

REPUBLIC OF RWANDA



HIGHER EDUCATION COUNCIL

P.O.BOX 6311 KIGALI

**HANDBOOK FOR ACADEMIC QUALITY ASSURANCE
AND ENHANCEMENT AND THE MAINTENANCE OF
STANDARDS IN HIGHER EDUCATION**

Revised August 2007

Revised August 2007

**HANDBOOK FOR ACADEMIC QUALITY ASSURANCE AND
ENHANCEMENT AND THE MAINTENANCE OF STANDARDS IN HIGHER
EDUCATION**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents	2
GLOSSARY/KEY CONCEPTS.....	8
REQUIREMENTS FOR PRIVATE PROVIDERS GAINING DEGREE- AWARDING POWERS (ACCREDITATION)	24
Introduction.....	25
Procedure	25
The provisional operating licence	26
Criteria	28
REQUIREMENTS FOR PRIVATE PROVIDERS GAINING UNIVERSITY/SPECIALIST INSTITUTE STATUS.....	30
THE PROCEDURES FOR PUBLIC AND PRIVATE PROVIDERS TO GAIN PERMISSION TO INTRODUCE A NEW SUBJECT OR TO OFFER A SUBJECT AT A DIFFERENT LEVEL	33
Introduction.....	34
The application for preliminary planning approval	34
Definitive approval	35
HANDBOOK FOR INSTITUTIONAL AUDIT	36
Introduction.....	37
The Qualification Framework and Code of Practice for the Assurance of Academic Quality and Standards in Higher Education	40
Audit Method	42
The Aims and Purpose of Institutional Audit	42
Focuses for Institutional Audit.....	44
Information	45
The Process	45
Membership of the Audit Team.....	47
The Audit Visit	48
The Outcomes and Audit Report	48
HANDBOOK FOR SUBJECT REVIEW	51
Introduction.....	52
Focus for Subject Review	52
Review Panel Membership	53
The Self-Assessment.....	53

Purpose of the Subject Review Visit	54
Procedure	55
The Outcome and Review Report.....	58
APPENDICES	59
QUALIFICATION FRAMEWORK AND CODE OF PRACTICE FOR THE ASSURANCE OF ACADEMIC QUALITY AND STANDARDS IN HIGHER EDUCATION	60
HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE AND ACADEMIC STANDARDS	64
Institutional Infrastructure Standards.....	65
Standards for Internal Quality Assurance of Programmes	72
APPLICATION FOR ACCREDITATION (DEFINITIVE OPERATING AGREEMENT) FOR A PRIVATE INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION	83
BASE ROOM FOR INSTITUTIONAL AUDIT PANEL VISIT.....	97
BASE ROOM FOR SUBJECT REVIEW PANEL VISIT	100
HANDBOOK FOR INSTITUTIONAL AUDITORS	102
Introduction.....	103
Institutional Visit	103
Areas for Consideration by the Audit Panel during the Visit	104
Institutional Mission	104
Institutional Management of Academic Standards.....	104
Institutional Management of Learning Opportunities	105
Academic Support Services	106
Institutional approaches to Quality Assurance and Enhancement.....	106
Research and Consultancy	108
Administrative and Management Issues	108
Deliberations and Decision of the Audit Panel.....	110
Audit Programme.....	110
HANDBOOK FOR SUBJECT REVIEWERS	113
Introduction.....	114
Curriculum Design, Content and Organisation.....	115
The Teaching, Learning and Assessment Strategy	116
Student Progression and Achievement	119
Student Support and Guidance.....	120

Learning Resources.....	120
Quality Management and Enhancement	121
Research, Consultancy and Knowledge Transfer	122
Compliance with the Rwandan National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education and the Code of Practice	122
Deliberations and Decision of the Subject Review Panel.....	122
Subject Review Programme.....	123
Agenda Meeting with Current /Former Students.....	126
Agenda Meeting with Employers	128
Observation of Teaching and Learning.....	130
Evaluation of Teaching and Learning Form	132
Review of Effectiveness of Assessment	137
GUIDELINES FOR UNDERTAKING A SELF-EVALUATION	139
Introduction.....	140
Guidelines for Preparing Self Evaluations for Institutional Audit/Subject Review	142
Planning	144
Assembling the Information and Evidence.....	147
Sources of Information	147
The Institution in Context	147
Evidence.....	150
Judgements.....	150
Reporting.....	151
Actions and Monitoring	153
The Portfolio of Evidence	153
Submission of the Self Evaluation/Briefing Paper	154
PROGRAMME PROPOSAL FORM	155
INSTITUTIONAL FACILITATOR.....	162
STUDENT BRIEFING PAPER	165

PREFACE

This *Handbook* sets out the requirements in Rwanda for:

1. The granting of accreditation to private providers of higher education;
2. The granting of the ‘University/Specialist Institute’ title to private providers of higher education;
3. The procedures for public and private providers of higher education gaining permission to introduce a new subject and/or to offer a subject(s) at a different level;
4. Periodic institutional audits of all providers of higher education, public and private;
5. Periodic reviews of subject provision in public and private institutions of higher education.

The intention is to assure the quality and maintain the standards of the higher education awards offered by institutions of higher education, and the research, consultancy, knowledge transfer and community engagement undertaken by the higher institutions. (Higher education is defined as all education that is of a higher level than the secondary school leaving certificate.)

The requirements set out in this *Handbook* apply to all higher education provision delivered in Rwanda. The awards available are set out in the *Rwandan National Higher Education Qualifications Framework* but, institutions may also offer non certificated short courses. Programmes offered in Rwanda validated by an overseas provider whether by the overseas provider or a local institution will be subject to the Council’s *Rwandan National Policy on Cross-border and Transnational Higher Education*. The *Handbook* will be subject to amendment from time to time. The Council will endeavour to ensure that all providers of higher education in Rwanda are notified when changes are made, but cannot guarantee to do so. Providers are advised to check the Council’s web pages on a regular basis. All licensing decisions, approvals to deliver new subjects, institutional audits and subject reviews will be conducted using the version of the *Handbook*; current when the application is submitted/the audits/reviews are carried out. However, all licensing decisions will be subject to the provider meeting all Rwandan legal requirements at the point at which

the accreditation is offered and subject to the provider remaining compliant with the law.

In order to promote public confidence that the quality of higher education provision and the standards of awards are being safeguarded and enhanced, the Government of Rwanda has determined that all provision in Rwanda will be demonstrably fit for purpose, and that awards will be benchmarked to international standards. This will ensure that qualifications gained in Rwanda are recognised as credible, both nationally and internationally. Only institutions that are either established by law (public higher education providers) or are accredited- have a definitive operating licence (private providers) will have the right to confer higher education qualifications/awards. To this end the Government of Rwanda has established the Higher Education Council. The Council has put in place procedures for enabling the recognition of private providers and enabling them to gain higher education qualifications awarding powers, as well as procedures for the periodic audit and subject review of all higher education providers, public and private.

Higher education institutions are responsible for managing the academic standards and quality of their awards and the research, consultancy and community service they undertake. The Higher Education Council judges how well they fulfil their responsibilities and the effectiveness of their processes. One of the main responsibilities of the Higher Education Council is to promote public confidence that the quality of higher education provision and the standards of awards offered are being safeguarded and enhanced. It also encourages higher education institutions to keep improving their management of quality. This *Handbook* describes the method and procedures used by the Council in furtherance of this responsibility.

The National Qualifications Framework and Code of Practice for the Assurance of Academic Quality and Standards in Higher Education (Appendix 1) provides institutions with a framework for, and guidance on, the ways in which they can demonstrate that its provision meets the required quality and standards. Elements of the *Code* are mandatory while other aspects provide guidance which should support providers in meeting the requirements. The *Code* will be amended and be added to

from time to time and providers should ensure that they have the most up-to-date version.

Public confidence in the quality and standards of higher education depends on the availability of public information that is objective and independent. The Council provides this by carrying out institutional audits of all providers, and reviews of the subjects taught in higher education institutions, as well as by being responsible for advising the Minister of Education on applications from private providers for accreditation, higher education qualification awarding powers, and the right to use the university/specialist institute title. It is also responsible for recommending to the Minister that higher education institutions can offer new subjects or offer a subject at an additional level. Institutional audit reports on the institution's management of standards and quality and provides confidence that the providers have in place policies, procedures and practices to assure and promote the quality of their provision and maintain the standards of their awards. Subject review is concerned with the standard of the learning outcomes of programmes of learning and the quality of student learning opportunities. The reports from all audits and reviews are made publicly available. The methodology used by the Council is one based on the verification of institutions self assessments by teams of expert peers.

(Note: provider and institution are used interchangeable in this policy – all higher education delivered in Rwanda whether it is delivered by an institution of higher education or another provider comes under the provision of this policy. The term 'degree awarding' is used to refer to the rights of provider to award any higher education qualification. A higher education qualification is any post the secondary school leaving certificate qualification.)

REPUBLIC OF RWANDA



HIGHER EDUCATION COUNCIL

GLOSSARY/KEY CONCEPTS

Academic Awards

Academic awards mark the outcome or successful completion of a course or programme of study that leads to a Rwandan qualification such as a degree, diploma or certificate. The Rwandan Qualifications Framework for Higher Education provides details of higher education awards that may be offered.

Academic Quality

Academic quality describes how well the learning opportunities available to students help them to achieve their award. It is about making sure that the appropriate and effective teaching, support, assessment and learning opportunities are provided.

Academic Registrar

The Academic Registrar is the senior manager responsible for all administrative matters related to the recruitment, assessment and progression of students, and conferment of awards. The Academic Registrar is responsible for maintaining and interpreting the Academic Regulations and overseeing the organisation of graduation ceremonies. The Academic Registry should normally have four departments - recruitment, assessment, awards and graduation and a secretariat that clerks Senate and Senate Standing Committees.

Academic Staff

See college tutor, tutorial assistant, lecturer, assistant lecturer, senior lecturer, associate professor and professor.

Academic Standards

The level of achievement a student has to reach to gain an academic award. This level should be comparable to similar programmes across Rwanda and be internationally credible for the level of the award. External examining is one way of maintaining these standards within higher education institutions. The Rwandan National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education provides guidance on the learning outcomes standards expected at each level of higher education across five dimensions – subject knowledge and understanding, subject skills, cognitive skills, and generic and graduate skills.

Accreditation

Accreditation is the process leading to the granting of a definitive operating licence to a private provider of higher education. See Definitive Operating Licence.

Affiliated Institution

A higher education institution that does not have qualification awarding powers of its own, but offers the awards by a higher education institution that has qualification awarding powers and to which it is affiliated. The institution is managerially and financially independent but, the qualification awarding institution is responsible for assuring the quality and standards of the awards. An affiliated institution works within the requirements of the validating institution to assure the standards of the programmes and awards they offer in the name of that validating institution. *See Collaborative Provision*

Assessment

Assessment is academic work done by students and marked by academic staff – both formative and summative. It includes course work, laboratory reports, practical exercises, dissertations, presentation, in-course examinations and end of module examinations. Assessment can be formative – designed mainly to provide feedback to students on their performance, and summative- primarily to contribute to the award of academic credit.

Audit Panel Members

The Higher Education Council uses a peer review process, where academics that work in higher education are appointed to teams. The institutions of higher education (public and private) are invited to nominate senior colleagues, but independent applications are also accepted from candidates with appropriate qualifications, experience and knowledge of higher education. Successful applicants are not employees of the Council; they are contracted to work for the Council. Panels are normally chaired by the Director General or one of the Directors of the Council. All panel members are trained prior to undertaking audits. This ensures they understand: the aims and objectives of the audit; the procedures; their role, tasks, the importance of teamwork, and rules of conduct; and, techniques for assimilating data, analysis, hypothesis testing, forming judgements and preparing reports.

Awarding Institution

A university, specialist institute, college of higher education or other higher education institution which awards degrees, diplomas, certificates or credits. Only institutions established by law to award higher education qualifications or granted accreditation may award higher education qualifications in Rwanda.

