platforms.	2	3	3	2	2.5	3	3	1	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	2	3	3.5	3	3	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	3	4	3.5	4	3	1	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	3	4	3.5	4	3	2	2
4.7	Student support services, including academic support and required counseling services are provided, in line with the institutional mode of delivery.	3	3	2	4	4	3	3	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.	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	1	2
4.9	The institution has a devoted office to promote international cooperation and enhance Intra-Africa mobility of students and staff.	3	2	3	3	4	3	0	4	3
Aggregated Value		2.78	2.77	2.67	3.33	3.44	3.33	2.67	1.67	2.00

The table 11 below shows some of identified strengths and weaknesses in the area of Teaching and Learning from the nine universities, as well as some recommendations for improvements.

Table 11: Identified Strengths and Weaknesses on Teaching and Learning

TEACHING AND LEARNING		
Institutional Strengths	Areas of Concern	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Student support services adequately provided in the University. ☞ Policies that promote teaching and learning innovation developed. ☞ Policy on staff recruitment, deployment, and appraisal. ☞ Students have the opportunity to evaluate effectiveness of both academic and non-academic staff. ☞ Strong international cooperation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Very high staff to student ratio ☞ Limited interaction between academic staff and students due lack of office spaces. ☞ The aging trend among the members of academic staff. ☞ Inadequate student support service. ☞ Poor mobility of students across Africa. ☞ Staff have heavy teaching loads. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Practical training needs to be enhanced. ☞ Establish a succession plan and placement of senior academics. ☞ Increase the number of academic staff with PhD. ☞ Improve intra-Africa mobility of students. ☞ Motivate academic staff to adopt teaching and learning innovations.

The table 12 below shows the results of the external rating in the area of Research, Publication and Innovation.

Table 12: External Ratings on Research, Publication and Innovation

4.5 RESEARCH, PUBLICATION AND INNOVATION – Ratings of External Evaluation										
No.	Standards for Quality Rating	AAU	BU	UCC	UDS	UKZN	2iE	SU	UT	UY
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	3	3	3.5	4	3	1	3
5.2	The institution has a policy and/or strategy on Innovation, Intellectual Property Ownership and Technology Foresight.	4	0	2	3	3.5	3	3	1	1
5.3	The institution has demonstrated success in attracting research grants from national or international sources and in partnership with industry.	4	1	2	4	4	4	3	2	2

4.5 RESEARCH, PUBLICATION AND INNOVATION – Ratings of External Evaluation

No.	Standards for Quality Rating	AAU	BU	UCC	UDS	UKZN	2iE	SU	UT	UY
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	2	3	3	4	3	1	2
5.5	Staff and students publish their research in accredited academic journals and apply for patents (where relevant).	4	3	2	4	3	3	3	2	3
5.6	Researchers are encouraged and supported to present their research at national and international conferences.	2	3	3	4	2.5	4	3	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	1	2	3	4	4	3	2	2

4.5 RESEARCH, PUBLICATION AND INNOVATION – Ratings of External Evaluation

No.	Standards for Quality Rating	AAU	BU	UCC	UDS	UKZN	2iE	SU	UT	UY
5.8	The institution encourages and rewards research whose results are used by society	4	1	2	3	3	3	3	0	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.	4	2	2	4	3.5	3	4	1	1
5.10	The institution has established link-ages to promote international joint research and publications	4	1	2	4	4	4	3	2	2
Aggregated Value		3.70	1.90	2.20	3.50	3.40	3.60	3.10	1.50	2.00

The table 13 below shows some of identified strengths and weaknesses in the area of Research, Publication and Innovation from the nine universities, as well as some recommendations for improvements.

Table 13: Identified Strengths and Weaknesses on Research, Publication and Innovation

RESEARCH, PUBLICATION AND INNOVATION		
Institutional Strengths	Areas of Concern	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Thematic research areas for the University established. ☞ Some amount of budget is allocated for research by the government. ☞ Library online resources to support research work. ☞ Efforts to increase the number of research grant applications. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Research policy and publication policy are not clearly defined in the University. ☞ Lack of patents for discovered innovations at the University. ☞ Lack of inter-institutional research collaboration ☞ Low research output. ☞ Heavy teaching load impact negatively on research output. ☞ Lack of adequate fund for research. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Register patents of innovations. ☞ Improve staff capacity in research. ☞ Widening and deepening of university-industry linkages. ☞ Promote international collaboration in research. ☞ Publish scientific research in international journals.

The table 14 below shows the results of the external rating in the area of Community/Societal Engagement.

