ACE — African Higher Education Centers of Excellence Project

WORLD BANK GROUP

ASSOCIATION OF AFRICAN UNIVERSITIES
ASSOCIATION DES UNIVERSITES AFRICAINES
اتحاد الجامعات الأفريقية

QAA GLOBAL

International Quality Review for ACE Impact

Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology

Review Report

July 2023

Contents

About this review

This is a report of an International Quality Review conducted by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) at Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology (KNUST). The review took place from 10 to 12 July 2023 and was conducted by a team of three reviewers, as follows:

- Ms Katie Akerman
- Dr Nadeem Khan
- Ms Chrystalle Margallo (student reviewer)

The QAA Officer for this review was Kevin Kendall.

International Quality Review (IQR) offers institutions outside the UK the opportunity to have a review by the UK's Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA). The review benchmarks the institution's quality assurance processes against international quality assurance standards set out in Part 1 of the [Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG)](.).

In International Quality Review, the QAA review team:

- makes conclusions against each of the 10 standards set out in Part 1 of the ESG
- makes conditions (if relevant)
- makes recommendations
- identifies features of good practice
- comes to an overall conclusion as to whether the institution meets the standards for International Quality Review.

A summary of the findings can be found in the section: [Key findings](.). The section [Explanations of the findings](.) provides the detailed commentary.

The QAA website gives more information [about QAA](.) and its mission. A dedicated section explains the method for [International Quality Review](.) and has links to other informative documents. For an explanation of terms see the [Glossary](.) at the end of this report.

Key findings

Executive summary

Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology (KNUST) is a public university that was established as the Kumasi College of Technology in 1951 with 200 trainee teachers. It now has approximately 85,000 students across six colleges. It is situated on a self-contained campus of about eight square miles in the city of Kumasi, which is the second city after Accra in Ghana, and capital of the Ashanti region. The campus contains all the usual university facilities such as science laboratories, libraries, lecture rooms, an e-learning centre and residential hostels.

It has a vision:

'To build on its leadership as the premier science and technology university in Ghana and to be among the top ten universities in Africa'.

Its mission is:

'To advance knowledge in science and technology through creating an environment for undertaking relevant research, quality teaching, entrepreneurship training and community engagement to improve the quality of life'.

To achieve its vision and mission, KNUST has a set of shared values:

- leadership in innovation and technology
- promoting a culture of excellence
- diversity and equal opportunity for all
- integrity and stewardship of resources.

The six colleges at KNUST are Agriculture and Natural Resources, Art and Built Environment, Humanities and Social Sciences, Engineering, Health Sciences and Science. These are divided into 14 faculties, four schools and six research centres.

KNUST has participated in the African Centre of Excellence programmes (ACE 1 and ACE Impact) in an attempt to strengthen its global positioning in research and education. KNUST has many affiliated institutions and has established Memoranda of Understanding with international partners for staff exchange and collaborative research projects.

The University has had considerable growth since it was established and was originally run on a faculty-based system. This has become decentralised and, since 2005, faculties have been condensed into the six colleges that exist now. Student numbers have continued to increase which has led to significant challenges in teaching staff recruitment and size of student groups, with some lectures containing up to 1,300 students. Some students have significant challenges and KNUST provides scholarships, food and clothing banks and a range of student support resources.

In reaching conclusions about the extent to which Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology meets the 10 ESG Standards, the QAA review team followed the evidence-based review procedure as outlined in the handbook for International Quality Review (June 2021). The University provided the review team with a self-evaluation and supporting evidence. During the review visit, which took place from 10 to 12 July 2023, the review team held a total of eight meetings with the Vice-Chancellor, senior management team, quality assurance staff, academic staff, professional support staff, students, alumni and

representatives from industry. The review team also had the opportunity to observe the University's facilities and learning resources at the campus in Kumasi.

In summary, the team found **four** examples of good practice and was able to make some recommendations for improvement/enhancement. The recommendations are of a desirable rather than essential nature and are proposed to enable the University to build on existing practice which is operating satisfactorily but which could be improved or enhanced. The team identified **two** conditions that the University must satisfy to achieve QAA accreditation.

Overall, the team concluded that Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology **meets** all the standards for International Quality Review **subject to meeting specific conditions**.

In July 2024, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology submitted additional evidence with reference to actions taken to address the conditions. After considering the additional evidence, the review team concludes that Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology has addressed the conditions and thus it **meets** all 10 of the European Standards and Guidelines (2015).

QAA's conclusions about Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology

The QAA review team reached the following conclusions about the higher education provision at Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology.

European Standards and Guidelines

Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology meets **eight** of the 10 ESG Standards and Guidelines. The standards not fully met by Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology are:

- ESG Standard 1.1: Policy for quality assurance.
- ESG Standard 1.9: Ongoing monitoring and periodic review of programmes.

Conditions

The QAA review team identified the following **conditions** that must be fulfilled before all of the European Standards and Guidelines can be deemed fully met at Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology. These conditions must be addressed within 12 months:

- Create a comprehensive and systematic quality assurance procedural document (ESG Standard 1.1, para 1.12), which:

  - ensures that the Quality Assurance Policy also includes processes/procedures setting out how approval and review works in practice, including the development of a handbook
  - ensures that the University comply with the responsibilities set out in the Quality Assurance Policy such as for the undertaking of departmental review
  - ensures that the Quality Assurance Policy includes reference to the use of external stakeholders, including students.

- Develop, approve and implement an integrated and systematic framework of cyclical programme monitoring and review (ESG Standard 1.9, para 9.9). This should:

  - establish a monitoring and review policy and procedure, which would include a range of quantitative and qualitative measures
  - establish a review schedule such that all programmes are subject to monitoring and reporting
  - identify clear responsibility for overseeing the policy and procedure
  - ensure that the outcomes are reported to and discussed by the University
  - ensure that students, external experts and stakeholders are formally involved in the procedures.

Following the submission of additional evidence by Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology in July 2024, the review team conclude that the conditions above have been fulfilled and that all ESG standards are therefore now **met.**

Good practice

The QAA review team identified the following features of **good practice** at Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology:

- Student profiles are reviewed at both department and faculty level, and are subject to audit, to ensure any students with a failing profile are identified and supported appropriately, for example, with a referral to the counselling service (ESG Standard 1.1, para 1.8).

- The comprehensive on entry student orientation programme delivered for all students (ESG Standard 1.4, para 4.4).

- The comprehensive support for academic progression of the faculty (ESG Standard 1.5, para 5.2).

- The Department of Student Affairs with the holistic student services hub covering a comprehensive range of student support services (ESG Standard 1.6, para 6.2).

Recommendations

The QAA review team makes the following **recommendations** to Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology:

- Develop and implement a mechanism to feed back outcomes to students from their assessment of lecturers to improve teaching and learning (ESG Standard 1.1, para 1.9).

- Develop a more sophisticated approach to academic integrity ensuring the reliability of assessment is not compromised (ESG Standard 1.1, para 1.11).

- Prepare robust procedural guidelines for programme design and approval to avoid inconsistencies in design of the programmes (ESG Standard 1.2, para 2.4).

- Provide a comprehensive plan to review programme objectives and ensure that courses have measurable learning outcomes, in the light of Bloom's Taxonomy, that are aligned with the programme objectives (ESG Standard 2.1, para 2.5).