Blended learning

Learning delivered to students on and /or off campus using a combination of methods e.g. face-to-face, print materials, e learning.

Board of Directors

The highest strategic decision making body of a higher education institution. It is responsible for the governance of the institution, the strategic direction, the financial strategy and the oversight of finance, and the oversight of collaborative agreements.

Borderless Higher Education

See Cross-border/Transnational Higher Education

Code of Practice

A set of policies, guides and toolkits designed to support the higher education institutions in Rwanda deliver higher education that is fit for purpose and internationally credible. Together with the *Rwandan National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education* it provides a set of nationally agreed reference points that help describe good practice and academic standards. It addresses all award-bearing activity, wherever or however provided. The Higher Education Council has published the Academic Infrastructure which includes the *National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education* as well as the *Code of Practice*. It was officially lauHECd by the Minister of Education on the 21st April 2007. It will be subject to amendment from time to time and additional elements may be added to the *Code of Practice*.

Collaborative Provision

Educational provision leading to an award of an awarding higher education institution developed, delivered and assessed through partnership arrangements with a collaborating institution, for example, the Colleges of Education delivering a Diploma leading to the award of a College of Education, University of Rwanda Diploma in Education. *See also Franchise*

College of Education

A College of Education is a higher education institution training teachers for lower secondary schools, and affiliated to, and offering awards in collaboration with the College of Education, University of Rwanda.

College of Higher Education

A college of higher education is an independent and self –governing body which may or may not have qualification awarding powers. Colleges that do not have qualification awarding powers prepare their students for the qualifications of a degree awarding institution.

College of Nursing

A higher education institution training nurses and affiliated to and offering awards in collaboration with the College of Medicine and Health Sciences, University of Rwanda

College of Technology

A higher education institution training engineers and affiliated to and offering awards in collaboration with the College of Science and Technology, University of Rwanda

College Tutor (Assistant College Tutor, Senior College Tutor)

Teachers employed to teach in Colleges of Higher Education. Assistant college tutors must have a second class honours upper division degree from a Rwandan higher education institution or equivalent in the subject area they are teaching, A college tutor must have a masters degree in the subject area they are teaching and a senior college tutor is an experienced member of staff who is promoted on the basis of having been judged to meet the published criteria. College tutors are expected to become qualified higher education teachers by taking a Postgraduate Certificate in Teaching and Learning in Higher Education. College tutors employed in public sector higher education institutions are expected to be on the Register of Recognised Higher Education Academic Staff. *See National Policy on Academic Appointment and Promotion Procedures*

Cross-border/ transnational Provision

Cross-border higher education refers to a wide range of educational activities that are part of international academic linkages and agreements, international development/aid projects or international commercial trade initiatives. Transnational higher education refers to all types of education in which learners are located in a country other than that of the awarding institution. Borderless education refers to the blurring of conceptual, disciplinary and geographic borders traditionally inherent in higher education. *See the Code of Practice for Cross-border/transnational Provision*

Definitive Operating Licence

An operating licence awarded to an institution following an accreditation visit. The licence specifies the subjects and levels at which the institution can deliver higher education awards as well as the faculties, schools and research centres recognised. The awards of a private higher education institution that are listed in its delimitative

operating licence are recognised. A licensed private higher education institution that wishes to offer new awards must make application to the Higher Education Council. See the *Procedures for Public and Private Providers to Gain Permission to Introduce a New Subject or to Offer a Subject at a Different Level*

Director of Academic Quality

Senior academic manager responsible for the academic quality of taught programmes – under graduate and post graduate. Specific responsibilities including ensuring that all academic programmes are validated delivered and assessed in line with the requirements of the *Rwandan National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education* and the associated *Code of Practice*.

Director of Research and Consultancy

Senior academic manager responsible for research and consultancy activities. The Director of Research and Consultancy may also be responsible for postgraduate research programmes.

Discipline

A defined area of academic study e.g. all types of engineering

External Examining

A system in which senior academics external to the awarding institution are appointed to be members of the boards of examiners for each degree programme and /or subject taught. External examining helps the higher education institution maintain academic standards, and ensure that assessment procedures are fair and fairly operated. External examiners are independent and impartial advisors and ensure that assessment processes are fair and fairly operated. External examiners comment on students' achievement in relation to national and international standards. They help to ensure the comparability of standards.

Distance Programme

Validated programmes offered off campus. The materials utilised for teaching may be printed and/or electronic. Summer schools and/or tutorials involving face- to- face

teaching may be offered, and the programme may involve e and blended learning. *See the Code of Practice for Distance Learning*

Executive Council

The Executive Council advises the Rector on the management of the institution. All senior management staff, academic and non academic are members of the executive council.

E-Learning

Learning delivered electronically to students on and/or off campus.

External Review

External review is an external scrutiny process that examines and judges standards and quality in a higher education institution. It is undertaken by people who do not work for the institution. In Rwanda there are two external review processes – institutional audit, and subject review. External review covers taught programmes, postgraduate research programmes, research, consultancy and community service.

Fit for Purpose

Fit for purpose means that the education provision enables the students to achieve the intended learning outcomes. Normally the intended learning outcomes should be designed to meet the needs of Rwanda and learners.

Franchise

A higher education provider being licensed to deliver an award developed and validated by a higher education institution. The validating institution remains responsible for the quality, standards and content of the award. The award should be of the same quality and standard as the equivalent awards delivered in the validating institution. There should be a formal Memorandum of Understanding between the delivering and awarding institutions. *See also Collaborative Provision, and Cross-border/transnational Provision*

Higher Education

Any education provision leading to award that is beyond the school leaving certificate. It includes all undergraduate awards and all postgraduate provisions.

Higher Education Institution

A higher education institution is an institution that offers programmes leading to awards beyond the school leaving examination as its main or only activity. Institutions must be established by law (public) or have a definitive operating licence (private). Institutions may have qualification awarding powers or offer the qualification of other higher education institutions that they are affiliated to or have a formal memorandum of understanding with.

Higher Education Provider

A higher education provider is any organisation that provides education at a level higher than the school leaving examination. The organisation must be registered with the Higher Education Council. A provider who is not a higher education institution as defined here may only offer awards validated by such an institution and must do so under a formal memorandum of understanding approved by the Higher Education Council. If the validating higher education is outside of Rwanda the provisions of the *Code of Practice for Cross-border/transnational Provision* must be adhered to.

Institutional Audit

Institutional audit is a quality assurance review process that focuses on the procedures a higher education institution uses to assure its academic standards and quality. It evaluates how the institution satisfies itself that its chosen standards are being achieved and makes a judgement about threshold standards.

Internationally Credible

Awards are internationally credible if they are recognised by other countries as meeting their standards for the same level of award. Awards are generally benchmarked at the honours degree, masters and doctoral levels.

Joint Programme

An undergraduate taught programme where a student studies two equally weighted subjects. The student may do any project in one subject or do a project that combines the two. A minor is a subject pathway on an undergraduate programme that takes up less than a third of a student's learning effort time and is awarded less than a third of the total credit available for the programme the student is on. A student may take a minor in combination with a major subject or may take a triple minor degree (three equally weighted subjects). *See Rwandan National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education*

Language Policy

The language of instruction and learning in higher education is English. All teaching and assessment must be in English except when students are being taught another language, all students must meet a minimum level of competency in English by the end of level 2 of their programme.

Law on Higher Education

Law N°27/2013 of 24/05/2013 Governing the Organisation and Functioning of Higher Education.

Learning Outcomes

The specification of what the student is expected to know and be able to do on completion of the module or level, or programme. They are the end product of the learning process.

Lecturer (Assistant Lecturer, Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Associates Professor, Professor)

A member of staff of a higher education institution employed to teach, carry out research, engage in consultancy and knowledge transfer and provide service to the community. The minimum qualification for appointment as an assistant lecturer is a progression master's degree equivalent to Level 6 in *The Rwandan National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education*. Lecturing staff are expected to become qualified higher education teachers by taking a Postgraduate Certificate in Teaching and Learning in Higher Education. Lecturers employed in public sector higher education institutions are expected to be on the Register of Recognised Higher

Education Academic Staff. *See National Policy on Academic Appointment and Promotion Procedures*

Managing Quality

The Code of Practice is a guideline on good practice and also provides model policies, and procedures and toolkits for managing and enhancing quality. It is designed to support institutions in managing the quality and standards of their academic provision. All institutions of higher education are responsible for maintaining the standards of their awards and the quality of education they provide. Within each institution a Senate (qualification awarding institution)/ Academic Board (affiliate institute) supported by standing committees has the responsibility for this work.

Major Subject

A major is a subject pathway on an undergraduate programme that takes up two thirds or slightly more of a students learning effort time and is awarded two thirds or more of the total credit available for the programme the student is on. A student takes a major in combination with a minor subject (three equally weighted subjects). Students normally do their project in the subject area of the major. *See Rwandan National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education*

Minor Subject

A minor is a subject pathway on an undergraduate programme that takes up less than a third of a students learning effort time and is awarded less than a third of the total credit available for the programme the student is on. A student may take a minor in combination with a major subject or may take a triple minor degree (three equally weighted subjects). If a student takes a triple minor they will normally do their dissertation in one subject area or do an interdisciplinary dissertation combining two or three of subject areas they are studying. *See Rwandan National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education*

Notional Hours of Student Learning Effort

The learning hours it is conceived an average learner will take to achieve the learning outcomes. It includes class contact time, time spent in directed learning, practical activities, individual learning, course work, and revising for and taking examinations. One credit is awarded for 10 hours of notional student learning effort (the time it would take the average learner to achieve the learning outcomes).

Performance Review

Performance review is an appraisal system for academic staff whereby they agree their major performance targets for the upcoming year in the context of their post profile with their line manager and are evaluated on the achievement of these targets. Academic staff also agree their workload as part of this process. *See also Workload Planning*

Personal Progress Files

Personal Progress Files are designed to help students learn and to make the results of learning more explicit. All students are expected to be supported in personal progress planning and must have their file assessed and approved before they take their final examinations.

Programme

A programme provides structured teaching and learning opportunities which lead to an award for example e.g. a Diploma in Secretarial Studies, an Honours Degree in Electrical Engineering, Masters in Social and Educational Research Methods..

Programme Specification

A programme specification provides detailed information including the aims of the programme, the learning outcomes, the resources available, and detailed information on the modules taught.

Project

The report of the research carried out by students for credit on the final year of an undergraduate degree with honours and on a master's programme. Project work is designed to enable students to demonstrate that they can work on their own with minimum supervision from a member of academic staff. Memoirs and dissertation are

alternative terms used. *See Rwandan National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education and Model Research Methods Handbook*

Quality Assurance

All the systems, resources and information devoted to the maintaining and improvement of standards and quality. It covers teaching and learning opportunities, student support services, research and consultancy and community service.

Quality Enhancement

The policies, procedures and practices designed to improve the quality of provision.

Quality Management System

The combination of process used to ensure that quality and standards are maintained and improved.

Quality Transformation

Quality transformation is the process of transforming higher education in Rwanda so that it is fit for purpose, and produces graduates, research and consultancy that is internationally credible.

Research Quality

The quality of academic research is usually measured by reference to peer review process such as the winning of competitive research bids and the publication of articles in peer review journals.

Rwandan National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education

The Framework sets out the higher education awards available in Rwanda, the credit required for each award and the main achievements and attributes of the major qualification titles.

Scholarship

Activities undertaken by academic staff to ensure that the material they are delivering to students is up-to-date and relevant. It can include activities such as personal study, professional practice, attending conferences, workshops and short courses, writing text books, preparing learning materials.

Self –evaluation

The document produced by an institution of higher education before an external visit – Definitive Operating Licence, Institutional Audit or Subject Review. The document draws on external reviews, evaluates the effectiveness of how standards and quality are managed, and identifies strengths and areas for improvement. The self-evaluation is a key reference point for the licensing/ audit/review panel and sets the context for the visit.