Table 14: External Ratings on Community/Societal Engagement

4.6 COMMUNITY/SOCIETAL ENGAGEMENT – Ratings of External Evaluation										
No.	Standards for Quality Rating	AAU	BU	UCC	UDS	UKZN	2iE	SU	UT	UY
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	2	3	3.5	3	2	0	0
6.2	The institution encourages departments and staff to develop and implement strategies for community engagement.	3	1	2	3	3.5	3	3	2	1
6.3	Students are required to engage with communities through their academic work.	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	0	1

6.4	The institution has forged partnerships with other education sub-sectors to enhance the quality of education in the country and region.	3	2	4	4	3.5	4	3	0	1
6.5	The Institution disseminates information on its community engagement activities to the local community.	3	2	2	3	3.5	3	3	2	1
6.6	The institution offers relevant short courses to the community/broader society based on identified needs and supporting identified economic opportunities.	3	1	3	4	3.5	3	3	1	1
6.7	The institution makes its facilities available (where possible) to the local community in support of community and socio-economic development activities.	4	1	2	4	3.5	4	4	2	-
Aggregated Value		3.00	1.57	2.57	3.43	3.43	3.29	3.00	1.00	0.83

The table 15 below shows some of identified strengths and weaknesses in the area of Community/Societal Engagement from the nine universities, as well as some recommendations for improvements.

Table 15: Identified Strengths and Weaknesses on Community/Societal Engagement

COMMUNITY/SOCIETAL ENGAGEMENT		
Institutional Strengths	Areas of Concern	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Developed policy on community engagement. ☞ The University engages with the community in some activities. ☞ The institution offers relevant short courses to the community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Lack of departments and students involvement with community ☞ Dissemination of community engagement activities is not extensive. ☞ Inadequate resources limit the potential to extend outreach programmes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Conduct research for community development. ☞ Enhance accessibility of the university facilities to the local community. ☞ Diversify activities in community engagement. ☞ Keep records of community outreach programmes. ☞ Strengthen fundraising mechanisms for community outreach.

The table 16 below shows the summary of aggregated results of the external rating for the nine universities at institutional level.

Table 16: External Rating Summary at Institutional Level

EXTERNAL RATING SUMMARY AT INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL									
Major Standard	AAU	BU	UCC	UDS	UKZN	2iE	SU	UT	UY
Governance and Management	3.22	3.11	3.33	3.78	3.89	3.22	3.89	2.22	1.83
Infrastructure	2.75	3.00	2.25	3.63	3.75	3.38	3.00	2.63	1.08
Finances	3.17	1.83	2.50	3.33	3.67	2.50	3.67	2.33	1.25
Teaching and Learning	2.78	2.77	2.67	3.33	3.44	3.33	2.67	1.67	2.00
Research, Publication & Innovation	3.70	1.90	2.20	3.50	3.40	3.60	3.10	1.50	2.00
Societal Engagement	3.00	1.57	2.57	3.43	3.43	3.29	3.00	1.00	0.83
Aggregated Rating Score	3.10	2.36	2.59	3.50	3.61	3.22	3.22	1.89	1.50

5. Results at Programme Level

The table 17 below shows the results of the external rating in the area of Programme Planning and Management.

Table 17: External Ratings on Programme Planning and Management

5.1 PROGRAMME PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT – Ratings of External Evaluation										
No.	Standards for Quality Rating	AAU	BU	UCC	UDS	UKZN	2iE	SU	UT	UY
7.1	The programme is aligned with the overall institutional mission and vision.	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3
7.2	The programme meets national accreditation criteria.	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2
7.3	The institution allocates sufficient resources to support the programme.	3	4	2	3	4	4	4	4	1
7.4	There is a programme coordinator(s) responsible for managing and ensuring quality of the programme.	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	3	2

5.1 PROGRAMME PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT – Ratings of External Evaluation

No.	Standards for Quality Rating	AAU	BU	UCC	UDS	UKZN	2iE	SU	UT	UY
7.5	The mode of delivery takes account of the needs and challenges of all targeted students.	3	4	3	3	3.5	3	3	2	2
7.6	Staff teaching on the programme have the appropriate type and level of qualification.	3	2	3	4	4	3	3	3	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.	2	2	4	4	3.5	4	4	1	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	4	3	4	3	3	2	0
Aggregated Value		2.88	3.38	3.38	3.50	3.88	3.63	3.63	2.88	1.88

The table 18 below shows some of identified strengths and weaknesses in the area of Programme Planning and Management from the nine universities, as well as some recommendations for improvements.