- Ensure that detailed programme specifications for each programme, which include course descriptions, are available on the website (ESG Standard 2.1, para 2.6).

- Prepare a gradual and timed action plan to reduce student to teacher ratio as committed in the strategic plan (ESG 1.3, para 3.3).

- Ensure that students receive personalised feedback on their assessed work to enable them to work on areas for improvement (ESG Standard 1.3, para 3.4).

- Revise and implement the guidelines on plagiarism fairly and consistently across all schools (ESG Standard 1.3, para 3.7).

- Develop a formal policy and procedure for accrediting Prior and Experience Learning (ESG Standard 1.4, para 4.3).

- Engage students as partners from the beginning of decision-making processes to ensure that students progress in their academic career in a well balanced manner (ESG Standard 1.4, para 4.5).

- Devise mechanisms for identifying training and development needs of the faculty on an ongoing basis, and ensure that these needs are met in a timely manner (ESG 1.5, para 5.4).

- Ensure there is equitable access by students to equipment and facilities as determined through the needs of the curriculum and assessments (ESG Standard 1.6, para 6.3).

- Carry out a comprehensive health and safety audit of laboratories, classrooms, dormitories and facilities to include proper signage for evacuation and information to deal with accidents and emergencies (ESG Standard 1.6, para 6.5).

- Articulate the integrated approach to information collection, analysis and dissemination in the revised Quality Assurance Policy (ESG 1.7, para 7.10).

- Publish programme specifications on the University website that includes course descriptions within the programme and how each course contributes to the achievement of programme intended learning outcomes (ESG Standard 1.8, para 8.1).

- Develop a website policy and procedure to ensure that information on the website is complete and accurate (ESG Standard 1.8, para 8.2).

Explanation of the findings about Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology

This section explains the review findings in more detail.

Terms that may be unfamiliar to some readers have been included in a brief glossary at the end of this report. A fuller glossary of terms is available on the QAA website, and formal definitions of certain terms may be found in the operational description and handbook for the review method, also on the QAA website.

Standard 1.1   Policy for quality assurance

Institutions should have a policy for quality assurance that is made public and forms part of their strategic management. Internal stakeholders should develop and implement this policy through appropriate structures and processes, while involving external stakeholders.

Findings

1.1   By Law ([Education Regulatory Bodies Act 2020](#)), all institutions and programmes must be accredited by the Ghana Tertiary Education Commission (GTEC). The Education Regulatory Bodies Act 2020 (Act 1023) formed the GTEC. Institutions are subject to re-accreditation every five years. The GTEC administers and accredits tertiary education institutions in Ghana, providing assurances that programmes developed meet national standards. The GTEC has re-accreditation mechanisms to assist institutions to comply with these standards. The University's policies and approach to quality assurance therefore need to align with the GTEC's requirements.

1.2   Alongside this the University participates in the HAQAA (Harmonisation of African Higher Education Quality Assurance and Accreditation) Initiative, funded by the European Union in partnership with the African Union, established to support the development of a harmonised quality assurance and accreditation system at institutional level, national, regional and Pan-African continental level. The Initiative is currently being implemented by a consortium including the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA). Activities will engage African regional and national organisations and networks active in the field. Actions identified for the University through participation in HAQAA included, for example, increasing the support for students with special needs, and improving the infrastructure for facilities (recognised by the University as 'adequate' in its self-evaluation). The University noted that financial resourcing for staffing is subject to agreement with GTEC.

1.3   The Chancellor of the University is His Majesty Otumfuo Nana Osei Tutu II, Asantehene and the Vice Chancellor is effectively the head of KNUST. The University Council is the highest academic authority of the University, and the Academic Board is responsible to the Council for research, academic partnerships and other academic activities. The Quality Assurance and Planning Office (QAPO) has constituted quality assurance subcommittees responsible for ensuring, enhancing, and maintaining quality and standards in the individual colleges and units of the University. These committees conduct regular audits, identify areas for improvement, and implement quality and standards set at the University to improve service delivery, through creating strategies and policies for quality management.

1.4   The student submission for the review sets out the structure for student representation, where the Students' Representative Council (SRC) is the primary representative body for students. In addition to the SRC, the Graduate Students' Association of Ghana-KNUST (GRASAG-KNUST) represents postgraduate students. The National Union of Ghana Students (NUGS) acts as a bridge between the University and broader national context, representing University students and advocating for their interests in national matters.

1.5   The University's Quality Assurance Policy 2018 has established the University's approach to quality assurance. The documentation and approach have not been updated since 2018. The statutes of the University stipulate that there shall be established a Quality Assurance and Planning Office (QAPO) which, in consultation with Provosts, Deans and Heads of Department, will institute measures and mechanisms in respect of strategic planning, quality assurance and the management of student data and any other

responsibilities as may be assigned to it by the Vice-Chancellor. The Quality Assurance Policy states that the QAPO shall advise the Academic Curriculum, Quality and Staff Development Committees on the determination and maintenance of acceptable levels of academic standards with respect to teaching, learning and research, conduct departmental reviews at least once every five years, preceded by self-assessment exercises, and facilitate quality audits and undertake surveys, staff training and development initiatives.

1.6   Although there is some documentation available on quality assurance, there is no handbook or similar setting out, at a high level, of provisions for programme development and approval, internal review or accreditation. For example, the Quality Assurance Policy states that for Internal Accreditation Reviews, the QAPO, in consultation with the Vice-Chancellor, shall periodically constitute committees to undertake internal accreditation of all programmes to ensure that they meet the standards set by appropriate bodies. There is a checklist and flowchart, but these do not include details of processes. The University confirmed that there is no written policy and process for monitoring and review.

1.7   The Quality Assurance Policy states that the University measures its performance by evaluation of student and employer satisfaction, underpinned by rigorous review procedures, comprising a suite of internal and external review processes. Therefore, the University maintains that it is constantly undergoing reviews at all levels for continuous improvement and monitoring by internal and external entities. The review team evaluated the effectiveness of the University's policy on quality assurance through discussions with staff, students and external stakeholders during the visit, and by scrutinising a wide range of institutional policy documents, reports and records of meetings. The team concluded that the University's approach to and mechanisms for quality assurance are not well articulated. Evidence was not provided to the team explaining how weaknesses are identified and addressed, and whether related key performance indicators are achieved. For example, the Design and Approval of Programmes is guided by systematic actions captured in a flowchart, supported by checklists, but these did not explain programme approval processes.

1.8   The Quality Assurance Policy sets out a comprehensive architecture for quality assurance at the University, spanning staffing, educational outcomes and research quality. As an example of how this is operationalised, the review team heard from QAPO staff that student profiles are reviewed at both departmental and faculty level, and are subject to audit, to ensure any students with a failing profile are identified and supported appropriately, for example, with a referral to the counselling service. The review team identified this as **good practice**.