Semester

A semester is 15 week period during which students are taught and examined. The academic year is normally divided into two semesters. An institution may operate a three semester system for part time (evening/distance/weekend) programmes. Students on one year masters programmes are generally taught for two semesters and undertake their project in the remaining weeks of the calendar year. Academic staff should normally do all their face –to-face teaching in two semesters and have time during the rest of the year for research, scholarship and ensuring their teaching materials and student resources including module and programme handbooks are up-to-date.

Senate

The Senate is the supreme academic body responsible for all academic matters. It is chaired by the Rector and has in membership all senior academic managers as well as elected representatives of academic staff and students.

Single Subject Programme

A single subject programme is a taught programme where a student studies one subject (discipline) or more than one subject (discipline) in combination as an integral part of an area of study. Students may take one or more other subjects in the first two

years as foundation for studying the degree subject, for example, mathematics on a physics degree, statistics on psychology, chemistry on a biology degree. Examples of single honours degrees are history, Latin, mathematics, anthropology, electrical engineering, economics, and examples of interdisciplinary degrees are business studies, environmental science, environmental studies, sports studies, classics, journalism. Any project is done in the subject of the programme. A minor is a subject pathway on an undergraduate programme that takes up less than a third of a student's learning effort time and is awarded less than a third of the total credit available for the programme the student is on. A student may take a minor in combination with a major subject or may take a triple minor degree (three equally weighted subjects). *See Rwandan National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education*

Specialist Institute

An established degree awarding institution that offers a narrow range of taught programmes and research generally in a technical field e.g. business studies, teacher training, engineering. Usually a specialist institute will offer postgraduate taught and research programmes as well as undergraduate degrees. Academic staff are expected to engage in research and consultancy as an integral part of their contractual duties..

Standards

The infrastructure, human and physical, and academic provision an institution makes to support its academic activities.

Student

A higher education student is registered by a provider to study for an award. A student should normally only be registered for one award at a time. A *full time student* is registered on a programme which requires them to devote 40 hours a week to their academic work for a 15 week semester. Normally they will be registered to take courses totalling 60 credits a semester. A full time student should **not** be in regular paid employment for more than a few hours a week during the semester. A *part-time student* is normally required to devote 20 hours a week to their academic work over a 15 week semester. Normally they register to take 30 credits a semester.

Subject

A subject is a broad area that may contain one or more programme of study, for example, business studies, mathematics, biology, education, medicine

Subject Review

An external review that judges the standards and quality of teaching and learning research, consultancy and community service at the subject level, normally the subject is reviewed across the institution. Subject reviews in Rwanda will normally group together all the subjects taught by a faculty.

Subject Review Team Members

The Higher Education Council uses a peer review process, where academics that work in higher education are appointed to teams. The institutions of higher education (public and private) are invited to nominate senior colleagues, but independent applications are also accepted from candidates with appropriate qualifications, experience and knowledge of higher education. Successful applicants are not employees of the Council; they are contracted to work for the Council. Teams of subject experts are normally chaired by the Director General or one of the Directors of the Council. All team members are trained prior to undertaking subject reviews. This ensures they understand: the aims and objectives of the subject review; the procedures; their role, tasks, the importance of teamwork, and rules of conduct; and, techniques for assimilating data, analysis and hypothesis testing, forming judgements, and preparing reports.

Tutorial Assistant

A tutorial assistant is a member of staff appointed on a two year contract to support learning and teaching activities. Tutorial assistants always work under the supervision of a member of academic staff. They are normally supported to commence study on an approved master's programme within two years of appointment. They must have a minimum of a second class honours (upper class) degree from a Rwandan institution of higher education or equivalent in the subject area they are supporting.

University

A university is an established degree awarding institution of higher education that teaches and carries out research in a range of subjects including technology. Usually a

university will offer postgraduate taught and research programmes as well as undergraduate degrees. Academic staff are expected to engage in research and consultancy as an integral part of their contractual duties.

Validation

Validation is the rigorous process by which a higher education institution approves its academic programmes for delivery. The process involves a consideration of the proposed programme by a validation panel which includes at least one external academic member who is an expert in the subject area of the proposed programme and normally an employer. The recommendations of the panel are confirmed by Senate. Programmes must be validated before being delivered for the first time, and periodically reviewed and revalidated.

Workload

The agreed distribution of time an academic member of staff spends on teaching and managing student learning, academic administration, scholarship, research, consultancy and other agreed activities. Academic staff agree their workload with their line manager at least once a year. *See Academic Workload Planning: National Policy and Practice.*

REPUBLIC OF RWANDA



HIGHER EDUCATION COUNCIL

REQUIREMENTS FOR PRIVATE PROVIDERS GAINING DEGREE-AWARDING POWERS (ACCREDITATION)

REQUIREMENTS FOR PRIVATE PROVIDERS GAINING DEGREE-AWARDING POWERS (ACCREDITATION)

Introduction

These regulations concern the granting of degree-awarding powers to private higher education institutions that have been granted a provisional operating licence in accordance with Article 17 of the Law Governing the Organisation and Functioning of Higher Education. Normally a provider should have had at least one cohort of students complete the level(s) of higher education provision for which degree-awarding powers are sought before application is made. Exceptionally a private provider may be permitted to apply before the first cohort of students have completed their programme(s), but if degree-awarding powers are granted they will be provisional, with final approval being given after the first cohort has completed their programme(s). To be awarded the power to award taught postgraduate degrees an institution will have to demonstrate that it has appropriate facilities for postgraduate teaching, that the staff delivering the programme are all qualified to PhD level and that a majority are undertaking appropriate and relevant research. To be granted PhD-awarding powers the institution will have to demonstrate that it has the facilities to supervise students, that the staff undertaking supervision are appropriately qualified and trained, and that they are carrying out research of high quality and publishing the findings in peer-reviewed outlets.

Procedure

1. The provider makes an application to the National Council, not earlier than two years after gaining a provisional operating licence or longer than six years. The application must specify the level of degrees for which degree awarding powers are sought and the subjects (see Appendix 4 for the *Application Form*);

2. The Provider is required to undergo an Institutional Audit, together with a Subject Review for each discipline taught at the institution. (see the relevant sections in this Handbook);
3. In addition to meeting the requirements of Institutional Audit and Subject Reviews (the detailed requirements for which are provided in the relevant sections of this Handbook and any related Appendices), and submitting the *Application Form* the provider is required to submit 10 copies (in French and English) of the following documents:

The provisional operating licence

- Details of any substantial changes to the information provided in the submission made for the provisional operating licence;
- A list of members of the permanent academic, administrative and technical staff, indicating their qualifications and grades;
- Audited accounts for each year since the institution was granted a provisional licence;
- An inventory of the fixed assets of the institution.

Appendix 2 sets out *Guidelines on Higher Education Infrastructure and Quality Standards*.

4. On receipt of the application the Higher Education Council, will arrange for a combined Institutional Audit and, Subject Reviews for all subjects taught at the institution. The Institutional Review Team will also consider the documentation required, in addition to that which is required for Institutional Audit and Subject Review, from private providers making application for degree-awarding powers. Scrutiny by the Higher Education Council establishes whether or not the applicant has reached a secure level of fitness for the powers being sought. The applicant must clearly demonstrate that there can be public confidence, both present and future, in the institution's systems for assuring the quality and standards of its degrees.
5. The Higher Education Council will make a recommendation to the Minister of Education based on the outcome of the Institutional Audit, the Subject Review(s) and consideration of the additional documentation. The recommendation can be one of the following:

- Definitive approval and degree-awarding powers for first degrees, taught post graduate degrees and doctoral degrees (Levels 1–7 of the *Rwandan National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education*);
- Definitive approval and degree-awarding powers for first degree and taught postgraduate degrees (Levels 1–6 of the *Rwandan National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education*);
- Definitive approval and degree-awarding powers for first degrees (Levels 1–5 in the *Rwandan National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education*);
- Definitive approval and provisional degree-awarding powers for first degrees (level 1-5 in the *Rwandan National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education*) – final approval to be confirmed following consideration of a paper-based Subject Review(s) when the first cohort of students have completed the requirements of their programmes;
- That the institution is not granted definitive approval and degree-awarding powers. In this case the Institution will be provided with a detailed list of the reasons for refusal and permitted to reapply provided it does so within six years of being granted a provisional licence. The Higher Education Council will determine the procedure for considering a resubmission in each individual case which may but will not necessarily include a full Institutional Audit and Subject Review(s);
- On receiving the report from the Higher Education Council the Minister will inform the institution of the outcome of their application. In the case of those awarded definitive approval and degree-awarding powers the agreement will specify the level of degrees and diplomas the institution can award, the subjects it can offer and the areas in which it can carry out research.
- Institutions awarded definitive approval and degree-awarding powers must apply to the Minister of Higher Education for approval if they wish to introduce new subjects and/or award

degrees at additional levels. Usually such application should be made when the institution is due to have an Institutional Audit but an application can be made at any time.

- Institutions with definitive operating licences will be subject to periodic Institutional Audit and Subject Reviews as set out in the manual.

Criteria

The provider will have to meet the requirements of Institutional Audit and Subject Review (s) as well as demonstrating they have sound financial management and the resources necessary to continue to deliver higher education of the necessary quality and standards. A judgement of confidence will be required for institutional audit, and if this is awarded the institution will be recommended for degree awarding powers for those subjects that are approved in subject review. If an institution is awarded a judgment of limited confidence, it will be required to take action as set out in Section 6 of the Handbook for Institutional Audit. If the Report is deemed to be satisfactory, the institution will be recommended for degree-awarding powers in those subjects that are approved in subject review.

In making their recommendations the Audit and Review Teams will be mindful of the different requirements for delivering taught undergraduate programmes, taught postgraduate programmes and providing supervision for doctoral programmes. In particular, where powers are sought to award doctoral degrees the audit and review teams will pay special attention to the level of professional knowledge of current research and advanced scholarly activity in the subjects of study. It will be expected that the institution's academic staff command the respect and confidence of their academic peers across the higher education sector as being worthy to deliver research degree programmes. Institutions wishing to offer research degrees should have in place a culture that actively supports creative, high-quality research and scholarship amongst its academic staff. Staff involved with research-degree supervision should have relevant knowledge, understanding and experience of current research in their own discipline and be able to demonstrate achievements that are recognised by the wider academic community to be of international standing - as evidenced by authoritative external peer review. In addition, providers must demonstrate that they

have in place quality assurance systems in line with the *Code of Practice for the Assurance of Academic Quality and Standards in Higher Education* and are providing capacity-building support for staff in carrying out the role of research supervisors.

REPUBLIC OF RWANDA



HIGHER EDUCATION COUNCIL

REQUIREMENTS FOR PRIVATE PROVIDERS GAINING UNIVERSITY/SPECIALIST INSTITUTE STATUS

REQUIREMENTS FOR PRIVATE PROVIDERS GAINING UNIVERSITY/SPECIALIST INSTITUTE STATUS

In most countries the use of the title ‘university’ is closely guarded and awarded only to institutions that clearly meet defined criteria. Controls are in place that regulate who may call themselves a university. This is both as an instrument of consumer protection and to protect the reputation of the countries’ higher education system by ensuring that those institutions that call themselves universities are recognisably similar and of a comparable standard. It is also to ensure that institutions that call themselves universities have the defining characteristics of a university

The Law Governing the Organisation and Functioning of Higher Education in Rwanda provides a clear definition of ‘University’ and ‘Specialist Institute’, and it is essential that only those institutions that meet the criteria are able to use the title. The Law is explicit that the only difference between a university and a specialist institute is the range of subjects taught, with the former expected to teach a broad range of subjects, including technology. University-sector institutions are expected to provide higher education at undergraduate and postgraduate levels as well as supervision for doctoral degrees, to undertake research that advances knowledge and to engage in community service. Only private institutions that can meet the criteria for offering the full range of higher education provision should be able to use the university/specialist institute title. The Government of Rwanda is mindful that institutions with the university/specialist institute title must be able to maintain the reputation of Rwandan Higher Education Institutions and be able to demonstrate that the quality of their awards will be of international standards in line with the Rwandan National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education, and that they fully meet the requirements of the Code of Practice. University/specialist institute status carries with it a responsibility for and a commitment to high standards and quality.