Table 18: Identified Strengths and Weaknesses on Programme Planning and Management

PROGRAMME PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT		
Institutional Strengths	Areas of Concern	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Stability of the academic calendar. ☞ Programmes are aligned with the institution's vision and mission. ☞ Weak students are given extra tutorials and support ☞ Annual track records of publications by academic staff members. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Academic staff with PhDs is insufficient, and very few are professors. ☞ Insufficient resources to support the programme. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Encourage many academic staff to obtain Ph.D. ☞ Establishment of functioning International Student Office. ☞ The tutorial system should be further strengthened. ☞ Adequate resources should be allocated to enable proper planning and management.

The table 19 below shows the results of the external rating in the area of Curriculum Development.

Table 19: External Ratings on Curriculum Development

5.2 CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT – Ratings of External Evaluation										
No.	Standards for Quality Rating	AAU	BU	UCC	UDS	UKZN	2iE	SU	UT	UY
8.1	The curriculum clearly specifies target learners and learning outcomes/competencies for each module/course and for the programme as a whole.	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	2
8.2	The curriculum is regularly updated to take account of new knowledge and learning needs to support African development.	3	2	3	3	3.5	4	3	2	2
8.3	Modules/courses are coherently planned and provide a sequenced learning pathway for students towards attainment of a qualification.	3	3	4	4	3.5	3	4	3	3
8.4	The curriculum includes an appropriate balance of theoretical, practical and experiential knowledge and skills (where applicable) as well as core and elective areas	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	3

5.2 CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT – Ratings of External Evaluation

No.	Standards for Quality Rating	AAU	BU	UCC	UDS	UKZN	2iE	SU	UT	UY
8.5	The curriculum has been developed to maximize student career pathways, opportunities for articulation with other relevant qualifications, and employment prospects.	4	3	3	4	3.5	4	4	3	2
8.6	Curriculum development has been informed by thorough research and consultation with relevant stakeholders including public sector planners, industry and other employers	3	3	3	4	3	4	4	1	1
8.7	The curriculum reflects positive African values, gender sensitivity and the needs of society.	3	1	3	3	3.5	3	3	3	1
Aggregated Value		3.29	2.71	3.14	3.71	3.57	3.71	3.71	2.57	2.00

The table 20 below shows some of identified strengths and weaknesses in the area of Curriculum Development from the nine universities, as well as some recommendations for improvements.

Table 20: Identified Strengths and Weaknesses on Curriculum Development

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT		
Institutional Strengths	Areas of Concern	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ There is coherence of modules within the curriculum. ☞ Curriculum developed towards attainment of a qualification. ☞ Curriculum in line with national needs. ☞ Curriculum is reviewed periodically. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Learning outcomes are not clearly specified in the curriculum. ☞ Non-inclusion of aspects of African values and gender sensitivity in the curriculum. ☞ Inadequate balance of theory and practice in some programmes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Specify learning outcomes, and competencies. ☞ Ensure employers & relevant stakeholder involvement in curriculum development. ☞ Curriculum should be well planned and goes through a validation process.

The table 21 below shows the results of the external rating in the area of Teaching and Learning.

Table 21: External Ratings on Teaching and Learning

5.3 TEACHING AND LEARNING – Ratings of External Evaluation										
No.	Standards for Quality Rating	AAU	BU	UCC	UDS	UKZN	2iE	SU	UT	UY
9.1	Teaching and learning are based on explicit learning outcomes which are consistent with programme and course aims.	3	4	3	4	4	4	3	3	2
9.2	A clear strategy is in place to identify the learning materials needed to support programme delivery.	4	4	2	3	4	3	3	3	1
9.3	Learning materials have been clearly presented, include reference to the learning aims and outcomes and an indication of study time.	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	2
9.4	The learning materials have been designed with the purpose of engaging students both intellectually, ethically and practically.	3	3	3	3	3.5	3	3	3	2
9.5	Programme review procedures include materials review and improvement.	4	3	3	3	3.5	3	3	2	3
9.6	Innovative teaching and learning materials are provided for students.	3	4	2	2	3.5	3	3	2	2
Aggregated Value		3.33	3.50	2.67	3.00	3.75	3.17	3.00	2.67	2.00

The table 22 below shows some of identified strengths and weaknesses in the area of Teaching and Learning from the nine universities, as well as some recommendations for improvements.