1.9   The team saw evidence of some student participation in quality assurance. Student Assessment of Lecturers is an initiative to improve teaching and learning through student evaluation of teaching staff. This evaluation enables students to provide feedback and recommendations to improve teaching and learning. Students confirm that their evaluation is aligned with the programme learning outcomes and is used to improve the curriculum. This is usually conducted from the middle of the semester and closed before the start of end-of-semester examinations. The feedback from students is communicated to the University Management (the Vice-Chancellor, Pro Vice-Chancellor, Registrar, Provosts, Deans, and Heads of Departments). Recommendations from students are discussed and adopted by the University Management. The University regularly reviews the evaluation instrument to ensure that it remains effective. It is intended that student representatives share feedback with their peers, but QAPO staff recognised that if this does not occur, there is no alternative mechanism. The team therefore **recommends** that the University develop and implement a mechanism to feed back outcomes to students from their assessment of lecturers to improve teaching and learning.

1.10 The University reported that it has several mechanisms to involve external stakeholders in its quality assurance processes. Employers confirmed to the review team that they have opportunities to engage with academic staff in relation to curriculum development and assessment strategies but that these were informal opportunities rather than formal engagement in approval and review processes.

1.11 The review team saw policies relating to plagiarism and noted the use of plagiarism-detection software. Site visit discussions confirmed that academic staff and students understand academic misconduct. However, a broader understanding of strategies to ensure academic integrity is not apparent. The review team therefore **recommends** that the University take advantage of available resources to develop a more sophisticated approach to academic integrity ensuring the reliability of assessment is not compromised. This could include developing a policy and detailed procedure giving guidance to staff and students on the expectations of the University.

1.12 Although policies are evident, these are not always brought together in a logical system. Processes supporting the institutional quality assurance system are not always apparent although there is a clearly stated commitment to continuous improvement. It was not demonstrated to the review team how the policy translates into practice through a variety of internal quality assurance processes that allow participation of all stakeholders across the University. The University has quality assurance policies that take account of both the national and international context in which the University operates. However, the quality assurance system is not underpinned by articulated processes, and there is limited evidence of the robust involvement of external stakeholders, including students, in quality assurance. The review team therefore identified a **condition** that must be fulfilled before Standard 1.1: Policy for quality assurance can be met by the University, which is to create a comprehensive and systematic quality assurance procedural document, which:

a   ensures that the Quality Assurance Policy includes processes/procedures setting out how approval and review works in practice, including the development of a handbook
b   ensures that the University complies with the responsibilities set out in the Quality Assurance Policy such as for the undertaking of departmental review
c   ensures that the Quality Assurance Policy includes reference to the use of external stakeholders, including students.

1.13, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology submitted further evidence in July 2024 which was scrutinised by the review team to determine whether the three elements of the condition had been met. The team's findings follow.

1)   Create a comprehensive and systematic quality assurance procedural document. The further submission:

a   provides a Quality Assurance Policy including processes/procedures setting out how approval and review works in practice. The evidence also included a Quality Management System Manual which explains in detail how the quality management system operates.

b   The university has introduced systems to ensure that it complies with the responsibilities set out in the Quality Assurance Policy including undertaking a departmental review.

c   The Quality Assurance Policy includes reference to the use of external stakeholders, including students.

1.14 The review team understands that the University has a commitment to quality improvement but the processes supporting this were not always apparent, particularly in respect of translating quality systems into practice in a coherent way, and involving external stakeholders and students. The further submission by the University in July 2024 demonstrates that these deficiencies have been rectified and if put into practice will serve the University's quality assurance systems well going forward. The review team therefore concludes that the condition has been addressed and Standard 1.1: Policy for quality assurance is now **met.**

Standard 1.2 Design and approval of programmes

Institutions should have processes for the design and approval of their programmes. The programmes should be designed so that they meet the objectives set for them, including the intended learning outcomes. The qualification resulting from a programme should be clearly specified and communicated, and refer to the correct level of the national qualifications' framework for higher education and, consequently, to the Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area.

Findings

2.1   As discussed above in 1.1, as a state-funded institution, the University is required to comply with the Ghana Tertiary Education Commission GTEC's accreditation standards for each of its programmes. The design and approval of new programmes is largely regulated through the GTEC's guidelines. The need for a new programme is derived from the national priorities and the labour market demands. As a public institution, the University serves the needs of local industry and community and offers programmes supporting the national agenda and priorities.

2.2   The University does not have a formal policy that guides the development and approval of a new programme. A flow-chart diagram outlines the staged approval processes for accreditation of a new programme by the University. Each programme proposal is subjected to scrutiny by the Quality Assurance and Planning Office (QAPO) against the criteria set forth in the form of a checklist that is based on GTEC's accreditation standards. QAPO has developed a programme proposal template which includes but is not limited to rationale, programme objectives and outcomes, market research and analysis of needs and demands from the local industry. The template also includes sections about human and physical resources, facilities, finances, and other requirements as laid down in the GTEC's accreditation standards.

2.3   The new programme proposal passes through several layers of endorsement and approvals starting from the respective academic department to faculty, the College Board, and the Academic Board and finally the Governing Council. The final approval is sought from GTEC before a programme is offered. The University expects students to be actively engaged in the programme development process. Meetings with the students reveal that the University has student representation through the elected student councils and their voice is captured through surveys and other means. It is stated by the academic administrators that students are part of decision-making bodies including such as the Governing Council, College Board and the Academic Board; however, this is not confirmed from the available evidence. In addition to the students, KNUST engages with alumni and employers in design and approval of new programmes. The meeting with the employers and alumni confirms that they are engaged by KNUST in designing the new programmes.

2.4   The review team notes some inconsistencies in the three samples of programme proposals. The basic structure outlined in the available programme samples varies in scope and style between programmes. The first sample includes a section about 'aims and objectives' at programme level, as well as a section about 'objectives' at the level of each course. A second sample details the programme objectives and includes sections about 'course objectives' and 'course learning outcomes' at the level of each course. A third sample includes a section about 'programme aims and objectives' followed by a single course objective for each of the courses. The absence of policy and procedural guidelines for developing a programme proposal poses a risk that programmes will have inconsistencies in design. The review team therefore **recommends** KNUST should prepare

robust procedural guidelines for programme design and approval to avoid inconsistencies in design of the programmes.

2.5   The review of sample programme proposals further reveals that the phrasing of the course objectives in some instances is not completely aligned with the correct level of the Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area, and the Diploma Supplement. A recent report from the Ghana Tertiary Accreditation Commission GTEC states that aims and objectives of the programme are 'poor'. GTEC recommended that KNUST should ensure that course objectives must be 'SMART'. A review of a sample programme proposal at Master of Philosophy level reveals that highly generalised phrasing is used in writing the course objectives. Some examples of used phrases include: 'to introduce', to increase knowledge', 'to comprehend'. The review team therefore **recommends** that KNUST should provide a comprehensive plan to review programme objectives, in the light of Bloom's taxonomy, and ensure that courses have measurable learning outcomes that are aligned with the programme objectives.

2.6   It is identified in the Gap Analysis Report that KNUST should publish programme specifications on its website that includes course descriptions within the programme and how each course contributes to the achievement of programme intended learning outcomes. The University has responded and updated the information for several courses. However, some programme offerings on the KNUST website still shows that programme specifications are not available. The review team therefore **recommends** that KNUST ensure that detailed programme specifications for each programme, which include course descriptions, are available on the website.