A private institution will be able to use the university title when it:

1. Delivers education across a broad range of subjects including science and technology;
2. Has been awarded a definitive operating licence and degree awarding powers;

3. Can demonstrate that at least 25 percent of staff are engaged in research that has led to outputs that have been subject to peer review.

A private institution will be able to use the specialist institute title when it:

1. Delivers education in a limited number of subjects;
2. Has been awarded a definitive operating licence and degree awarding powers
3. Can demonstrate that at least 25 percent of staff are engaged in research that has led to outputs that have been subject to peer review.

The Minister of Education will confer on an institution the right to use the title university/specialist institute when they meet the criteria. A private institution can request the Minister to confer on them the right either when they apply for degree awarding powers and definitive approval or when they are required to undergo a periodic Institutional Audit.

REPUBLIC OF RWANDA



HIGHER EDUCATION COUNCIL

**THE PROCEDURES FOR PUBLIC AND PRIVATE PROVIDERS TO GAIN
PERMISSION TO INTRODUCE A NEW SUBJECT OR TO OFFER A
SUBJECT AT A DIFFERENT LEVEL**

The Procedures for Public and Private Providers to Gain Permission to Introduce a New Subject or to Offer a Subject at a Different Level

Introduction

The Higher Education Council does not accredit individual programmes. It carries out institutional accreditation of private providers through the procedures for granting definitive approval. The Higher Education Council is also charged with periodically reviewing the quality and standards of all higher education provision through Institutional Audit and Subject Review. Institutions are expected to validate taught programmes using procedures that conform to the requirements of the *Code of Practice* and specifically in this context the *Procedures for the Validation of Modules and Programmes*. Institutions adherence to the requirements will be tested during Institutional Audits and Subject Review Visits.

However, where an institution wishes to introduce a new subject (or faculty/department) or provide a subject at a different level they must:

1. Apply for preliminary planning approval to the Council at an early stage;
2. Use an external reviewer(s) on the validation panel who is, either on the Higher Education Council's *Register of Auditors, Reviewers and External Examiners* or apply to the Council for the external reviewer(s) to be approved by the Council;
3. Submit the report of the validation panel(s), the relevant minutes from Senate and the Board of Directors and a copy of the programme specification(s) to the Council.

A programme should not be advertised and/or students recruited until the Council has given preliminary planning approval. Student should not be enrolled/ registered on the programme until the Council has received the information as specified at 3 above, and in the case of a public provider the Cabinet have been informed.

The application for preliminary planning approval

This can be made using *The Programme Planning Pro-forma* (one form for each new programme to be developed) provided as a toolkit with the *Code of Practice* (see *Appendix 10*). This should be accompanied by:

1. A letter requesting preliminary planning approval for the new subject signed by the Rector (note where the request is for a new faculty/department a preliminary planning approval form should be completed for each programme to be developed);
2. Confirmation from the Board of Directors that the funding is available for any additional human and/or physical resources necessary to develop and deliver the programme;
3. Confirmation by the Academic Council, Senate and Board of Directors that it is in line with the institution's Mission;
4. The staffing plan showing the grades of staff to deliver the programme and when they will be recruited if they are not already in post;
5. For post-graduate courses evidence of the academic research being engaged in by staff to underpin the delivery of the program.

Providers are advised to consult the following documents when developing a new programme:

- *Rwandan National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education;*
- *The Code of Practice;*
- *The Higher Education Institutional Infrastructure and Academic Standards Document*

Definitive approval

Definitive approval should be requested by: submitting the report of the validation panel(s), the relevant minutes from Senate and the Board of Directors and a copy of the programme specification(s) and other materials provided to the validation panel. Provided the validation(s) have been carried out in accordance with the Council's guideline then approval will be given.

REPUBLIC OF RWANDA



HIGHER EDUCATION COUNCIL

HANDBOOK FOR INSTITUTIONAL AUDIT

HANDBOOK FOR INSTITUTIONAL AUDIT

Introduction

An institution scheduled for institutional audit (or applying for definitive approval) has to prepare a document (a briefing paper) setting out their approach to managing the quality and standards of their academic work including teaching and learning, research, consultancy, knowledge transfer and community engagement in line with their Mission. This document provides information on the process. Central to institutional audit is the preparation and submission of a briefing paper – a self evaluation of the ways and extent to which the institution assures and enhances the quality of its provision. In preparing their self evaluations institutions are advised to read this document carefully and to consult the *Handbook for Institutional Auditors* (Appendix 7), the *Qualification Framework and Code of Practice for the Assurance of Academic Quality and Standards in Higher Education* (Appendix 1) and *Higher Education Institutional Infrastructure and Academic Standards* (Appendix 2). Institutions should also consult relevant Government policies including those on higher education, and strategic planning guidance issued from time to time by the Higher Education Council. Public sector institutions may find the questionnaires provided for private sector institutions useful when preparing their briefing paper. Guidance on writing a self evaluation is provided in Appendix 9. Institutions may find the guidance useful when preparing their briefing paper. Appendix 12 provides guidance for students in preparing their briefing paper.

Institutions are expected to provide a base room for the use of the audit panel during their visit. Appendix 5 provides details of what is required. Institutions are advised to appoint a senior member of staff as an institutional facilitator. Appendix 11 provides details of the role of the institutional facilitator. Appendix 7 contains a copy of the *Institutional Audit Reviewers Handbook*. Institutions may find it useful to consult this while they are preparing their briefing paper. The *Handbook* also contains a copy of the timetable for the visit by the audit panel to institutions.

Institutional Audit evaluates an institution's policies, systems, strategies and resources for quality management of the core functions of teaching and learning, research,

knowledge transfer, consultancy and community service using the Council's audit criteria. It is also concerned with outcome standards of teaching and research. Quality management includes arrangements for quality assurance, quality support and quality enhancement, and covers aspects of input, processes and outcomes. Institutional audit will seek to assess an institution's capacity for quality management of its academic activities in a manner that meets its specific mission, goals and objectives, and engages appropriately with the expectations and needs of various internal and external constituencies.

Quality management entails a number of institutional planning and action to address issues of quality and standards. These include institutional arrangements for:

- Quality assurance – the policies, systems, strategies and resources used by the institution to satisfy itself that its quality requirements and standards are being met;
- Quality support – the policies, systems, strategies and resources used by the institution to support and sustain existing levels of quality;
- Quality development and enhancement- the policies, systems, strategies and resources used by the institution to develop and enhance quality;
- Quality monitoring- the policies, systems, strategies and resources used by the institution to review, monitor and act on quality issues.

Institutional Audit in Rwanda is an evidence-based process carried out through peer review and forms part of the Rwandan Quality Assurance Framework. It is concerned with the way in which higher education institutions exercise their powers as degree-/diploma-awarding bodies, and each review results in a report that sets out the degree of confidence that may be reasonably be placed in the provider's ability to assure and enhance the quality of its provision and safeguard the standards of its awards in line with the requirements of the Qualifications Framework. It covers all the educational provision for which the institution is responsible. It is also concerned with the ways in which the institution assures the quality and standards of research undertaken by academic staff, consultancy and other knowledge transfer services offered by the institution and community service undertaken. Subject review which is also undertaken by the Council is concerned with the quality of student learning

experience, the learning outcomes they are supported in achieving and that graduates are both fit for purpose and internationally credible. The quality of research, consultancy, knowledge transfer, and community service is also considered as an integral aspect of subject review.

The Council's understanding of quality encompasses fitness for purpose, value for money, and individual and social transformation within an overarching fitness of purpose framework. With due allowance for mission differentiation and diversity, institutional audits assess whether institutions manage the quality of their core academic activities in a manner that:

- Is fit for purpose in advancing the institution's mission and goals;
- Addresses transformational challenges for the development of individual students as well as the requirements of social and economic development;
- Provides value for money in relation to the full range of higher education purposes.

It is a process by which the Higher Education Council assures all stakeholders in higher education that the institution has adequate and appropriate mechanisms to assure the quality and protect the standards of their educational provision. It is concerned with an evaluation of the way in which quality and standards are assured by institutions in the context of a commitment to continuous quality improvement. It provides public information on the soundness of an institution as a provider of HE qualifications of national and international credibility as well as producing high quality research, and providing services to support the social and economic development of the country.

1. Central to the review is the determination of the soundness of the provider's discharge of its powers as an awarding body. This is a question not only of the soundness of administrative procedures but also of the ways in which the provider discharges its responsibilities for granting nationally and internationally recognised academic awards in a coherent and consistent manner.
2. Institutional audit assesses whether institutions manage the quality of their core academic activities in a manner that is fit for purpose in advancing the

institution's mission, vision and strategic objectives and provides value for money. Specifically, Institutional Audit addresses the robustness and security of the systems supporting the institution's qualifications-awarding function.

3. Institutional audit balances the need for public credibility and independent and rigorous scrutiny with the recognition that institutions themselves are best placed to provide stakeholders with valid, reliable and up-to-date information about the academic standards of their awards and the quality of their educational provision. Institutional audit encourages institutions to be self-evaluative and is therefore a process that, in itself, offers opportunities for enhancement of institutional management of standards and quality.
4. All institutions of higher education will be subject to institutional audit every five years.

The Qualification Framework and Code of Practice for the Assurance of Academic Quality and Standards in Higher Education

The important points of reference for Institutional Audit for taught programmes and research degrees are provided by the *Qualification Framework and Code of Practice for the Assurance of Academic Quality and Standards in Higher Education*. Institutions should have in place the means of meeting the expectations contained in all sections of the *Code*. Institutions will be required to demonstrate that they have systems and policies in place to ensure that their awards are in line with the *National Qualifications Framework* and that they are complying with the *National Admissions Policy*. They must also demonstrate compliance with the *Code of Practice on Cross-border/Transitional Provision*.

Institutions must demonstrate that they conform to the underlying principles of the following elements of the *Code* and justify any variation of detail:

- *General Academic Regulations*
- *National Learning, Teaching and Assessment Policy*
- *Procedures for the Validation of Modules and Programmes*
- *National Policy on Language Teaching in Higher Education*
- *National Policy on Academic Appointment and Promotion Procedures*

- *Calculating Academic Staffing in Higher Education Institutions*
- *National Equality and Diversity Policy for Higher Education*
- *Code of Practice – Examinations*
- *Code of Practice – Distance Learning*
- *National Policy on Internal and External Moderation*
- *Standards for Student Programme and Module Handbooks*
- *Academic Work Load Planning: National Policy and Practice*
- (If appropriate) *Framework and Regulations for Higher Degrees by Research*

This document must be adopted by PRIVATE PROVIDERS, and they must demonstrate that they conform to its requirements:

- *Code of Practice for Operating Private Higher Education Institutions*

This document must be adopted by PUBLIC SECTOR INSTITUTIONS, and they must demonstrate that they conform to its requirements:

- *Staff Development Policy for Public Sector Institutions*

Other elements of the *Code* are provided for guidance and should assist institutions meeting the expectations placed on them.

(Note that additional mandatory and guidance elements may be added to the *Code* and that the existing *Code* may be updated from time to time. HEIs will be consulted on any proposed changes and notified about any that have been made. The Quality Enhancement Page on the Higher Education Council's website will have the most up-to-date version. In case of dispute the English version is authoritative.)

In addition institutions will be expected to provide information as to how they assure the quality and standards of research undertaken by academic staff, and consultancy and other knowledge transfer services offered by the institution, and community service undertaken.

All institutions will have to show that they meet the requirements set out in the *Higher Education Institutional Infrastructure and Academic Standards Document (Appendix 2)*.

Audit Method

The Council has laid down a set of criteria for the conduct of audit. The criteria will serve as guidelines when institutions are writing their self evaluation reports. Audit panels will interpret and apply the criteria to the designated audit areas, with due consideration of the institution's mission, context, goals, and level of development of the institution being audited.

The Council employs an audit method consisting of institutional self evaluation followed by external validation by peers and experts. Self evaluation requires institutions to develop an audit portfolio, with supporting information and evidence, in which the effectiveness and efficiency of the institution's management of the quality of core academic activities are evaluated against the Council's audit criteria and any other relevant quality criteria the institution has set for itself.