Table 22: Identified Strengths and Weaknesses on Teaching and Learning

TEACHING AND LEARNING		
Institutional Strengths	Areas of Concern	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ A teaching and learning centre established for improving skills of academic staff. ☞ There is in place a clear procedure for review and improvement of learning materials. ☞ Course outlines given to students at the beginning of the course to guide learning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ No explicit learning outcomes for teaching and learning. ☞ Theory and practice not linked through internship in some study programmes. ☞ There are no clear strategies for identifying learning materials. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Teaching and learning should be based on explicit learning outcomes. ☞ Assist students to engage in more independent learning ☞ Use variety of teaching modes and materials. ☞ Enhance internships for the professional programmes. ☞ Appropriate technologies should be employed in the teaching & learning process.

The table 23 below shows the results of the external rating in the area of Assessment.

Table 23: External Ratings on Assessment

5.4 ASSESSMENT – Ratings of External Evaluation										
No.	Standards for Quality Rating	AAU	BU	UCC	UDS	UKZN	2iE	SU	UT	UY
10.1	The institution has systems in place for external examiners.	1	3	4	3	4	3	3	0	0
10.2	Clear information about mode of assessment is provided for all courses/modules making up the programme.	4	3	4	3	4	4	3	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	3	3	2	3.5	4	3	3	4
10.4	The level of challenge of assessments is appropriate to the specific programme and targeted students.	1	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3
10.5	A variety of assessment methods are used in the programme.	3	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3
10.6	Marking procedures ensure consistency and accuracy and the provision of feedback to students.	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	2
Aggregated Value		2.67	3.00	3.33	2.83	3.58	3.50	3.00	2.50	2.67

The table 24 below shows some of identified strengths and weaknesses in the area of Assessment from the nine universities, as well as some recommendations for improvements.

Table 24: Identified Strengths and Weaknesses on Assessment

ASSESSMENT		
Institutional Strengths	Areas of Concern	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Courses and modules provide information on modes of assessment. ☞ There are procedures for marking and feedback to students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Delayed feedback to learners on continuous assessment. ☞ Lack of external examination system. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Fortify external examination system for quality control. ☞ Use diverse student assessment methods. ☞ Feedback should be provided early to the students of the outcome of assessments. ☞ Practical assessment of professional programmes should be enhanced.

The table 25 below shows the results of the external rating in the area of Programme Results.

Table 25: External Ratings on Programme Results

5.5 PROGRAMME RESULTS – Ratings of External Evaluation										
No.	Standards for Quality Rating	AAU	BU	UCC	UDS	UKZN	2iE	SU	UT	UY
11.1	Student progress is monitored throughout the programme and early warning is provided for students at risk.	4	4	3	3	4	2	3	1	1
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	3	3	3	2.5	3	3	3	2
11.3	Quality student feedback is provided.	3	3	3	2	2.5	3	3	3	2
11.4	Expert peers and/or professional bodies review the relevance and quality of learning achieved by students.	2	4	3	4	3.5	4	3	0	2
11.5	There is established linkage with potential employers that facilitate graduate employment.	2	3	2	3	3.5	4	3	1	2

5.5 PROGRAMME RESULTS – Ratings of External Evaluation

No.	Standards for Quality Rating	AAU	BU	UCC	UDS	UKZN	2iE	SU	UT	UY
11.6	Tracer studies of graduates and their employers are conducted to obtain feedback on achievement of graduates.	1	3	-	3	2	3	3	0	1
11.7	The programme has an effective research plan with suitable implementation, evaluation and feedback mechanisms.	3	2	3	3	3.5	3	3	1	2
11.8	Research and consultancy is undertaken in the subject area to solve industrial problems and support the social and economic development.	4	1	3	2	3.5	4	2	1	3
Aggregated Value		2.88	2.88	2.86	2.88	3.13	3.25	2.88	1.25	1.88

The table 26 below shows some of identified strengths and weaknesses in the area of Programme Results from the nine universities, as well as some recommendations for improvements.

Table 26: Identified Strengths and Weaknesses on Programme Results

PROGRAMME RESULTS		
Institutional Strengths	Areas of Concern	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Established processes for monitoring student progress and providing feedback. ☞ Efforts are made to support female students. ☞ Good completion rates of students. ☞ There is established linkage with potential employers to facilitate graduate employment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Lack of monitoring of students' progress and early warning to students at risk. ☞ There was no evidence of Alumni Association and tracer studies of graduates. ☞ Research and consultancy in the university should be based on industrial problems and social development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Actively engage past students to establish an Alumni Association. ☞ Undertake tracer studies of graduates. ☞ Effective coordination of research activities. ☞ Stronger link between the University and industry in terms of research.

The table 27 below shows the summary of aggregated results of the external rating for the nine universities at programme level.