2.7   The sample programme proposals include the course syllabi, the expected student workload, class hours, lists of textbooks and assessment strategies. There are structured internships for some of the programmes and KNUST has arrangements with local employers and internship providers, who are mostly alumni of the University.

2.8   Overall, the team concludes that KNUST has developed mechanisms for the design and approval of programmes which meets the criteria for the national accreditation agency GTEC. The meetings with different stakeholders including the academic leadership, faculty, quality assurance officials, students and alumni confirm their awareness and involvement in the process, therefore Standard 1.2: Design and approval of programmes is **met**.

Standard 1.3   Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment

Institutions should ensure that the programmes are delivered in a way that encourages students to take an active role in creating the learning process, and that the assessment of students reflects this approach.

Findings

3.1   KNUST's Teaching and Learning policy provides the overarching philosophy and framework of teaching and learning at the University. The policy emphasises that the academic faculty employs a variety of teaching and learning methodologies embedded with the use of technology. In the self-evaluation document, it is stated that the University promotes a student-centred approach by placing students at the centre of the teaching and learning process. During the interview with the academic faculty, it is stated that faculty uses a variety of teaching methods such as group assignments, projects, group presentations, field work and visits depending upon the nature and the level of the course.

3.2   Teaching at the University is supplemented with experiential training in the workplace in the form of internships or placements. It is mandated through the 'Industrial Placement and Internship Policy' that every student must spend at least four weeks in a workplace before they can graduate. Students state that the University provides support in identifying relevant work placement/internship opportunities; however, not every student could find a work placement as there are limited places, and competition for employment is high.

3.3   The self-evaluation document and the Gap Analysis Report highlight a key challenge that the University is facing is an increased student to teacher ratio. The student population has increased greatly over the years, the number of faculty has not increased correspondingly, resulting in crowded classrooms. Meetings with senior administrators, faculty and students confirm that the class sizes for some courses are very high. A meeting with students revealed that one of the undergraduate courses in Biochemistry has 346 students. During the site visit, some classrooms are found to be significantly larger, as compared with the international norms, and mostly designed as lecture halls with limited scope of interaction between the students. Students have also raised the concern that the lecture was the common mode of teaching with little focus on collaborative work. The faculty mentioned that they employ technology and make effective use of technology to interact with students. The review team **recommends** that KNUST should prepare a gradual and timed action plan to reduce student to teacher ratio as committed in the strategic plan.

3.4   KNUST's Regulations on the Conduct of University Examinations are available to faculty and students. It is mandated through the regulations that all assessments are moderated by a second examiner and the Chairperson of the relevant department. The faculty has confirmed during the meeting that assessments are moderated prior to the exams and grades are moderated after the exams. Students, however, stated that they do not always receive personalised qualitative feedback for the assessed work. The review team therefore **recommends** that KNUST should enforce measures to ensure that students receive personalised feedback on their assessed work to enable them to work on areas for improvement.

3.5   The University offers various mechanisms for dealing with student complaints. For academic matters, the first point of contact is the Academic Supervisor. For other matters, students can approach the College Counsellor and seek help from a range of services. Students confirm that they are aware of their rights and responsibilities, and they are also aware of whom to contact in a time of need.

3.6   For every course, the University gathers formal feedback on teaching from the students at the end of each semester. The results of the surveys are published in the form of a report. During the meeting, students stated that they were not aware how the University uses the feedback, though they mentioned that the faculty discusses if a particular issue is highlighted from the survey. The review team encourages the University to develop formal mechanisms to share survey feedback with the students.

3.7   The issue of plagiarism is stated very briefly in the Regulations on the Conduct of University Examinations. The guidelines do not specify the penalties in case plagiarism is detected. Meetings with faculty confirmed that it is mandatory to carry out plagiarism detection for the assignments and thesis. Students on the other hand, during the meetings, stated that it is up to the faculty to impose the penalty and it varies from one school to another. The review team therefore **recommends** that that KNUST should revise and implement the guidelines on plagiarism fairly and consistently across all schools.

3.8   The University has a dedicated centre for online content development, instructional design, and online delivery. During the visit, the review team discussed the student-centred aspects of online course delivery. Different features of the online learning management system were demonstrated to the review team. Students have access to all learning resources even after classroom hours and can catch up with any teaching materials in their own time. The learning management system allows interaction and teachers can assign individual and group tasks to ensure the student-centred aspects of online delivery.

3.9   The SED states that all students are provided with support throughout their academic journey at the University. Each student is assigned an 'Academic Supervisor' from the very beginning of their academic year at the University. Supervisors provide additional guidance and support to students who face challenges during their studies. In a meeting with the team, students confirm that the faculty is accessible and responsive to their needs.

3.10   The SED states the University arranges professional development activities for faculty and staff to keep them abreast of the latest advancements in teaching and learning. Workshops on the use of instructional technology are carried out during semester breaks for faculty. KNUST has implemented a Peer and Professional Evaluation of Teaching Policy and each faculty member is evaluated by peers and this feedback is used for further improvement of teaching practice.

3.11   KNUST has taken steps that encourages students to take an active part in the teaching and learning process despite the constraints it faces in terms of a high student to teacher ratio. The University has developed diversified approaches to teaching, learning and assessment and based on evidence provided the review team concludes that Standard 1.3: Student-centred teaching, learning and assessment is **met**.

Standard 1.4 Student admission, progression, recognition and certification

Institutions should consistently apply pre-defined and published regulations covering all phases of the student 'life cycle', for example student admission, progression, recognition and certification.

Findings

4.1   The University provides clear information on course offers on KNUST's website such as how to apply, deadlines and fees as well as programme-specific Admission Entry Requirements for Prospective Undergraduate Students, which is confirmed by students. The website also contains the freshers guide which prospective students can access prior to admission. KNUST provides admission assistance through the admissions portal and the helpdesk link.

4.2   There are separate Admission Requirements for Prospective Undergraduate Students and Prospective Postgraduate Admission. Students reinforced the ease of finding entry requirements; however, course information within the website is not regularly updated. The students are further provided with course specifications and learning objectives at orientation by their lecturer at the start of the academic year.

4.3   Accreditation of Prior and Experience Learning is briefly addressed through the Learning and Teaching Policy. A credit transfer process is practised which recognises a memorandum of understanding for internships and partners that is limited to separate agreements and only available for selected courses. There is no maintained policy to ensure a consistent and fair process is upheld; the review team finds a systematic gap in maintenance of policy into practice. The team therefore **recommends** that the University develop a formal policy and procedure for accrediting Prior and Experience Learning.

4.4   Students benefit from processes that are put in place to enable a comprehensive and holistic transition into their academic programme at KNUST as shown in the Sample Orientation Programme for College and reinforced by students. This includes orientation for freshers after the admissions processes to inform them about the University community which also covers the University Chaplaincy; the University Library and Its Resources; the University Hospital and Its Resources; Student Affairs; Security on Campus; University Rules and Regulations vis-à-vis the Laws of Ghana and Fire Prevention on Campus. A second phase of orientation is provided and tailored to each college and specific accommodation locations. During orientation, students are provided with a 'Student Guide and code of conduct' which contains student-related policies and useful information regarding the University. The review team therefore concludes that the comprehensive on entry student orientation programme delivered for all students is **good practice**.