It should be noted that the criteria cover two broad areas which will form the focus of evaluation during the audit:

1. Mission of the institution; links between planning, resource allocation and quality management;
2. Teaching, learning, learning, research, consultancy, knowledge transfer and community engagement.

The Aims and Purpose of Institutional Audit

The aims of institutional audit are to meet the public interest in knowing that higher education providers in Rwanda have:

- A mission, goals and objectives that are responsive to national, regional and international contexts. The transformational role that institutions are required to play within the national higher education context is important here. Key documents are *Vision 2020*, the *Poverty Reduction and Economic Strategy*, the *National Science, Technology, Scientific Research and Innovation Policy*.
- Effective means of ensuring that the awards and qualifications in higher education are of an academic standard at least consistent with those referred to and that the institutions are exercising their powers as degree-awarding bodies in a proper manner

- Institutional arrangements for a quality management system include: quality assurance policies, systems and strategies that enable institutions to satisfy themselves that quality standards and systems are being met; quality support policies, systems, strategies and resources that are used by the institution to support and sustain existing levels of quality; and quality monitoring policies, systems, strategies and resources used by the institution to review, monitor and act on quality issues.
- A quality culture and a commitment to continuous improvement, particularly by building on information gained through monitoring, internal and external reviews and feedback from stakeholders;
- Effective means of providing learning opportunities of a quality that enables students, whether on taught or research programmes, to achieve higher education awards and qualifications.

The objectives of the process are to:

- Ensure that institutions have in place effective systems for fulfilling their missions and achieving their objectives in an efficient and effective manner and are able to demonstrate the relevance of the provision they are making;
- Ensure that policies, practices and procedures are in place to ensure that the academic standards of higher education awards and qualifications are maintained and securely managed;
- Enable students and other stakeholders to have confidence in the learning opportunities that are provided and the quality and standards of academic provision;
- Contribute, in conjunction with subject review, to the promotion and enhancement of quality in teaching, learning and assessment;
- Ensure that the institution has in place , as appropriate to its mission, systems for supporting, monitoring and evaluating the quality and standard of research, consultancy, knowledge transfer and community service engaged in by academic staff

Focuses for Institutional Audit

1. Institutional Mission – the institution has a clearly stated mission and purpose with goals and priorities, which are responsive to its local, national and international context. There are effective strategies in place for the realisation and monitoring of these goals and priorities. Human, financial and infrastructural resources are available to achieve these goals and priorities.
2. Institutional Management of Academic Standards – the institution has systems in place for external examiners, external reviewers, and assessment policies and regulations to ensure the maintenance of academic standards.
3. Institutional Management of Learning Opportunities - the use made of external examiners and reviewers, research and other scholarly activity to inform teaching, learning resources, admission policies, student support and guidance, staff appraisal and academic staff development including staff engaging with pedagogic developments in their discipline.
4. Academic Support Services - including the library, learning materials, computer support services, teaching accommodation, specialist facilities, ancillary support for learning and teaching.
5. Institutional approaches to Quality Assurance and Enhancement – the existence of a quality assurance handbook readily available to all academic staff, the use made of external examiner reports, internal and external review, student feedback, management information, dissemination of good practice and staff development to enhance quality
6. (Where appropriate) Institutional Arrangements for Postgraduate Research Students - including the arrangements for supervision and the training of supervisors, student feedback, monitoring of student progress and the provision made for students;
7. Institutional arrangements for the quality assurance, development, support, increasing productivity and monitoring of research and consultancy activities;
8. Administrative and Management Issues - including governance, leadership, academic management, the admission of students and support of students, staff appointment procedures, development opportunities, appraisal and promotion. The qualities and competencies of academic staff are appropriate for a provider with degree-awarding powers, including maintaining high

professional standards and acceptance of the professional responsibilities of operating in a higher education environment.

9. Community Service and Good Governance – the institution plays an active role in inculcating an ethic of community service and the ways these are linked to learning and teaching.

Information

An audit team will have available to it a variety of information sources including:

1. A briefing paper prepared by the institution outlining its approach to managing the security of the academic standards of its awards and the quality of its educational provision and evaluating the effectiveness of its approach. An index to the briefing paper will list all the existing documents cited by the institution to illustrate its approach and support its evaluation of that approach. The documents will be made available to the team during the visit and the Review Team may request documents in advance of the visit.
2. The briefing paper is the principal reference document considered by the team undertaking the audit. The paper is an analytical and critical self-evaluation and relates to the whole of the institution. The paper provides the main opportunity for the provider to set out its considered answers about how effectively it is in effectively discharging its responsibility for the standard of the awards it grants and for the quality of the education it provides to enable students to achieve that standard.
3. Key documents such as the institution's strategic plan, quality manual and other documents that the institution wishes to submit;
4. A briefing paper prepared by students on behalf of the students of the institution

The Process

1. The Higher Education Council publishes a schedule of audit visits such that institutions have at least six months' advance notice of a visit
2. Three months before the visit the institution submits 10 copies of its briefing paper (in English and in the case of private providers the appropriate fee)

describing its approach to quality and standards. The paper should be reflective as well as descriptive and cover the following questions: what are we trying to do; why are we trying to do it; how are we doing it; why is it the best way to do it; how do we know it works; and; how can we improve it? The paper should outline the approach taken by the institution to the management of the security of the academic standards of its awards and the quality of its educational provision. It should give a clear picture of the institution's approach and an evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of that approach.

The Institutional Briefing Paper should have the following sections:

- Introduction and Background – Mission, vision, values, strategic and academic planning;
 - A description of the governance of the institution including the Board of Directors, Senate, Executive Council and Faculty Councils. The organisational structure of the institution and the opportunities for student participation;
 - Institutional Management of Academic Standards – the approach taken by the institution to ensure the maintenance of academic standards;
 - Institutional Management of Learning Opportunities;
 - Academic Support Services;
 - Institutional Approaches to Quality Assurance and Enhancement;
 - Institutional Arrangements for Postgraduate Research Students;
 - Institutional Arrangements for Supporting Research and Consultancy;
 - Student Support and Guidance;
 - Administration and Management;
 - Community Service and Good Governance.
3. The Institutional Briefing Paper is sent to the members of the audit team two months in advance of the audit visit.
 4. One month before the scheduled visit the audit team meet to discuss the issues they wish to pursue during the visit and to determine if there is information or evidence they wish the institution to provide in advance of the visit. Following this meeting the Audit Team Chair draws up the agenda for the audit, and, when the team members have approved it, this is sent to the institution.

5. The Audit Team Chair and Secretary visit the institution about one month before the visit to agree the physical and other arrangements for the visit. The institution's Director of Academic Quality is the contact person.
6. The Audit Team will visit the institution for four days in order to gain a sound understanding of the institution and its approach to the strategic management of academic standards and quality. During the visit the team will test and verify the judgements in the briefing papers, review with the provider any specific concerns that have arisen during subject reviews and gather any further evidence necessary to enable it to form a view on the effectiveness of the institution's arrangements for the overall management of quality and standards and of its awarding function. The team will pursue the issues it identified at its meeting, study further institutional documentation relating to the management of standards and quality and meet groups of staff and students. The agenda for the visit will include meetings with students so that it can gain first-hand information on the students' experience as learners and on their engagement with the institution's approach to quality assurance and enhancement. The team will also include a meeting with senior staff and meetings with samples of staff and students.

Membership of the Audit Team

The audit team should normally comprise five members - the Chair who should be a senior academic/academic administrator (The Director General /a Director of the Higher Education Council or a Rector or Vice Rector Academic), three academics who have significant experience of teaching and research, and the secretary to the team – usually an officer from the Higher Education Council. (When the Audit is undertaken following an application for recognition for qualification awarding powers – a definitive operating licence - the team should include a Vice Rector Administration and Finance).

The internal auditors for any given visit, including the Chair, are nominated by the Director of the Higher Education Council and approved by the Board of the Higher Education Council. They are selected from a register of approved and trained auditors. The names of the approved auditors are submitted to the institution to ensure that there is no conflict of interest.

The Audit Visit

The audit visit lasts four days. The institution is required to provide a base room and a meeting room for the audit team for the duration of the visit (see Appendix 6). (The Council makes all the arrangements for the travel and accommodation of the audit team members.) During the visit the audit team will ‘test’ the institution’s self assessment by consulting the documents provided in the base room and meeting with senior managers, groups of staff, of present and graduated students, employers and other stakeholders and the Chair and members of the institution’s Board of Directors. The timetable for the visit is included in the Institutional Auditors Handbook – Appendix 7)

Given the difficulty in explaining in writing the nuances and complexity of a vibrant intellectual culture supporting high quality learning , teaching, research, innovation, consultancy and community engagement the audit team will explore with the members of the relevant institutional constituencies they meet the institutional culture. Specifically they will explore the relationship between the institutional mission and planning through a discussion of the following:

- The unique and distinctive ways in which the institution enriches and adds excellence to the higher education sector – nationally, regionally and internationally;
- How the institution provides a vibrant intellectual culture;
- How the institution supports the absorption and transmission of cutting-edge knowledge;
- How the institution acts as an incubator of new ideas and cutting-edge knowledge and technologies within the national system of innovation;
- Examples in the last three years of institutional success in promoting and enhancing quality.

The Outcomes and Audit Report

The Audit Report, which will be in narrative style, will be prepared within 10 weeks of the visit and submitted to the institution so that they can make comments on factual accuracy. The report will then be published and made publicly available. The report

has the same structure as the institutional briefing papers. The audit team conclude their report by making a judgement as to the confidence that can reasonably be placed in the soundness of the institution's present and likely future management of the academic standards of its awards and the confidence that can reasonably be placed in the soundness of the present and likely future management of the quality of learning opportunities available to students.

- **Confidence** means that the institution is judged to possess rigorous mechanisms for the management of the security of the academic standards of its awards and is using these effectively and consistently, that it is providing high-quality learning opportunities for students, and that it has mechanisms in place for enhancing the quality of its provision. A judgement of confidence may be accompanied by a small number of recommendations that are considered desirable, but there will be none that are considered essential or advisable.
- **Limited Confidence** indicates that there is evidence that the institution's capacity to manage the quality of learning opportunities and/or the security of the standard of its awards soundly and effectively is limited. The reason for the judgement may be significant weaknesses in the institution's structures and procedures or in their implementation. The judgement of limited confidence is not one of failure but an indication that improvements need to be made. A judgement of limited confidence will be accompanied by a number of recommendations that are advisable as well as a number considered desirable. The institution will be asked to submit an action plan to the Higher Education Council within three months of receipt of the report, indicating how it intends to address the recommendations, and to provide a subsequent report when the action plan has been implanted. This has to be within 12 months of the audit. Failure to do so, or a report that is deemed not to demonstrate that adequate action has been taken, will mean that the outcome of the report is amended to 'no confidence'.
- **No confidence** indicates that there is substantial evidence of serious and fundamental weaknesses in the institution's capacity to secure the academic standards of its awards and/ or maintain the quality of its

educational provision. A judgement of no confidence will be accompanied by a number of recommendations that are considered essential, as well as a number that are considered advisable and /or desirable. Within three months of the publication of the report the institution will be required to submit an action plan to the Higher Education Council, with implementation times within 18 months, showing how it intends to address the recommendations. Three-monthly progress reports will have to be submitted to the Higher Education Council. The institution will be visited at the end of the 18 months. If the judgement of 'no confidence' remains this will be reported to the Minister for Education, who will determine if the institution should be closed or what other action should be taken.

Revised August 2007

REPUBLIC OF RWANDA



HIGHER EDUCATION COUNCIL

HANDBOOK FOR SUBJECT REVIEW

HANDBOOK FOR SUBJECT REVIEW

Introduction

An institution scheduled for a subject review (or applying for definitive approval) has to prepare a document (a self evaluation see Appendix 9) setting out their approach to managing the quality and standards of their academic work in the subject including teaching and learning, research, consultancy, knowledge transfer and community engagement in line with their Mission. The institution are advised to appoint an institutional facilitator (see Appendix 100 and must provide a base room for the audit team for the duration of the visit to the institution (see appendix 6).