Table 27: Rating Summary at Institutional Level

RATING SUMMARY AT PROGRAMME LEVEL									
Major Standard	AAU	BU	UCC	UDS	UKZN	2iE	SU	UT	UY
Programme Planning and Management	2.88	3.38	3.38	3.50	3.88	3.63	3.63	2.88	1.88
Curriculum	3.29	2.71	3.14	3.71	3.57	3.71	3.71	2.57	2.00
Teaching and Learning	3.33	3.50	2.67	3.00	3.75	3.17	3.00	2.67	2.00
Assessment	2.67	3.00	3.33	2.83	3.58	3.50	3.00	2.50	2.67
Programme Results	2.88	2.88	2.86	2.88	3.13	3.25	2.88	1.25	1.88
Aggregated Rating Score	3.01	3.10	3.08	3.18	3.58	3.45	3.24	2.37	2.09

6. Institutions Self-Rating Versus External Evaluation

In this Section, the institutions self-ratings and external evaluations are presented for each of the nine universities at both institutional and programme levels.

Table 28: Ratings on Addis Ababa University at Institutional Level

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY		
Self-Rating Versus External Evaluation (INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL)		
Major Standard	Institution Self-Rating	External Evaluation
Governance and Management	3.44	3.22
Infrastructure	3.00	2.75
Finances	3.50	3.17
Teaching and Learning	3.00	2.78
Research, Publication and Innovation	3.60	3.70
Societal Engagement	3.29	3.00
Aggregated Rating Score	3.31	3.10

Table 29: Ratings on Addis Ababa University at Programme Level

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY		
Self-Rating Versus External Evaluation (PROGRAMME LEVEL)		
Major Standard	Institution Self-Rating	External Evaluation
Programme Planning and Management	3.63	2.88
Curriculum	3.57	3.29
Teaching and Learning	3.33	3.33
Assessment	3.50	2.67
Programme Results	3.38	2.88
Aggregated Rating Score	3.48	3.01

Table 30: Ratings on Botho University at Institutional Level

BOTHO UNIVERSITY		
Self-Rating Versus External Evaluation (INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL)		
Major Standard	Institution Self-Rating	External Evaluation
Governance and Management	3.22	3.11
Infrastructure	3.13	3.00
Finances	3.00	1.83
Teaching and Learning	2.89	2.77
Research, Publication and Innovation	2.00	1.90
Societal Engagement	2.00	1.57
Aggregated Rating Score	2.71	2.36

Table 31: Ratings on Botho University at Programme Level

BOTHO UNIVERSITY		
Self-Rating Versus External Evaluation (PROGRAMME LEVEL)		
Major Standard	Institution Self-Rating	External Evaluation
Programme Planning and Management	3.50	3.38
Curriculum	3.14	2.71
Teaching and Learning	3.17	3.50
Assessment	3.33	3.00
Programme Results	2.50	2.88
Aggregated Rating Score	3.13	3.09

Table 32: Ratings on University of Cape Coast at Institutional Level

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST		
Self-Rating Versus External Evaluation (INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL)		
Major Standard	Institution Self-Rating	External Evaluation
Governance and Management	3.33	3.33
Infrastructure	2.25	2.25
Finances	2.50	2.50
Teaching and Learning	2.89	2.67
Research, Publication and Innovation	2.30	2.20
Societal Engagement	2.86	2.57
Aggregated Rating Score	2.69	2.59

Table 33: Ratings on University of Cape Coast at Programme Level

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST		
Self-Rating Versus External Evaluation (PROGRAMME LEVEL)		
Major Standard	Institution Self-Rating	External Evaluation
Programme Planning and Management	3.38	3.38
Curriculum	3.29	3.14
Teaching and Learning	2.83	2.67
Assessment	3.50	3.33
Programme Results	3.00	2.86
Aggregated Rating Score	3.20	3.08

Table 34: Ratings on University of Dar es Salaam at Institutional Level

UNIVERSITY OF DAR ES SALAAM		
Self-Rating Versus External Evaluation (INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL)		
Major Standard	Institution Self-Rating	External Evaluation
Governance and Management	3.89	3.78
Infrastructure	3.25	3.63
Finances	3.33	3.33
Teaching and Learning	3.89	3.33
Research, Publication and Innovation	3.90	3.50
Societal Engagement	3.14	3.43
Aggregated Rating Score	3.57	3.50

Table 35: Ratings on University of Dar es Salaam at Programme Level

UNIVERSITY OF DAR ES SALAAM		
Self-Rating Versus External Evaluation (PROGRAMME LEVEL)		
Major Standard	Institution Self-Rating	External Evaluation
Programme Planning and Management	4.00	3.50
Curriculum	3.57	3.71
Teaching and Learning	3.17	3.00
Assessment	4.00	2.83
Programme Results	3.38	2.88
Aggregated Rating Score	3.62	3.18