4.5   At the start of the review, the University acknowledged that it faces issues around timetabling and staff to student ratio. During the student meetings, the students expressed dissatisfaction with the effects of the demanding timetable preventing a balance with extracurricular activities including internship opportunities. The SED states that the Student Association collaboratively creates extracurricular events and activities for students to encourage a balanced student journey; however, this previous practice has not continued as confirmed by current students. The review team finds that there is a lack of students' work/life balance throughout the student life-cycle, therefore the team **recommends** that the University engage students as partners from the beginning of decision-making processes to ensure that students progress in their academic career in a well balanced manner.

4.6   The University states that students are regularly asked for feedback in various mechanisms, which is confirmed by the students. The University states that students complete a few surveys; however, the evidence received by the review team only included one assessment of the student experience. The review team finds that there is no formal management process of feedback mechanism for students including the closing of the feedback loop shown in the SED and meeting with students. The review team therefore encourages the University to ensure its surveys include surveying students on their experience along with evaluating and feeding back results to students to enhance their experience as a whole.

4.7   KNUST provides a range of scholarship awards and scholarship opportunities are available on the website Scholarships Page to support students throughout their student life cycle. Alongside bursaries provided through the Department of Student Affairs (DOSA) students also receive a care package on an emergency basis confirmed in the student meeting and the tour.

4.8   Student progression is managed and monitored with the Students Information System. Students who fulfil academic requirements and obtain the minimum cumulative weighted average receive a certificate of completion. The student information system is maintained by DOSA confirmed during the visit and meetings.

4.9   Notwithstanding gaps in policy and feedback management and processes, the team found that students benefit from a range of holistic orientation programme and scholarship opportunities. Students confirm that they are satisfied with their onboarding. The review team therefore concludes that the admission processes, the practices of orientation and the arrangements for admissions are aligned with the requirements of Standard 1.4. Although the review team has made some recommendations, none prevents the standard from being met, nor poses a high risk to the University. The review team therefore concludes that, Standard 1.4: Student admission, progression, recognition and certification is **met**.

Standard 1.5   Teaching staff

Institutions should assure themselves of the competence of their teachers. They should apply fair and transparent processes for the recruitment and development of the staff.

Findings

5.1   The Recruitment Policy guides the recruitment of faculty and staff at the University. The policy states that all faculty and staff at KNUST are hired purely on merit regardless of gender, race, nationality, ethnicity, beliefs, disability, or age. Academic positions are advertised in print media as well as on the University's website. The recruitment process starts at a departmental level and each candidate is required to make a short demonstration of his/her teaching skills followed by an interview. Recommendations are submitted to the respective College's 'Appointment and Promotion' subcommittee, which further invites the candidate to assess his/her knowledge and skills. If the candidate is successful, s/he is finally interviewed by the University's Appointment and Promotion Committee chaired by the Vice Chancellor with the membership of Pro-Vice Chancellor, Provost, Dean and Head of the relevant department in attendance. Recommendations of the committee are then forwarded to the Academic Board for further consideration who recommends it to the final authority in the University Council.

5.2   Teaching staff from lecturer cadre and above require a PhD in the relevant discipline and those holding a master's degree are appointed as assistant lecturers. The University provides financial assistance and support to assistant lecturers to complete their PhD and they are eligible to apply for a paid or unpaid study leave after three years of appointment. The University also encourages the faculty to attract externally funded research projects. The faculty can opt for a full-time or part-time PhD ranging from three to six years' duration, respectively. The faculty can also receive a waiver for tuition fee as well as support for fieldwork. Those who embark on a full-time basis for a research degree are not assigned any teaching duties. Since 2017, the University has supported 160 assistant lecturers to pursue doctorate degrees. The review team considers the comprehensive support for academic progression of the faculty to be **good practice**.

5.3   The University has established KNUST Research Fund (KRef) to support research and scholarship of teaching and learning. In the past year alone, 33 members of staff have been awarded grants, totalling approximately One Million Ghana Cedis. The Office of Grants and Research (OGR) has carefully scrutinised 64 applications from KRef and awarded grants to 33 of the most competitive proposals.

5.4   The University also offers professional development opportunities for faculty and a thematic professional development training is organised every year during the summer break. This summer school broadly covers a theme identified as a strategic priority for the University. In 2022, the theme covered the topic and sessions about the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The review team recognises that there are professional development opportunities for faculty but there are no mechanisms in place to identify the individual training needs of the faculty. As stated in 1.2, one thematic area identified by GTEC is the lack of proper training in writing programme and course learning objectives. Meetings with the faculty and quality assurance personnel confirm that the need for training and development in this area has to be addressed. The review team, therefore, **recommends** that KNUST should devise mechanisms for identifying training and development needs of the faculty on an ongoing basis, and ensure that these needs are met in a timely manner.

5.5　KNUST offers online programmes through its Institute of Distance Learning. Faculty teaching members for these programmes are required to constantly upskill with the use of technology, therefore they are encouraged to attend courses offered by the e-Learning Centre.

5.6　KNUST has also launched a new initiative to enhance teaching by the introduction of formal qualifications such as Master of Education in Higher Education Pedagogy, Certificate in Higher Education Pedagogy. In addition, the University provides financial support for faculty to attend conferences, seminars, and short courses.

5.7　The University has established criteria for promotion to the next academic rank that is widely known to the faculty. The University employs peer-to-peer teaching assessment as part of its promotion criteria. The faculty meeting the criteria may apply for a promotion which is then evaluated, and any outcomes are then notified to the faculty. During interviews with the senior administrators, it is further confirmed that the University implements these criteria fairly.

5.8　The University has devised a policy framework for the annual appraisal of administrative and support staff. The review team notes there is no process that guides appraisal of the faculty on an annual basis, similar to the support staff. The review team therefore has recommended in 5.4 above, that KNUST should develop mechanisms for annual appraisal of its faculty so that areas of further development are identified and supported in a timely manner.

5.9　Faculty members are also supported and encouraged to join professional associations such as the Ghana Institution of Engineering, the Ghana Medical Association and the Ghana Bar Association. Programme advisory boards also provide an opportunity for the faculty to liaise with the industry.

5.10　The review team concludes that the University's policies and processes for faculty recruitment, continuous professional development, performance appraisal and promotion are in alignment with the guidelines laid out in Standard 1.5. Therefore, the review team concludes that Standard 1.5: Teaching staff is **met**.

Standard 1.6   Learning resources and student support

Institutions should have appropriate funding for learning and teaching activities and ensure that adequate and readily accessible learning resources and student support are provided.

Findings

6.1   Students are offered a wide range of support covering all aspects of their journey; managed by the Department of Student Affairs (DOSA). Each team under the DOSA focuses on student wellbeing, International Affairs, Housing & Residence Life, Student Conduct & Discipline, Student Support Services and Student Health Services. A section of the main University website is available to students which provides information on all support services available to them and how they can access them.

6.2   DOSA supports students and facilitates mobility of students within and across the University; through a holistic student services available in one hub; ensuring a holistic offering of support for housing, conduct and discipline and other health and support teams throughout the student life cycle. The review team therefore concludes that the Department of Student Affairs with the holistic student services hub covering a comprehensive range of student support services is **good practice**.

