

# **GHANA TERTIARY EDUCATION COMMISSION**

## **Institutional Review Reporting Format for the Assessment of Public and Private Chartered Universities in Ghana**

### **1.0 Introduction**

An Institutional Review Report (IRR) is compiled by the Institutional Review Team once the institutional review has been completed and is the final outcome of the review visit. The IRR should provide a brief account of the review processes and findings supported with evidence(s), an analysis of the issues identified and discussed with Management of the University with the team's reflections and conclusions.

The IRR will conclude in an overall judgment of the level of accomplishment by the University with regard to the quality of its education provision and the standard of its awards. The report will be made available to the University reviewed. It will enter the public domain subsequently through GTEC's website depending on the Board's policy prevailing at the time.

### **2.0 Purpose of the Report**

The purpose of the IRR is to inform the institution and external stakeholders of the review findings and to provide a reference point to support and guide staff in continuing quality assurance activities towards quality enhancement and excellence.

### **3.0 Scope**

The IRR will include but not limited to the underlisted elements:

- a. a brief introduction to the University and its review context
- b. a brief description of the review process (The review visit programme or schedule of meetings as an appendix)
- c. review team's view of the University self-evaluation report (SER)
- d. commentary on the review indicators
- e. overview of the University approach to Quality Assurance
- f. final assessment of performance of the University in terms of the prescribed Quality indicators

- g. commendations and recommendations
- h. summary

### **3.0 Criteria and Standards**

1. Innovations in Governance and Management
2. Financial Governance and Sustainability
3. Information Resources and Deployment
4. Infrastructural Developments
5. ICT Architecture and Systems
6. Internationalization, Partnership/Collaboration
7. Student Experience
8. Gender/Diversity
9. Curriculum Design and Development
10. Teaching and Learning
11. Student Assessment and Awards
12. Strength and Quality of Teaching Staff and Non-Teaching staff
13. Postgraduate Studies
14. Research, Innovation and Publication
15. Community Engagement, Consultancy and Outreach
16. Distance Education
17. Quality Assurance
18. Annual Reporting Framework

Under each of these eighteen criteria, a variable number of standards will be assessed by the review team after careful scrutiny of the documentary evidence(s) provided by the institution for the standards under each criterion.

### **4.0 Review Judgments**

The review judgements will be based on the university's arrangements for quality assurance which support and sustain the standards expected. The standards and quality should reflect agreed national guidelines. Therefore, clear and concise outcomes are expected of the IRR which will enable the wider public to form a picture of the reviewed

university's effectiveness in maintaining the standard of its awards and the quality of education offered in its name.

## **5.0 Structure of the Report**

The following structure or format is recommended when writing the Institutional Review Report. Each section should comprise a description, analysis and commentary followed by judgement.

### **Section 1-Brief introduction to the university and its review context**

This section of the report will introduce the University and the context for the review. It will describe the background of the University such as the year of establishment, available Act, etc. It will provide information on the number of faculties/schools/colleges and departments, number of programmes and courses, number of students enrolled, number of academic, administrative and academic support and non-academic staff etc. This will enable the public get an idea of the size, age and maturity of the University. This should reflect the context within which the University operates taking into account constraints if any.

### **Section 2-Review team's view of the University's Self-Evaluation (SER)**

In this section of the report, the review team needs to identify the strengths and limitations of the SER, the sufficiency and the reliability of the evidence provided, comment on the SWOT analysis and mention areas that have been identified for particular scrutiny during the review. The review team should also comment on the university's Corporate Plan and the Vision, Mission, Goals and Objectives contained therein, and whether clearly identified strategies and activities are in place along with personnel responsible for implementation according to a given time-frame.