Table 36: Ratings on University of KwaZulu-Natal at Institutional Level

UNIVERSITY OF KWAZULU-NATAL		
Self-Rating Versus External Evaluation (INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL)		
Major Standard	Institution Self-Rating	External Evaluation
Governance and Management	4.00	3.89
Infrastructure	4.00	3.75
Finances	4.00	3.67
Teaching and Learning	3.78	3.44
Research, Publication and Innovation	4.00	3.40
Societal Engagement	3.71	3.43
Aggregated Rating Score	3.92	3.60

Table 37: Ratings on University of KwaZulu-Natal at Programme Level

UNIVERSITY OF KWAZULU-NATAL		
Self-Rating Versus External Evaluation (PROGRAMME LEVEL)		
Major Standard	Institution Self-Rating	External Evaluation
Programme Planning and Management	4.00	3.88
Curriculum	4.00	3.57
Teaching and Learning	4.00	3.75
Assessment	4.00	3.58
Programme Results	3.50	3.13
Aggregated Rating Score	3.90	3.58

Table 38: Ratings on 2iE at Institutional Level

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR WATER AND ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING, 2iE		
Self-Rating Versus External Evaluation (INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL)		
Major Standard	Institution Self-Rating	External Evaluation
Governance and Management	3.44	3.22
Infrastructure	3.75	3.38
Finances	3.33	2.50
Teaching and Learning	3.56	3.33
Research, Publication and Innovation	3.70	3.60
Societal Engagement	3.57	3.29
Aggregated Rating Score	3.56	3.22

Table 39: Ratings on 2iE at Programme Level

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR WATER AND ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING, 2iE		
Self-Rating Versus External Evaluation (PROGRAMME LEVEL)		
Major Standard	Institution Self-Rating	External Evaluation
Programme Planning and Management	3.75	3.63
Curriculum	3.71	3.71
Teaching and Learning	3.50	3.17
Assessment	3.50	3.50
Programme Results	3.63	3.25
Aggregated Rating Score	3.62	3.45

Table 40: Ratings on Strathmore University at Institutional Level

STRATHMORE UNIVERSITY		
Self-Rating Versus External Evaluation (INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL)		
Major Standard	Institution Self-Rating	External Evaluation
Governance and Management	3.89	3.89
Infrastructure	3.75	3.00
Finances	3.67	3.67
Teaching and Learning	3.00	2.67
Research, Publication and Innovation	3.60	3.10
Societal Engagement	3.14	3.00
Aggregated Rating Score	3.51	3.22

Table 41: Ratings on Strathmore University at Programme Level

STRATHMORE UNIVERSITY		
Self-Rating Versus External Evaluation (PROGRAMME LEVEL)		
Major Standard	Institution Self-Rating	External Evaluation
Programme Planning and Management	3.63	3.63
Curriculum	3.71	3.71
Teaching and Learning	3.17	3.00
Assessment	4.0	3.00
Programme Results	2.88	2.88
Aggregated Rating Score	3.48	3.24

Table 42: Ratings on University of Tlemcen at Institutional Level

UNIVERSITY OF TLEMCCEN		
Self-Rating Versus External Evaluation (INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL)		
Major Standard	Institution Self-Rating	External Evaluation
Governance and Management	2.22	2.22
Infrastructure	2.88	2.63
Finances	2.17	2.33
Teaching and Learning	1.78	1.67
Research, Publication and Innovation	1.70	1.50
Societal Engagement	1.43	1.00
Aggregated Rating Score	2.03	1.89

Table 43: Ratings on University of Tlemcen at Programme Level

UNIVERSITY OF TLEMCCEN		
Self-Rating Versus External Evaluation (PROGRAMME LEVEL)		
Major Standard	Institution Self-Rating	External Evaluation
Programme Planning and Management	2.75	2.88
Curriculum	2.57	2.57
Teaching and Learning	2.33	2.67
Assessment	2.83	2.50
Programme Results	1.13	1.25
Aggregated Rating Score	2.32	2.37

Table 44: Ratings on University of Yaoundé II at Institutional Level

UNIVERSITY OF YAOUNDÉ II		
Self-Rating Versus External Evaluation (INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL)		
Major Standard	Institution Self-Rating	External Evaluation
Governance and Management	2.31	1.83
Infrastructure	1.90	1.08
Finances	2.07	1.25
Teaching and Learning	1.84	2.00
Research, Publication and Innovation	1.94	2.00
Societal Engagement	1.10	0.83
Aggregated Rating Score	1.86	1.50