6.3   The University has a range of resources and equipment such as laboratories in each college, central library and in each college, online and hard copy resources, learning centres, e-learning centres and study spaces available for students. However, students stated that they have challenges with accessing resources and equipment due to high numbers of students. The review team therefore **recommends** that the University ensures there is equitable access by students to equipment and facilities as determined through the needs of the curriculum and assessments.

6.4   Students are also provided with training around the tools to support their learning such as software and learning environment literacy. Students receive personalised support through 1-1 sessions with the University counsellors or through their academic tutors. However, the review team noted that class sizes vary, and students will also experience a variation of support, whether this is specifically tailored was a concern. Students are provided with a student guide which includes information on student housing and different student support services available. During the meeting with the students, the student guide was mentioned to have been useful as a point of reference in understanding support that is available.

6.5   The review team visited the campus and various sites and facilities where some health and safety concerns were identified within the laboratories. KNUST should display the details of emergency contacts/first respondents in the classrooms, laboratories and meeting rooms/offices. In addition, fire escape routes and assembly points should be identified and properly notified. Moreover, regular health and safety inspections/audits should be carried out to ensure the premises comply with national and international health and safety protocols. The review team therefore **recommends** that KNUST should carry out a comprehensive health and safety audit of laboratories, classrooms, dormitories and facilities to include proper signage for evacuation and information to deal with accidents and emergencies.

6.6   Students deemed to be finding challenges with learning and coping with studies are referred to the DOSA; however, there is a lack of policy and a consistent identified process for students at risk and support which is further discussed in Standard 1.1.

6.7   During meetings with support services and students, the review team explored the means of feedback for students around their experience and support, where it was identified that students are surveyed at course level to evaluate their lecturer and experience of their course. There was no evidence of surveys or use of surveys to enhance student support at KNUST. Feedback regarding the survey results was only fed back to student representatives who are given the responsibility to disseminate the information, however there is no clear and dedicated process to close the feedback loop to students (para 1.9).

6.8   During the student meeting limited library resources was highlighted along with Wi-Fi hotspots that are not accessible. Within the GAP analysis these issues were also identified which KNUST is addressing by providing SIM cards to students with data. However, students find that this is not enough to address the Wi-Fi issues. A demonstration of the library resources was held during the tour which showed a large database of e-learning resource; however, it was evident during the visit that there is improvement needed in awareness by students of the library resources and how to access the resources (para 6.3).

6.9   Notwithstanding gaps in the feedback and closing the feedback loop processes, the team found that there are appropriate resources for support, learning and teaching at KNUST where most are adequate and readily accessible for students. Students confirm that they are satisfied with the services provided by DOSA; however, there are improvements to be made with ensuring all students can access all support and resources available to them. The review team therefore concludes that the learning resources and student support are aligned with the requirements of standard 1.6. Although the review team has made some recommendations, none prevents the standard from being met, nor poses a high risk to the institution. The review team therefore concludes that, overall, Standard 1.6: Learning resources and student support is **met**.

Standard 1.7   Information management

Institutions should ensure that they collect, analyse and use relevant information for the effective management of their programmes and other activities.

Findings

7.1   The University collects a range of information and data, determined by its own internal management and quality assurance needs and its external reporting requirements. Data collection is generally done via applications developed within the University to meet specific requirements.

7.2   The University has identified key performance indicators (KPIs) that are aligned with its mission and goals. The KPIs currently include students' satisfaction (measured through surveys); student-to-staff ratios; classroom and other learning infrastructure capacities; the number of international and fee-paying students. Although, these KPIs are monitored, there are gaps in documenting the evidence. Going forward, the Quality Assurance and Planning Office (QAPO) is developing new KPIs to be used for benchmarking its performance. The following KPIs have been proposed:

- student enrolment
- student and graduation rates
- faculty and staff retention
- research productivity
- alumni engagement and giving
- diversity and inclusion
- resource management
- student Satisfaction
- Employer satisfaction
- community engagement
- teaching excellence
- internationalisation.

7.3   Student records and data are maintained in a student management system by the Department of Student Affairs (DOSA). The DOSA is responsible for administration and management of all aspects of a student's journey at the University. It is the hub of all official student records and is responsible for their accuracy, integrity and security.

7.4   The University also uses a virtual learning environment (VLE). This system collects a range of learning and engagement-related data. The University noted that the pandemic had shown some paucity in the availability of e-resources, and senior staff confirm that, as a result, the University invested in these.

7.5   The QAPO ensures that academic staff maintain accurate records including programme and assessment changes, moderation data, grades, and all other assessment-related information. The QAPO has a role in both collecting and analysing information and data. It conducts the exit survey and collects and analyses student evaluation forms. The QAPO collects data on the profile of its student population, including demographics, academic background, and socio-economic status. This data is used to assist students with special needs such as funding and disability. Use of data in this respect can still be improved as so much information is collected and thus several analyses could be performed for improved decision-making, and through the PASET Benchmarking Process within the ACE

Impact Project; KNUST is collaborating with the University of Nottingham to improve the use of data for improved decision-making.

7.6   Students note that they can access information through an App. It also serves as a platform for communication with students.

7.7   The review team evaluated the effectiveness of the University's information management systems and approaches during the visit through discussions with faculty, staff and students, and by scrutinising a wide range of institutional policy and procedure documents, reports and records of meetings. The team heard that the QAPO is responsible for the accuracy of the website. The Head of MIS keeps an updated record through a database. The Head of Department puts any updates through the Faculty and College to the Head of MIS. The team was informed by senior staff that here is a process to trigger this and a template for the website.

7.8   Students confirm that the collection of student evaluations is comprehensive, and the outcomes are acted on by the University. Students were also involved, via their representatives, in discussion of the evaluation outcomes and subsequent actions. Student feedback on learning resources and support services was also collected and responded to. The review team heard, for example, that an instance of using feedback obtained from such to improve service delivery includes the procurement and installation of audiovisual infrastructure in most large classrooms as several respondents criticised the poor state and/or absence of such equipment in teaching facilities.

7.9   During the tour, the review team received a demonstration of the VLE, and noted that programme information is rolled over annually up to a maximum of three years, at which point there is a review of the content of the VLE for each individual programme. The VLE is comprehensive with programme materials, assessment information and discussion boards.

7.10   Responsibilities for information collection, analysis and dissemination are clear and the University has established an integrated approach to meet its quality assurance needs going forward; however, it is **recommended** that this is articulated in the revised Quality Assurance Policy.

7.11 Information relating to KPIs, student cohorts, student performance and satisfaction with their learning experience, and graduation paths are collated and analysed. The team heard that the staff/student ratio was of concern as approval is needed from the Ministry for more full-time staff. Part-time staff are used to support full-time staff. The review team therefore concludes that Standard 1.7: Information management is **met**.

Standard 1.8   Public information

Institutions should publish information about their activities, including programmes, which is clear, accurate, objective, up-to date and readily accessible.

Findings

8.1   There is a comprehensive range of information available on the University website such as the Quality Assurance Policy, Teaching and Learning Policy, Research Policy and the Peer and Professional Evaluation of Teaching Policy, which provide some information to prospective and current students about the University policy. ESG guidelines for 1.8 requires information on courses offered and the intended learning outcomes of programmes to be published for prospective students; however, this is not available on the KNUST website. The review team therefore **recommends** that KNUST publish programme specifications on its website that includes course descriptions within the programme and how each course contributes to the achievement of programme intended learning outcomes as mentioned in the GAP analysis and in 1.2.