In a case where the University has been previously reviewed, the review team should report on the University's performance and also indicate whether remedial action(s) had been taken to correct the deficiencies identified in the previous report. This will instil confidence among all stakeholders that the University is striving to achieve and maintain the quality of its educational provision and the standard of its awards

**Section 3-**A brief description of the Review Process and methodology

This section deals with the steps involved in the conduct of the review preparation by the review team and by the institution prior to the institutional review. It will also outline details of the review visit such as inception and debriefing meetings with management, presentations by faculties and departments, interaction with students and non-teaching staff, tour of facilities, processes observed, evidence examined and meetings of the review team at intervals during the review visit. It will also mention the review team's satisfaction with the arrangements made by the institution to facilitate the conduct of the review in a cost-effective manner with minimal wastage of time during the five-day period. The degree of commitment of the institution to openness, transparency, communications and logistical support should be recorded in this section.

**Section 4 -**Overview of the University's approach to Quality and Standards

This section will describe the key features of the university's approach and arrangements to quality assurance, any recent and proposed developments and evidence of the university's capacity to take action to remedy weaknesses and seek improvement. More importantly this section should deal with whether the university has a well-established IQAU), and whether the quality culture is well entrenched within the university. The commentary could include:

- a. availability of QA policies, manuals and reports
- b. internal quality assurance processes (cooperation between QA unit and the QA cells)
- c. existing practices within these processes have contributed to maintenance of standards
- d. necessary steps taken by the University to identify and implement measures that would enhance quality to achieve excellence.

**Section 5 -**Commentary on the eighteen criteria of Institutional Review

This presents the review team's analysis of the effectiveness of the university's processes under each of the eighteen criteria identified in the SER. Where appropriate, reference should be made to national guidelines and/or local codes of practice as a baseline for the review team's commentary. This section will conclude with a commentary on the overall (global/qualitative) impression of the review team on the capacity of the University to achieve and maintain the highest standards and quality expected under the eighteen criteria within the existing constraints of the University

## **Section 6 -Commendations and Recommendations**

This will list the commendations of policy and procedures for tertiary education, areas of good and innovative practice, quality of research and publications, approval and review of programmes and awards, quality of teaching and students' assessments, research and innovations, community engagement, national and international collaborations, management information systems etc. This list is not all inclusive and any comments on quality pertaining to excellence in higher education could be included under commendations.

This section will also make recommendations for remedial actions needed to bring about improvement and quality enhancement.

## **Section 7 –Summary**

This will be a summary of the review team's main findings as given under the different sections of the report.

### **6.0 Procedure for Submission of the Report**

Members of the review team will take responsibility for individual sections of the report. The Chair of the Institutional Review Team will coordinate the sections of the report to produce the final comprehensive report agreed to by the team to the University for response and comments.

The University's responses together with the review report will be considered by the Quality Assurance Committee of the Commission and recommendation made to the Board.

## **7.0 Request for Discussion**

The review team would already have given an indication of its conclusions at the final debriefing meeting with the Vice Chancellor and senior management of the University at the conclusion of the review visit where the latter would have had an opportunity to sort out any factual errors and misinterpretations made by the review team. However, on receiving the draft report from the Commission, the University may ask for a further discussion with the review team about the contents of the report, prior to publication.

## **8.0 Publication of the Report**

The outcome of institutional review is a published report. Its purpose is to inform the institution and external parties of the findings of the review and to provide a reference point to support and guide staff in their continuing quality assurance activities.

In particular, the report will give an overall judgment on the reviewer's assessment of the performance of the institution with regard to quality assurance supported by a commentary on:

- a. the rigour and robustness of the university's mechanisms for discharging its responsibility for the standard of its awards; the quality of the education it provides; the effectiveness of its planning, quality and resource management; and the efficiency of its administration;
- b. the sufficiency, reliability of the evidence used and its accessibility to external scrutiny;
- c. commentary with commendations and recommendations to encourage further excellence and/or improvement.

The draft report will be submitted to the QAC by the review team's Chairman. After the University accepts the Institutional review report, it will enter the public domain through

the Commission's website so that all stakeholders including students, graduates, prospective employers, grant providing agencies, educationists and policymakers have access to it.

The Minister for Education will be served with a copy of the report.