This document provides information on the process. Central to subject review is the preparation and submission of a briefing paper – a self evaluation of the ways and extent to which they provide education fit for purpose and internationally credible in the subject being reviewed. In preparing their self evaluations institutions are advised to read this document carefully and to consult the *Handbook for Subject Reviewers* (Appendix 8), the *Qualification Framework and Code of Practice for the Assurance of Academic Quality and Standards in Higher Education* (Appendix 1) and *Higher Education Institutional Infrastructure and Academic Standards* (Appendix 2). Institutions should also consult relevant Government policies including those on higher education, and strategic planning guidance issued from time to time by the Higher Education Council. Public sector institutions may find the questionnaires provided for private sector institutions useful when preparing their self evaluation (Appendix 3 and Appendix 4). Guidance on writing a self evaluation (self assessment) is provided in Appendix 9.

Focus for Subject Review

Subject Review evaluates the quality and standards of educational provision at the level of the subject/discipline. Subject review is based on a self evaluation. The task of reviewers is to test, by means of their own observations and analysis of the evidence provided by the institution the statements made in the self evaluation. The reviewers will make judgements on the appropriateness and effectiveness of the provision in terms of academic standards and quality of learning opportunities as well as report on the maintenance and enhancement of standards and quality.

Taught programmes at all levels are reviewed as is post graduate research provision, and research, consultancy, knowledge transfer and community engagement activities undertaken by academic staff in the subject area under review. The unit of review is the subject, with all the subjects in one faculty normally being reviewed together. A provider may request that subjects from more than one faculty are reviewed together, and where a subject is taught in more than one faculty the review of the subject wherever it is taught will occur at the same time.

The main features of the method are:

- Peer review
- Self-assessment
- Review visit graded profile
- Overall summary judgement
- Subject review report.

Review Panel Membership

Reviews are carried out by teams of subject specialists led by a Review Team Chair (who is not a subject specialist), with all the subjects in a faculty normally being carried out at the same time. The team will normally comprise two specialist reviewers for each subject. It is the subject reviewers' responsibility to make judgements on the quality of education provided. The Higher Education Council briefs reviewers prior to their undertaking a visit

The Self-Assessment

The Self-Assessment provides an evaluation of the student learning experience of the subject, the research, consultancy, knowledge transfer and community engagement activities of academic staff, and the ways in which quality is assured and standards maintained, accompanied by evidence. Additional evidence such as programme validation documentation, external examiner reports, student work, examination papers and marking schemes, student handbooks, programme and module handbooks, academic regulations and student feedback will be provided for the team to scrutinise during the visit. The team will also meet with groups of staff and students during the

visit inspect facilities such as laboratories and classrooms and carry out observation of teaching.

Six aspects of the teaching and learning provision are evaluated:

- Curriculum Design, Content and Organisation
- Teaching, Learning and Assessment
- Student Progression and Achievement
- Student Support and Guidance
- Learning Resources
- Quality Management and Enhancement

In addition the provision made to support research, consultancy, knowledge transfer activities and community engagement is considered.

Purpose of the Subject Review Visit

The purpose of the subject review visit is to gather, consider and test the evidence of the quality and standard of the education, research, consultancy, knowledge transfer and community engagement, and to establish a graded profile

The graded quality profile shows the quality of the student learning experience and student achievement across the six aspects graded from 1 to 3, with 1 indicating that the provision is unsatisfactorily. In addition a seventh judgement is made that the standards of the provision are being met.

The overall grade is derived from the profile with a maximum grade of 18 and a minimum of six. A grade of 1 in any aspect means the provision is unsatisfactory, whatever the overall grade.

A single judgement of teaching and learning standards is made – satisfactory or failing.

A qualitative evaluation of the research, consultancy, and knowledge transfer and community engagement activities is also provided. The evaluation takes account of the mission and objectives of the institution.

Provision that scores at least 2 on each of the six aspects and satisfactory for standards, is deemed satisfactory – all other provision is deemed as failing.

A subject review report is published after each visit.

Procedure

1. The provider submits a self-assessment for the faculty being reviewed together with the programme specifications for all programmes which are the responsibility of the faculty. Ten bound copies of the self-assessment should be provided in French and English. The self-assessment should have a separate section for each subject offered by the faculty that discusses the strengths and weaknesses of the provision as well as describes it. The self-assessment should list all the programmes delivered in the subject and provide details of the number of staff in the subject their qualifications and grade. A student profile and a description of the learning resources available to support the programme should be given. The department(s) responsible for the provision should be identified. The self-assessment should cite and index the supporting evidence, which will be provided to the reviewers during the visit. In preparing the self-assessment, providers should ensure that they address the requirements of the *Code of Practice*. The self-assessment should be organised under the following headings (the provider should ensure the minimum information as indicated under each heading is provided and be mindful that they are expected to evaluate the extent to which the education they are providing is fit for purpose and benchmarked to international standards):
 - The provider's broad educational purpose in providing the programme and the learning outcomes that demonstrate successful completion of the programme of study
 - Staff and student profile - including numbers of academic staff in the subject together with their qualifications and grades and whether full-time

or part-time, a summary of other staffing resources that contribute to the delivery of the programme, the number of students on each programme of study, broken down by full-time/part-time, day/evening, on campus/distance. Policy on staff development including development for learning, teaching and assessment. Evidence of staff research and scholarly activities to support the delivery of the curriculum.

- Curriculum Design, Content and Organisation- this section should include a brief factual description of the curricular structure, options and pathways provided in the subjects as well as aims and learning outcomes for each programme;
 - Teaching, Learning and Assessment - this section should include information on the approaches used to teaching, learning and assessment and an evaluation of how successful they are;
 - Student Progression and Achievement – this section should include statistical data including the entrance requirements for the programme, the number and percentage of students passed and failed at the end of each academic year for the past three years, number and percentage of withdrawals each year for the last three years, number and percentage of students completing the programme for the last three years and information on the employment gained by students on graduation. It should be accompanied by an evaluation;
 - Student Support and Guidance provided by the subject provider and otherwise in the institution;
 - Learning Resources to support the delivery of the programme;
 - Quality Management and Enhancement policies, practices and procedures;
 - The ways in which the standards of awards are safeguarded.
 - Research and consultancy undertaken by academic staff in the subject area including registration for masters and PhDs;
 - Community engagement engaged in by staff and students in the subject area.
2. The Higher Education Council appoints a review team at least three months before the date the review is scheduled to begin. The review team should have a

team leader who is not a subject specialist but supports and guides the team members, and two subject specialist reviewers for each subject to be reviewed. The names of the members of the team are subject to be approved by the Board of Directors of the Higher Education Council. The provider is sent the names in advance of the review visit and is able to object to reviewers on the basis that there is a conflict of interest.

3. Teams of subject specialists who are familiar with teaching and learning processes carry out subject review. This enables judgements to be creditable to providers and the transparent manner in which it is carried out, and the public availability of reports ensures that it also has credibility with all stakeholders.
4. The main responsibility of the reviewers is to read, analyse and test the self-evaluation and make judgements about the quality and standards of the provision.
5. The subject provider sets up a base room for the reviewers and provides the following documentation relevant to the subjects being reviewed: academic staff CVs, samples of student work, examination papers and marking schemes programme validation documents, relevant policies, subject/course handbooks, external examiner reports, student evaluation, minutes of relevant meetings, module/unit outlines, Student Services handbook and any other evidence that the provider believes will assist the team in arriving at a reasoned judgement. A detailed teaching timetable for the subjects being reviewed for the period of the review should also be provided. The institution should also provide all published research by academic staff for the past three years, consultancy reports and evidence of community engagement activities.
6. The institution appoints a senior member of staff, normally the Director of Academic Quality, to be the institutional facilitator.
7. The review team visit the institution for four days. While at the institution they review the evidence provided in the base room, meet with senior staff, groups of staff and students from the subject(s) under review, look at the facilities available to support student learning in the subject, meet with the Librarian and Director of Student Services and undertake peer observation of teaching.
8. On the final day at the institution the review team meet and agree the outcome. The Team leader then drafts a report, which is circulated to all members of the review team for comment within 21 days of the visit.

The Outcome and Review Report

2. When the review team have completed their report it is submitted to the Director of the Higher Education Council. The Director sends it to the provider, who has 14 days to reply indicating any areas of factual inaccuracy.
3. The report, together with the outcomes, is then submitted to the Minister of Education.
4. Judgements are made on the academic standards in each subject under scrutiny. The reviewers make a judgement as to whether academic standards are being maintained or not.
5. The judgement on the quality of learning opportunities is produced as a graded profile.
6. Providers are normally given 12 months to bring any failing provision up to the required standards and provision of learning opportunities. The provider will submit an action plan to the Higher Education Council.
7. In the case of providers who receive a judgement of 'unsatisfactory', a limited subject review will be undertaken 12 months from the publication of the review report. Where the subject provision is still deemed to be failing a private provider will have awarding powers withdrawn in the subject and public providers will not be permitted to recruit any further students with Government funding. Where possible students will be transferred to providers who offer the subject and whose provision has been deemed satisfactory.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1:

REPUBLIC OF RWANDA



HIGHER EDUCATION COUNCIL

QUALIFICATION FRAMEWORK AND CODE OF PRACTICE FOR THE ASSURANCE OF ACADEMIC QUALITY AND STANDARDS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

This Code is intended to assist higher education institutions in meeting their responsibilities for the assurance and enhancement of quality and maintenance of standards within which they can consider the effectiveness of their individual approaches to a range of activities. Representatives of higher education institutions prepared the Code. The Code does not cover all the activities of higher education institutions nor does it identify all the circumstances when a particular element would be relevant. However there are a number of principals under laying the Code and an awareness of these and a commitment to them will assist institutions in assuring themselves and others that they have developed and are applying good practice in the range of activities they are engaged in. The main principals are:

1. A clear definition of responsibilities – for example within a particular area of activity which committee, faculties, departments, staff members, students and others should be clearly defined;
2. The consistent application of polices, practices and procedures underpinned by principles of fairness and equality of opportunity;
3. The availability of clear and accessible information – information on policies, procedures and practices, responsibilities and opportunities should be clear, up-to-date and accessible to all potential audiences. Information should help

students understand what they should expect from their higher education experience and staff members to ensure that they are contributing effectively and working, within, the arrangements in place to secure quality and standards.

4. The competence of staff – that all staff are supported to competently fulfil their particular roles and responsibilities. In particular academic staff should be appropriately qualified. Academic staff must normally have a qualification at least one level higher than that at which they are teaching. Academic staff teaching to diploma level should have a good honours degree, to honours level, a master's qualification, and to master's level and supervising doctoral students a PhD.
5. The periodic monitoring and review of all policies, procedures and practices to identify and remedy any possible ways in which they are undermining the assurance of quality and the maintenance of standards.

The Code of Practice will be reviewed and revised from time to time to ensure continuing currency. Higher education institutions are required to ensure that they are alert to such changes and that they remain compliant with the Code.