8.2   The GAP Analysis identified that the main University website is constantly updated; however, departments and colleges do not update their websites regularly. The University does not maintain a website policy or procedure that ensures the website is consistently maintained. Each school is expected to maintain their webpage; however, the gap in policy does not assure consistency. The University has formed a committee to develop a policy on communication and media engagement in the future. The review team therefore **recommends** that KNUST should develop a website policy and procedure to ensure that information on the website is complete and accurate.

8.3   With regard to recruitment of prospective students, advertisement is done on the University website and the national newspapers. The University has relevant employment forms and a vacancy portal accessible to all stakeholders on its website.

8.4   In addition to the website, the University has a radio station called Focus FM, which the review team was shown during the tour. The radio provides both staff and students as well as the University community and its neighbouring towns with information and the most recent updates to listeners.

8.5   The review team found that the University publishes information about its activities including programmes which are clear and accessible; however, there are gaps in terms of ensuring the information is up to date, accurate and available. This includes the absence of course specifications, (para 2.6), the consistent updating of the website and a maintained policy and procedure in maintaining the website. Despite the gaps, students confirmed the usefulness and accessibility of the website. The review team therefore concludes that the public information is aligned with the requirements of standard 1.8. Although the review team has identified gaps and concerns, none prevents the standard from being met, nor poses a high risk to the institution. The review team therefore concludes that, overall, Standard 1.8: Public information is **met**.

Standard 1.9   Ongoing monitoring and periodic review of programmes

Institutions should monitor and periodically review their programmes to ensure that they achieve the objectives set for them and respond to the needs of students and society. These reviews should lead to continuous improvement of the programme. Any action planned or taken as a result should be communicated to all those concerned.

Findings

9.1   The University's Quality Assurance Policy states that the Quality Assurance and Planning Office (QAPO) shall periodically constitute committees to undertake internal accreditation of all programmes to ensure that they meet the standards set by appropriate bodies such as the GTEC, as well as prepare all departments for external accreditation. The University's SED also notes that the University has developed a platform to monitor the accreditation of its programmes. The software has an in-built alert feature that notifies Heads of Departments/Deans/Provosts 12 months in advance to the expiration of a programme's accreditation. To ensure that departments respond promptly to the preparation of documents, accreditation committees have been formed by each department and the members trained at the college level to enhance the timely response to reports from GTEC.

9.2   Feedback from industry stakeholders on new and additional skills required to make graduates more employable and responsive to their needs is also factored into the review of programmes before submission to the GTEC for re-accreditation.

9.3   At the national level, the GTEC re-accreditation application form has a section that requires programmes to indicate modifications since the last accreditation. In situations where programmes are modified/rebranded to such an extent that the old and new differ substantially, a new document is forwarded to GTEC.

9.4   The review team evaluated the effectiveness of the University's approach and processes for the monitoring and review of programmes by scrutinising a wide range of institutional policy documents, reports and records of meetings, and through discussions with faculty, staff and students during a site visit.

9.5   The University confirms that although it believes that there is regular monitoring, review and revision of its provision, no evidence was provided to the review team of a full programme review schedule or reporting of such, or evidence of five-yearly departmental review or engagement with any review outcomes. It was, therefore, not possible to ascertain whether students, external experts and stakeholders were formally involved in the monitoring and review procedures. It was not possible to identify where responsibility lies for overseeing any monitoring and review policy and processes or where outcomes were reported to and discussed. The Quality Assurance Policy states that the University undertakes internal cyclical review of programmes, through conducting departmental reviews at least once every five years, preceded by self-assessment exercises and quality audits.

9.6   Individual staff teaching performance scrutiny is well evidenced rather than programme performance and outcomes. As stated, the QAPO has responsibility for the monitoring and review of programmes. Minutes of meetings were not provided, nor was relevant reporting considering quantitative or qualitative information. This means that there is no consistent evidence that the University has sufficient information to ensure that its programmes are up to date; that the provision remains appropriate; and to create a supportive and effective learning environment for students, as is required under this Standard.

9.7   Minor changes to the curriculum as a result of students' feedback are conducted by departmental boards while major revisions are noted and channelled into the next revision of the programme for accreditation (three years for a new programme and five years for an existing programme). However, the engagement of academic advisers external to the University or industry representatives is not evident in relation to monitoring and review.

9.8   The most regular activity is student evaluation of teaching, considering individual staff teaching performance, rather than programme performance and outcomes. Reports discuss little quantitative or qualitative information, and some do not include any quality or academic performance-related matters. It is noted that the University advises it is in the process of developing ways to measure other indicators.

9.9   The review team therefore identified one **condition** that must be fulfilled by the University before standard 1.9 can be met. This is to develop and implement a framework of cyclical programme review, which ensures that programmes achieve the objectives set for them and respond to the needs of students and society. Any action planned or taken as a result should be communicated to all those concerned. Regular monitoring, review and revision of programmes should aim to ensure that the provision remains appropriate and creates a supportive and effective learning environment for students. Monitoring and review should also include an evaluation of whether the content of the programme is up to date; students' workload, progression and completion; the effectiveness of procedures for assessment of students; student expectations, needs and satisfaction in relation to the programme; the learning environment and support services and their fitness for purpose for the programme. Programmes should be reviewed and revised regularly involving students and other stakeholders and revised programme specifications are then published.

9.10   The team concludes that the University has some components in place for the effective monitoring and review of its provision but currently lacks an integrated and systematic framework of cyclical programme review. The review team therefore concludes that the University meets Standard 1.9: Ongoing monitoring and periodic review of programmes, subject to meeting a specific **condition**. The University should develop, approve and implement an integrated and systematic framework of cyclical programme monitoring and review and provide evidence of its implementation within 12 months. This should:

a   establish a monitoring and review policy and procedure, which would include a range of quantitative and qualitative measures
b   establish a review schedule such that all programmes are subject to monitoring and reporting
c   identify clear responsibility for overseeing the policy and procedure
d   ensure that the outcomes are reported to and discussed by the University
e   ensure that students, external experts and stakeholders are formally involved in the procedures.

9.11   Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology submitted further evidence in July 2024 which was scrutinised by the review team to determine whether the five elements of the condition had been met. The team's findings follow.

1) Develop, approve and implement an integrated and systematic framework of cyclical programme monitoring and review and provide evidence of its implementation. The further submission:

   a   includes a monitoring and review policy and procedure which includes a range of quantitative and qualitative measures.

b   includes a review schedule so that all programmes are subject to monitoring and reporting.

c   gives clear responsibility for overseeing the policy and procedure.

d   gives clear processes for reporting and discussion by the University.

e   shows how students, external experts and stakeholders are formally involved in the procedures.

9.12 The review team concluded that the university had some of the components in place for effective monitoring and review but lacked an integrated and systematic framework for cyclical programme review. The further submission by the University in July 2024 demonstrates that the University has now put these systems in place that should improve their programme monitoring and review processes in the future. The review team therefore concludes that the condition has been addressed and Standard 1.9: Ongoing monitoring and periodic review of programmes is now **met.**

Standard 1.10 Cyclical external quality assurance

Institutions should undergo external quality assurance in line with the ESG on a cyclical basis.