Table 45: Ratings on University of Yaoundé II at Programme Level

UNIVERSITY OF YAOUNDÉ II		
Self-Rating Versus External Evaluation (PROGRAMME LEVEL)		
Major Standard	Institution Self-Rating	External Evaluation
Programme Planning and Management	2.00	1.88
Curriculum	1.72	2.00
Teaching and Learning	1.88	2.00
Assessment	3.17	2.67
Programme Results	0.63	1.88
Aggregated Rating Score	1.88	2.09

7. Overall Quality Rating of Participating Institutions

The table 46 below shows the overall quality rating for each of the nine universities.

Table 46: Overall Quality Rating of Participating Institutions

Overall Quality Rating of Participating Institutions		
Name of the Institution	Institutional Level	Programme Level
Addis Ababa University (AAU)	Good Quality	Good Quality
Botho University (BU)	Satisfactory Quality	Good Quality
University of Cape Coast (UCC)	Satisfactory Quality	Good Quality
University of Dar es Salaam (UDS)	Good Quality	Good Quality
University of KwaZulu-Natal (UKZN)	Excellent Quality	Excellent Quality
Institute for Water and Environmental Engineering, 2iE	Good Quality	Good Quality
Strathmore University (SU)	Good Quality	Good Quality
University of Tlemcen (UT)	Insufficient Quality	Satisfactory Quality
University of Yaoundé II (UY)	Insufficient Quality	Satisfactory Quality

8. Conclusions

This consolidated report provides quality rating results of nine higher education institutions at both institutional and programme levels based on institutions' self-evaluation as well as external validation of experts who participated in the African Quality Rating Mechanism (AQRM) evaluation missions.

The identified institutional strengths, areas of concern, and indicated recommendations for future consideration are beneficial to the participating universities and other higher education institutions in Africa as input to support continuous improvement in teaching/learning, research, and community engagement activities.

The quality assurance focal persons of the nine universities that participated at the Pan African Quality Assurance and Accreditation Framework (PAQAF) Validation Workshop in July 2015 unanimously attested that the AQRM evaluation exercise helped them enormously towards enhancing quality at their respective institutions. The national and regional Quality Assurance Agencies that participated in the PAQAF validation workshop also expressed their support to the AQRM. The 7th International Conference and Workshops on Quality assurance in Higher Education in Africa held in Abuja in September 2015 recommended that the AQRM should be domesticated by African countries and be vigorously implemented.

Steps should be taken to ensure that AQRM is adopted by African Universities as a key instrument for assessing and improving quality of higher education. The Association of African Universities is called upon encourage its member institutions to adopt the AQRM and employ it as a means of supporting continuous quality improvement and for enhancing internal quality assurance systems towards the development of institutional cultures of quality.

Annex 1: TOR for Quality Experts of AQRM Evaluation Mission

The Quality Reviewers will undertake the following activities:

- i. Carefully read and analyse the AQRM Questionnaires and self-rating of the university.
- ii. Make a tour of the university' campus to inspect buildings, facilities and look over the overall environment.
- iii. Visit classrooms, laboratories, libraries, computer centers to inspect learning facilities and evaluate the quality of infrastructure and material resources. Inspection of facilities includes:
 - ☞ Library and ICT facilities
 - ☞ Laboratories and workshops
 - ☞ Lecture halls, class rooms, and staff offices
 - ☞ Student support services
- iv. Evaluate the quality of students support services and the overall academic staff profile (qualifications and rank).
- v. Inspect relevant documents, as appropriate.
- vi. Hold meetings with senior management, academic staff and students to get more insight into the university situation.
 - ☞ Courtesy Call to the Vice Chancellor and discussion with University Senior Management

☞ Meeting with group of Students

☞ Meeting with group of Academic Staff

- vii. Evaluate internal quality assurance processes of the university. The evaluation will take into account the AQRM survey questionnaires responses.
- viii. Based on findings, validate the self-rating of the university and assign an overall Quality Rating to the institution.
- ix. Provide recommendations on modalities and approaches for improving quality of the university's education provision.
 - ☞ Oral feedback to the University Management on general outcome of the AQRM assessment
- x. The Quality Experts will be required to produce and submit electronic copies of the Evaluation Report.

Note:

Checklist of AQRM Reference Points is shown below for further reference.