HIGHER EDUCATION QUALIFICATIONS FRAMEWORK AND CODE OF PRACTICE

This document must be adopted, and institutions must demonstrate that they conform to its requirements:

- **RWANDAN NATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS FRAMEWORK FOR HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS**
- **NATIONAL STUDENT ADMISSION POLICY**
- **CODE OF PRACTICE ON CROSS-BORDER/TRANSNATIONAL PROVISION**

Institutions must demonstrate that they conform to the underlying principles of these documents and justify any variation of detail

- **GENERAL ACADEMIC REGULATIONS NATIONAL LEARNING, TEACHING AND ASSESSMENT POLICY PROCEDURES FOR THE VALIDATION OF MODULES AND PROGRAMMES**
- **NATIONAL POLICY ON LANGUAGE TEACHING IN HIGHER EDUCATION**
- **NATIONAL POLICY ON ACADEMIC APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION PROCEDURES**
- **CALCULATING ACADEMIC STAFFING IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS**
- **NATIONAL EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY POLICY FOR HIGHER EDUCATION**
- **CODE OF PRACTICE – EXAMINATIONS**
- **CODE OF PRACTICE – DISTANCE LEARNING**
- **NATIONAL POLICY ON INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL MODERATION**
- **STANDARDS FOR STUDENT PROGRAMME AND MODULE HANDBOOKS**
- **ACADEMIC WORK LOAD PLANNING: NATIONAL POLICY AND PRACTICE**

The following papers offer guidance in good practice. Institutions should demonstrate that their practice follows the principles embodied in them and should justify any substantial departures of practice:

- **STUDENT REGULATIONS AND DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURES IN HIGHER EDUCATION**
- **NATIONAL STUDENT SUPPORT AND GUIDANCE POLICY**
- **NATIONAL STAFF DEVELOPMENT POLICY FOR HIGHER EDUCATION**

- **RECRUITMENT, SELECTION AND APPOINTMENT POLICY AND PROCEDURE**

This document must be adopted if relevant, and institutions must demonstrate that they conform to its requirements, but it may not be relevant to all institutions:

- **FRAMEWORK AND REGULATIONS FOR THE AWARD OF HIGHER DEGREES BY RESEARCH, and REGULATIONS ON CHEATING AND PLAGIARISM IN RESEARCH DEGREES**

The following documents are supplied as guidance and/or resource:

- **THE NATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS FRAMEWORK AND MODULAR PROGRAMMES – A BRIEF OVERVIEW**
- **NOTES OF GUIDANCE: PROGRAMME PROPOSAL FORM**
- **NOTES OF GUIDANCE: MODULE DESCRIPTION FORM**
- **NOTES OF GUIDANCE: PROGRAMME SPECIFICATION FORM**
- **PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT PLANNING**
- **MODAL RESEARCH PROJECT HANDBOOK**
- **MODEL STUDENTS COMPLAINTS PROCEDURES**
- **RESOURCES FOR PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT PLANNING FOR RESEARCH STUDENTS**
- **FORMS FOR RESEARCH STUDENT MANAGEMENT**

This document must be adopted by PRIVATE PROVIDERS, and they must demonstrate that they conform to its requirements:

- **CODE OF PRACTICE FOR OPERATING PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS**

This document must be adopted by PUBLIC SECTOR INSTITUTIONS, and they must demonstrate that they conform to its requirements:

- **STAFF DEVELOPMENT POLICY FOR PUBLIC SECTOR INSTITUTIONS**

APPENDIX 2

REPUBLIC OF RWANDA



HIGHER EDUCATION COUNCIL

HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE AND ACADEMIC STANDARDS

These standards are designed to provide guidance to institutions on what is likely to be judged acceptable by The Higher Education Council for the granting definitive operating licence to private providers in terms of physical and institutional resources. It also provides a guide to the minimum expected quality and standard of academic delivery. It also provided board guidelines on the level of infrastructure likely to be necessary to meet the requirements of institutional audit and subject reviews for all providers and should be read in conjunction with the Institutional Audit and Subject Review Handbooks. Further guidance on the expectations of auditors and reviewers can be found in the Higher Education Qualifications Framework for Rwanda and the associated Code of Practice. However, judgements by review and audit teams will be more strongly influenced, in the last resort, by the effectiveness of the delivery than by the extent of resources. The major criterion will be that the institution is fit for its declared purpose and can meet its declared objectives, with regard to the aspect of provision under scrutiny and is fully in conformity with the law. Institutions must meet the minimum expected standards and quality of academic delivery.

Institutional Infrastructure Standards

	Acceptable	Needs to be Improved	Unsatisfactory
Governance			
Board of Directors	Established as required in Law, meets regularly and carries out its responsibilities effectively and efficiently.	Established as required in Law but meets infrequently and is not fully discharging its responsibilities.	Is either not established as required by Law or if it is in place is not discharging its responsibilities.
Senate	Established as required by Law meets according to a published Academic Calendar and effectively and efficiently carries out its functions	Established as required by Law but meets infrequently and /or is not fully discharging its responsibilities.	Is either not established as required by Law or if it is in place is not discharging its responsibilities.
Faculty Councils	Established as required by Law meets according to a published Academic Calendar and effectively and efficiently carries out its functions	Established as required by Law but meets infrequently and /or is not fully discharging its responsibilities	Is either not established as required by Law or if it is in place is not discharging its responsibilities

Departmental Councils	Established as required by Law meets according to a published Academic Calendar and effectively and efficiently carries out its functions	Established as required by Law but meets infrequently and /or is not fully discharging its responsibilities	Is either not established as required by Law or if it is in place is not discharging its responsibilities
Rector/Vice Rectors Principal/Vice Principals	Appointed in accordance with the Law and provides leadership and sound management.	Appointed in accordance with the Law and carries out management functions satisfactorily	Is either not appointed in accordance with the Law or is not providing leadership or managing the institution satisfactorily
Deans	Elected in accordance with the Law and provide leadership and sound management.	Elected in accordance with the Law and carries out management functions satisfactorily	Is either not elected in accordance with the Law or is not providing leadership or managing the institution satisfactorily

Heads of Departments	Elected in accordance with the Law and provides leadership and sound management.	Appointed in accordance with the Law and carries out management functions satisfactorily	Is either not elected in accordance with the Law or is not providing leadership or managing the institution satisfactorily
Staff and Student Involvement	Staff and students represented on all committees. Communications strategy in place to ensure staff and students are kept full informed and opportunities for consultation provided	Staff and students represented on committees but limited if any communication or consultation channels in place.	Little if any evidence that staff or students have formal or informal opportunities to make their views known or are kept informed of developments by the administration.
Infrastructure			
Classroom space (Campus based)	1m ² per student	1m ² per 4 students	1m ² per 5 students or less

Library Space (Campus based)	1m ² per student	1m ² per 4 students	1m ² per 5 students or less
Science and Engineering Labs (Campus based science and engineering students)	1m ² per student	1m ² per 4 students	1m ² per 5 students or less

Academic Staff (Full time)	Single or 2 person offices of adequate size	2m ² space valuable per member of staff	1m ² space valuable per member of staff
Administrative Staff (Full time)	3m ² space valuable per member of staff	2m ² space valuable per member of staff	1m ² space valuable per member of staff
Facilities for Disabled	Adequate access to enable students and staff with disabilities	Plans to improve access for staff and students with disabilities	No plans to provide access for people with disabilities.
Academic Staff- Institutions offering degrees			
Staff/Student Ratio			
Arts / Social Sciences	1:25	1:30	Over 1:30
High Cost Classroom	1:21	130	Over 1:30
Part lab/part classroom	1:17	1:25	Over 1:25
Science	1:15	1:20	Over 1:20
Engineering	1:14	1:19	Over 1:19
Clinical Medicine	1:10	1:15	Over 1:15

Qualifications Academic Staff¹			
PhD ²	15% of Staff	10% Staff	Less 10%
Masters	90% staff	50%	Less 50%
Percentage of part time staff	Less than 30%	35%	More than 35%
Contact hours of staff per week – academic year	18 hours	25 hours	30 hours and over
Research Policy	Research Policy approved by Senate and being implemented	Research Policy approved by Senate but not being implemented	No Research Policy in place
Publications by academic staff	More than on average 1 per Lecture and above with a spread across departments	Less than an average of 1 per Lecturer and above	none
Teaching Staff- Institutions offering up to undergraduate diploma level			
Staff/Student Ratio			
Arts / Social Sciences	1:30	1:35	Over 1:35

-
- 1 Tutorial Assistants **do not** count as academic staff. All new appointments to AL must have a master's degree. This requirement will be amended in 24 months to require all academic staff to have a minimum of a master's degree.
 - 2 This is the minimum acceptable proportion of academic staff with doctorates. Institutions with a mission to carry out research including offering supervision for postgraduate research degrees will be expected to have a significantly higher proportion

High Cost Classroom	1:25	130	Over 1:30
Part lab/part classroom	1:22	1:28	Over 1:28
Science	1:19	1:25	Over 1:25
Engineering	1:18	1:24	Over 1:24
Qualifications Teaching Staff³			
Masters	30% of Staff	20% Staff	Less 20%
Bachelors – 2.1/Distinction	100% staff	100%	100%
Percentage of part time staff	Less than 30%	35%	More than 35%
Contact hours of staff per week – academic year	25 hours	30 hours	30 hours and over
Strategic Plan	Strategic Plan approved by Board of Directors and implementation plan approved and being implemented. Embedded annual planning process	Strategic Plan approved by Board of Directors but not yet being implemented	No strategic plan in place
Higher Education Qualifications	Fully implementing the Qualifications	Qualifications Framework not	Qualifications Framework not

3 Tutorial Assistants **do not** count as academic staff. All new appointments to AL must have a master’s degree. This requirement will be amended in 24 months to require all academic staff to have a minimum of a master’s degree.

Framework and Code of Practice	Framework and meeting the requirements of the Code of Practice.	fully implemented and not meeting all the requirements of the Code of Practice.	implemented and little if any evidence of adherence to the code of Practice.
Risk Policy	Risk Policy approved by Board of Directors and all policies, practices and procedures subject to a risk analysis	Risk Policy approved but not implemented	No Risk Policy in place
Health and Safety Policy	Health and Safety Policy approved by Board of Directors and being actively implemented	Health and Safety Policy approved	No Health and Safety Policy
Staff and Student Disciplinary Procedures	Staff and Student Disciplinary Procedures in conformity with the Law approved by the Board of Directors and being implemented	Staff and Student Disciplinary Procedures in conformity with the Law approved by the Board of Directors	No procedures

Standards for Internal Quality Assurance of Programmes

1. Policies and Procedures for Quality Assurance	
Standard	Guidelines
<p>Institutions have policies and associated procedures for the assurance of the quality and standards of their programmes and awards. They should commit themselves explicitly to the development of a culture which recognises the importance of quality, and quality assurance, in their work.</p> <p>To achieve this, institutions should develop and implement a strategy of continuous enhancement of quality.. Policy and procedures should be publicly available. They should include a role for students and other stakeholders.</p>	<p>Formal policies and procedures provide a framework within which higher education institutions can develop and monitor the effectiveness of their quality assurance systems. Policies contain statements of intentions and the principal means by which these will be achieved. Procedural guidance can give more detailed information about the ways in which policy is implemented and provides a useful reference point for those who need to know about the practical aspects of carrying out the procedures (see the <i>Rwandan National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education</i> and associated <i>Code of Practice</i>).</p> <p>The policy statement is expected to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The relationship between teaching and research in the institution; • The institution’s strategy for quality and standards; • The organisation of the quality assurance system; • The responsibility of departments, faculties and other organisational units and individuals for the assurance of quality; • The involvements of students in

	<p>quality assurance;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ways in which the policy is implemented, monitored and revised. <p>It is important that there is commitment to the policy at all levels of the institution and that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All programmes have clear and explicit intended learning outcomes; • Staff are ready, willing and able to provide teaching and learners support that will enable students achieve the outcomes • Staff who demonstrate particular excellence, expertise and dedication are recognised and appropriately rewarded; • There is a commitment to improve and enhance the education offered to students.
<p>2. Programmes are consonant with an institution’s mission</p>	
<p>Programmes are consonant with the institution’s mission and goals form part of institutional planning and resource allocation, meet national requirements, the needs of students and other stakeholders, and are intellectually credible. They are designed coherently.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programme are in line with the institutions mission and goals; • Programme outcomes meet national labour market needs. The professional requirements are taken into consideration where appropriate. Relevant stakeholders including external academic peers

and employers were involved in the design and validation of programmes.