Findings

10.1 The University engages with external bodies for the purposes of external quality assurance; and this occurs in a cyclical manner, every three to five years. This is done in compliance with existing national laws relating to accreditation of Institutions of Higher Learning set out in the National Accreditation Board Act, 2007 (Act 744). Primarily, the University deals with the Ghana Tertiary Education Commission (GTEC), which oversees all programmes and Professional, Regulatory and Statutory Bodies, for example, the Medical and Dental Council of Ghana (for medical and dental training/education), and the General Legal Council (for Law training/education)).

10.2 All new academic programmes are introduced by relevant departments and after the internal quality approval by the University, programmes must be accredited by GTEC in the first instance for three years and subsequently for a five-year cycle. During the accreditation visits for programmes by GTEC, a panel assessment report is produced which must be responded to or addressed by the respective department before GTEC finally issues a certificate of accreditation for the programme.

10.3 The University also engages with professional/regulatory bodies for some professional programmes (Pharmacy Council, Legal Council, Ghana Institute of Engineers). These bodies also review submitted applications and then send a team of assessors to the school/faculty and do on-site assessments following which they provide reports. The relevant school/faculty responds to the report/s within a specified period. Based on the responses sent, the regulatory body gives a final verdict and may give some directives which should be complied with. The University stated that this contributes to the cycle of continuous improvement.

10.4 A third area of external cyclical quality assurance that the University engages with is the use of external examiners/moderators in examinations and this is in accordance with its statutes. Departments recommend external examiners/moderators who are in the rank of senior lecturer or above for consideration and approval for appointment by the school/faculty, college and then finally by the Academic Board. The appointment is for three years and is renewable for one more term only. They moderate examination questions, participate in oral/practical exams and submit reports after each exercise. The reports submitted by the external examiners/moderators are used by departments to improve standards.

10.5 When the University's current registration expires, the submission for re-accreditation will be made to GTEC by the Quality Assurance and Planning Office (QAPO). As part of the process, the University conducts and completes a questionnaire and provides additional supporting documents as may be required by GTEC including a separate write-up on developments since the last Institutional Accreditation/Re-Accreditation visit. The team heard that the University is in constant dialogue with GTEC. A database with colour coding (RAG rating) is used for GTEC accreditation. The Academic Board approves the submission to GTEC.

10.6 The University demonstrates its intent to go beyond the compliance requirements of the GTEC to build a culture of quality and emphasises its commitment to continuous improvement. The University ensures that cyclical external review is implemented in quality assurance policies and practices. The review team therefore concludes that there is an

effective cyclical quality assurance in place, and that consequently Standard 1.10: Cyclical external quality assurance is **met**.

Glossary

Action plan
A plan developed by the institution after the QAA review report has been published, which is signed off by the head of the institution. It responds to the recommendations in the report and gives any plans to capitalise on the identified good practice.

Annual monitoring
Checking a process or activity every year to see whether it meets expectations for standards and quality. Annual reports normally include information about student achievements and may comment on the evaluation of courses and modules.

Collaborative arrangement
A formal arrangement between a degree-awarding body and another higher education provider. These may be degree-awarding bodies with which the institution collaborates to deliver higher education qualifications on behalf of the degree-awarding bodies. Alternatively, they may be other delivery organisations who deliver part or all of a proportion of the institution's higher education programmes.

Condition
Conditions set out action that is required. Conditions are only used with unsatisfactory judgements where the quality cannot be approved. Conditions may be used where quality or standards are at risk/continuing risk if action is not taken or if a required standard is not met and action is needed for it to be met.

Degree-awarding body
Institutions that have authority, for example from a national agency, to issue their own awards. Institutions applying to IQR may be degree-awarding bodies themselves, or may collaborate to deliver higher education qualifications on behalf of degree-awarding bodies.

Desk-based analysis
An analysis by the review team of evidence, submitted by the institution, that enables the review team to identify its initial findings and subsequently supports the review team as it develops its review findings.

Enhancement
See **quality enhancement**.

European Standards and Guidelines
For details, including the full text on each standard, see www.enqa.eu/index.php/home/esg.

Examples of practice
A list of policies and practices that a review team may use when considering the extent to which an institution meets the standards for review. The examples should be considered as a guide only, in acknowledgment that not all of them will be appropriate for all institutions.

Externality
The use of experts from outside a higher education provider, such as external examiners or external advisers, to assist in quality assurance procedures.

Facilitator
The member of staff identified by the institution to act as the principal point of contact for the QAA officer and who will be available during the review visit, to assist with any questions or requests for additional documentation.

Good practice
A feature of good practice is a process or way of working that, in the view of a QAA review team, makes a particularly positive contribution to the institution's higher education provision.

Lead student representative
An optional voluntary role that is designed to allow students at the institution applying for IQR to play a central part in the organisation of the review.

Oversight
Objective scrutiny, monitoring and quality assurance of educational provision.

Peer reviewers
Members of the review team who make the decisions in relation to the review of the institution. Peer reviewers have experience of managing quality and academic standards in higher education or have recent experience of being a student in higher education.

Periodic review
An internal review of one or more programmes of study, undertaken by institutions periodically (typically once every five years), using nationally agreed reference points, to confirm that the programmes are of an appropriate academic standard and quality. The process typically involves experts from other higher education providers. It covers areas such as the continuing relevance of the programme, the currency of the curriculum and reference materials, the employability of graduates and the overall performance of students. Periodic review is one of the main processes whereby institutions can continue to assure themselves about the academic quality and standards of their awards.

Programme of study
An approved course of study that provides a coherent learning experience and normally leads to a qualification. UK higher education programmes must be approved and validated by UK degree-awarding bodies.

Quality enhancement
The process by which higher education providers systematically improve the quality of provision and the ways in which students' learning is supported.

QAA officer
The person appointed by QAA to manage the review programme and to act as the liaison between the review team and the institution.

Quality assurance
The systematic monitoring and evaluation of learning and teaching, and the processes that support them, to make sure that the standards of academic awards meet the necessary standards, and that the quality of the student learning experience is being safeguarded and improved.

Recognition of prior learning
Assessing previous learning that has occurred in any of a range of contexts including school, college and university, and/or through life and work experiences.

Recommendation
Review teams make recommendations where they agree that an institution should consider developing or changing a process or a procedure in order to improve the institution's higher education provision.

Reference points
Statements and other publications that establish criteria against which performance can be measured.

Self-evaluation document
A self-evaluation report by an institution. The submission should include information about the institution as well as an assessment of the effectiveness of its quality systems.

Student submission
A document representing student views that describes what it is like to be a student at the institution, and how students' views are considered in the institution's decision-making and quality assurance processes.

Validation
The process by which an institution ensures that its academic programmes meet expected academic standards and that students will be provided with appropriate learning opportunities. It may also be applied to circumstances where a degree-awarding institution gives approval for its awards to be offered by a partner institution or organisation.

Email: accreditation@qaa.ac.uk
Website: www.qaa.ac.uk