Annex 2: Checklist for AQRM Reference Points

GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT - Reference Points

- A clearly stated vision and mission with institution's specific goals and priorities
- specific strategies in place for monitoring achievement of institutional goals
- Clear accountability structures for responsible officers
- Representation of staff, students and external stakeholders in governance structures; and gender balance
- Developed quality assurance policies and procedures.
- Mechanisms for evaluating staff
- Management information system to manage student and staff data
- Policy on diversity of staff and students, representation of women and disabled.
- Policy on staff and student welfare.

INFRASTRUCTURE - Reference Points

- Sufficient lecturing spaces to accommodate student numbers
- Sufficient learning space for students and access to electronic learning resources
- Staff access to computer resources and the internet
- Students access to computer resources and the internet
- Sufficient laboratory facilities in science programmes
- Up to date laboratory equipment
- Up to date library to support academic learning
- Provision for maintaining utilities and safety measures

FINANCE - Reference Points

Access to sufficient financial resources
Procedures in place to attract funding
Clearly specified budgetary procedures
Financial support to deserving students (institutional bursaries and/or scholarships)
Information provision about financial aid and criteria for its allocation
Publication of income and expenditure statements.

TEACHING AND LEARNING - Reference Points

Promotion of teaching and learning innovation
Support mechanisms for upgrading of staff teaching and learning skills
Students opportunities to engage with staff
Student: staff ratios and academic staff average workloads
Policy on review of academic programmes
Policy on staff recruitment, deployment, and development
Student support services
Support mechanisms for students to become independent learners
Promotion of international cooperation and Intra-Africa mobility of students and staff

RESEARCH, PUBLICATION AND INNOVATION - Reference Points

Research policy and publication policy
Policy on innovation and intellectual property ownership

Research grants from national or international sources
Staff support to enhance their research skills
Staff and students publications in accredited journals and applications for patents
Support for presenting research findings at national and international conferences
Availability of Research and Development budget
Promotion of research whose results are used by society
Mechanism for partnership with industry
Linkages to promote international joint research and publications

COMMUNITY/SOCIETAL ENGAGEMENT - Reference Points

Policy and procedure for engaging with the local community or society
Promotion of implementation strategies for community engagement.
Students engagement with communities through their academic work
Partnerships with other education sub-sectors to enhance the quality of education
Dissemination of information on community engagement activities
Provision of relevant short courses to the community
facilities availability to the local community (where possible)

PROGRAMME PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT - Reference Points

Programme alignment with the Institution overall mission and vision
Compliance of programme with national accreditation criteria
Allocated resources to support the programme.
Assigned coordinator(s) responsible for ensuring quality of the programme
Appropriateness of delivery mode to needs of all targeted students
Appropriate type and level of staff qualification
Regularity of internal and external programme review
Strategy for the use of technology appropriate to the programme

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT - Reference Points

Specification of learning outcomes/competencies for each module/course
Curriculum updating to take account of new knowledge and learning needs
Coherence of Modules/courses towards attainment of a qualification
Appropriate balance of theoretical, practical and experiential knowledge and skills
Curriculum linkage with other relevant qualifications and employment prospects
Relevant stakeholders involvement including employers in curriculum development
Inclusion of African values, gender sensitivity, and the needs of society in curriculum

Programme Level TEACHING AND LEARNING - Reference Points

Teaching and learning are based on explicit learning outcomes
Clear strategy for identifying learning materials to support programme delivery

Presentation of Learning materials with learning aims and outcomes
Design of learning materials in engaging students intellectually and practically
Procedures of learning materials review and improvement
Provision of innovative teaching and learning materials

ASSESSMENT - Reference Points

Systems in place for external examiners
Provision of information about mode of assessment for all courses/modules
Use of assessment to ensure that students have mastered specific outcomes
Appropriate level of assessments to the specific programme and targeted students
Use of variety of assessment methods in the programme
Marking procedures and the provision of feedback to students

PROGRAMME RESULTS - Reference Points

Monitoring of student progress and provision of early warning to students at risk
Strategies to increase completion rates for the subject area
Provision of quality student feedback
Review of students learning achievement by expert peers/professional bodies
Established linkage with potential employers to facilitate graduate employment
Tracer studies of graduates and their employers on graduates achievement
Effective research plan with evaluation and feedback mechanisms
Research and consultancy on industrial problems and social development

AFRICAN UNION UNION AFRICAINE

African Union Common Repository

<http://archives.au.int>

African Union Commission

Education, Science, Technology and Innovation (ESTI)

2016-07

African Quality Rating Mechanism (AQRM)

ESTI-Education Division

<https://archives.au.int/handle/123456789/8882>

Downloaded from African Union Common Repository