- Programmes meet the requirements of the Rwandan National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education.
- Provision is made for each programme in the institution's planning and resource allocation processes.
- Learning outcomes, degree of curriculum choice, teaching and learning methods and expected completion times cater for the learning needs of students. Competencies of students who complete programmes are made explicit.
- The design of programmes maintains an appropriate balance of theoretical, practical and experiential knowledge and skills. They have sufficient disciplinary content and theoretical depth, at the appropriate level, to serve their educational purposes.
- Modules are coherently planned with regard to content, level, aims and outcomes, relative weighting and delivery.
- There is a policy and procedures for developing and evaluating learning

	<p>materials.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional and vocational programmes, in addition: promote the students’ understanding of the specific occupation for which they are being trained; students master techniques and skills required; and, work-based learning, work placements and internships form an integral part of the curriculum as appropriate.
<p>3. Approval, monitoring and periodic review of programmes and awards</p>	<p>The confidence of students and other stakeholders is established and maintained through effective quality assurance activities which ensure that programmes are well-designed, regularly monitored and periodically reviewed, thereby securing their continued relevance and currency.</p> <p>The quality assurance of programmes and awards is expected to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development and publication of explicit learning outcomes; • Careful attention to curriculum and programme design and content; • Specific needs of different mode of delivery (e.g. full time, part-time, distance –learning, e-learning) and types of higher education (e.g academic, vocational. Professional); • Availability of appropriate learning resources; • Formal programme approval

	<p>procedures by a body other than that teaching the programme and including members external to the institution;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring of the progress and achievement of students; • Regular periodic reviews of programmes(including external panel members); • Regular feedback from employers, labour market representatives and other relevant organisations; • Participation of students in quality assurance activities.
<p>4. Teaching and learning strategy</p>	
<p>The institution gives recognition to the importance of promoting student learning. The learning and teaching strategy is appropriate for the institutional type, mode(s) of delivery and student composition, contains mechanisms to ensure the appropriateness of the teaching and learning methods, and makes provision for staff development for teaching and learning. The strategy sets targets , plans for implementation, and mechanisms to monitor progress , evaluate impact and effect</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognition of the importance of promoting students learning is reflected in the institution’s policies and procedures, including resource allocation; provision of support services, staff appointments and promotions;. • A teaching and learning strategy is in place which conforms to the requirements of the <i>Rwandan National Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy</i>. • Contains targets, plans for implementation, ways of monitoring

<p>improvements</p>	<p>progress and evaluating impact, and mechanisms for feedback and improvement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a peer observation of teaching in place. • Students provide feedback on modules and programmes through a <i>Student Evaluation Questionnaire</i>. • Academic staff are support in gaining a Postgraduate Certificate in Learning and Teaching in Higher Education; • There is a regular programme of staff development for learning and teaching.
<p>5. Assessment of students</p>	
<p>Students should be assessed using published criteria, regulations and procedures which are applied consistently. Assessment should be appropriate for measuring learning outcomes. Assessment should be rigours and fair and there should be procedures in place for ensuring the validity and reliably of assessment practices. Assessment should be carried out professionally at all times and takes into account the extensive knowledge which exists about testing and examination processes. Assessment securer at all stages.</p>	<p>The assessment of students is one of the most important elements of higher education. The outcomes of assessment have a profound effect on students' future careers. It is therefore important that assessment is carried out professionally at all times and takes into account the extensive knowledge which exists on testing and examination processes. Assessment also provides valuable information for institution about the effectiveness of teaching and learner support. Student assessment procedures are expected to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be designed to measure the achievement of the intended learning outcomes and other programme

objectives;

- Students are assessed on employability skills developed on their programme of study;
- Be appropriate for their purpose, whether diagnostic, formative or summative;
- Have clear published criteria for marking;
- Be undertaken by people who understand the role of assessment in the progression of students towards the achievement of the knowledge and skills associated with their intended qualification;
- Have in place systems for the internal and external moderation of marking by appropriately qualified and experienced academics;
- Have clear regulations covering student absence, illness and other mitigating circumstances;
- Have regulations for student appeals;
- Have regulations for plagiarism and cheating;
- Ensure that assessments are conducted securely in accordance with the institution's stated procedures;
- Be subject to administrative verification checks to ensure the accuracy of the procedures;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff development is provided as necessary and appropriate.
<p>6. Quality assurance of teaching staff</p>	
<p>Institutions should have ways of satisfying themselves that staff involved with the teaching of students and the management of student learning are qualified and competent. They should have sufficient relevant experience and teaching competency and their research profile should be adequate for the nature and level of the modules they are teaching on.</p>	<p>Academic staff are the single most important learning resource available to most students. It is important that those who teach have a full knowledge and understanding of the subject they are teaching, have the necessary skills and experience to transmit their knowledge and understanding effectively to students in a range of teaching contexts, and can access feedback on their own performance.</p> <p>Institutions should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appoint and promote staff in line with the <i>Recruitment, Selection And Appointment Policy and Procedure</i> in the <i>Code of Practice</i>; • Have a staff appraisal system in place that includes giving staff feedback on their performance; • Have a peer observation of teaching system in place; • Provide staff development opportunities for staff to enhance their skills in teaching including the taking of a Postgraduate Certificate in Teaching and Learning in Higher Education; • Ensure that staff are engaged in appropriate research and scholarship

	<p>to support the teaching on the programme;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have in place mechanisms to support poor teachers in improving their skills to an acceptable level and the means to remove them from teaching duties if they fail to improve sufficiently; • Have in place an induction programme for all newly appointed staff; • All academic staff are provided with a post profile that clearly sets out the duties and responsibilities of their post; • All academic staff plan their workload at least once a year with their line manager.
<p>7. Learning resources and student support</p>	
<p>Institutions should ensure that the resources available for the support of student learning are adequate and appropriate for each programme offered</p>	<p>In addition to their teachers students rely on a range of resources to assist learning. In addition to teaching staff students need a range of physical resources such as libraries and computing facilities as well as human support in the form of tutors, counsellors and other advisors. Learning resources should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Readily accessible to students and designed with their needs in mind; • Routinely monitored and regularly reviewed to improve the

	<p>effectiveness of the support services provided;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate to meet the demands placed on them by student numbers; • The staff -student ratio should be as set out in the infrastructure standards above and there should be adequate administrative and technical support staff.
8. Information systems	
<p>Institutions should ensure that they collect, analyse and use relevant information for the effective management of their programme of study and other activities.</p>	<p>Institutional self-knowledge is the starting point for effective quality assurance. It is important that institutions have the means of collecting and analysing information about their own activities. Without this they will not know what is working well and what needs attention, or the results of innovatory practices. The system should cover:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student progression and achievement • Employability of graduates; • Students' satisfaction with their programmes • Effectiveness of teachers; • Profile of student population; • Learning resources and their costs; • The institution's own key performance indicators
9. Public information	
<p>Institutions should regularly</p>	<p>Institutions should provide information on:</p>

<p>publish up to date, impartial and objective information, both quantitative and qualitative, about the programmes they awards they are offering</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The programmes they offer;• The intended learning outcomes of the programmes;• The qualifications they award;• The teaching learning and assessment procedures they use;• The learning opportunities available to students;• Student evaluation;• Profile of students;• Employment of graduates.
---	---

REPUBLIC OF RWANDA

APPENDIX 4



HIGHER EDUCATION COUNCIL

APPLICATION FOR ACCREDITATION (DEFINITIVE OPERATING AGREEMENT) FOR A PRIVATE INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

(Please fill out all items and append attachments wherever necessary. Please hand in 2 copies to the Higher Education Council)

(Applicants are advised to make reference to the *Law Governing the Organization and Functioning of Higher Education - Law N°27/2013 of 24/05/2013*, the *Handbook for Academic Quality Assurance and Enhancement and the Maintenance of Standards in Higher Education*, and the *National Higher Education Qualifications Framework for Rwanda and Code of Practice*. You are advised to contact the Higher Education Council to obtain the most up-to-date versions.)

- **Name of the Private Higher Education Institution**
(Please indicate any abbreviation that will be used)

2. Address of the Private Institution of Higher Education

- a) Postal Address
- b) Fax Number
- c) E-mail Address
- d) Web Address
- e) Telephone Number(s)

3. Location and Land

- a) Location of the private institution of higher education
- b) The size of land owned by the private institution of higher education.
(Please attach a copy of the land title)
- c) Size of land to be used
- d) Year when the land was purchased if applicable
- e) If the land on which the private higher education institution is leased or rented please provide a copy of the lease/tenancy agreement.

4. Infrastructure to Support the Delivery of Higher Education

1. Buildings

State the total area in square metres of the following buildings:

- a) Classrooms – number and size of each (please attach on a separate sheet)
- b) Library
- c) Science Laboratories – number, subject and size of each (please attach a separate sheet)

- d) Computer Laboratories – number and size of each
- e) Administration bloc
- f) Offices for administration staff
- g) Offices for academic staff
- h) Student welfare offices
- i) Health clinic/Sickbay area
- j) Student canteen
- k) Provision for staff and students with special needs including the physically disabled
- l) Student hostels – number, total area in square metres and number of bed spaces
 - m) Male students
 - n) Female Students
- o) Provide a master plan of your campus showing all the actual and any planned buildings. Please indicate those buildings that are already in place.

2. Transport

How many vehicles do the institution own?

3. Educational Facilities in Place

- Dates of publication of the majority of books (Give in blocks)
Before 1990
1990- 1994
1995 – 1999
2000- 2004
2005 and later
- Total number of computers in the library
- Please give details of other learning materials the provided for student use
- Total number of computers for student use in labs
- Total number of computers for academic staff use
- Total number of computers for administration

- What programmes are used to search for and retrieve materials in the library
- Give details of the cataloguing system used in the library including if it is computerized.
- Please give details of the internet access available for staff and students
- State the number of chairs in the library
- What residential accommodation for students is provided

Female Students

Male Student

5. Staffing

(Please attach a full list of all permanent academic, administrative, technical and support staff together with their grade and qualifications).

- How many full time academic **staff** does the Private Higher Education employ Prof, Associate. Prof, SL, L AL (CVs and certified copies of the diploma must be available in the base room when the site visit is made). (Please note that the minimum qualification for appointment is a master's degree in the area of teaching specialization).

Grade	Number Full Time	Number Part Time
Professor		
Associate Professor		
Senior Lecture		
Lecture		
Assistant Lecture		

- How many **tutorial assistants** are employed? (Please note that the minimum qualification for appointment is a 2.1 (Distinction) degree in the subject to be taught.)
- How many **teaching ONLY** staff are employed (Institutions offering programmes **ONLY** to undergraduate certificate/diploma or for teaching foundation languages)

Grade	Full Time	Part Time
Senior College Tutor		
College Tutor		
Assistant College Tutor		

(Please note that academic /teaching staff employed in public institutions of higher education are contractually obliged to have their employer’s permission to take on additional teaching. You must provide letters of authorization for all part time staff who have full time contracts with public institutions of higher education when you submit this form).

- Indicate the qualifications of staff as follows – (Note the minimum criteria for appointment for each grade is set out in the *Academic Staff Appointment and Promotion Guide*, the ratio of staff with masters and PhDs in *Standards in Higher Education* and the methodology for determining full-time equivalent academic staff numbers in *Calculating Academic Staff in Higher Education*).

Table 1 A– For Full Time Staff in Institutions Teaching to Degree Level

Subject	Prof	A.Prof	SL		L		AL	TAs
			PhD	M	PhD	M		

Table 2 for Institutions Planning to Offer Undergraduate Certificates, Diplomas and Ordinary Degrees Only

(Staff employed to teach ONLY foundation languages may also be appointed /promoted to these grades of post)

Full Time

Subject	Senior College Tutor	College Tutor	Tutor

Part Time

Subject	Senior College Tutor	College Tutor	Tutor

--	--	--	--

- Please append an Academic Staffing Plan indicating the staff/student ratio for each subject taught (**note** staff and students who are part time are counted fractionally).
- How many administrative staff does the institution employ? Please attach a structure for administrative staff listing all posts and indicating grades.
- How many support staff does the institution employ Please attach a structure for support staff listing all posts and indicating grades.
- Please give the names , qualifications and gender of the following officers of the institution
 - Chair of the Board of Directors
 - Members of the Board of Directors
 - Chancellor
 - Rector/Principal
 - Vice Rector Academic/Vice Principal
 - Vice Rector Research (if offering PhDs)
 - Vice Rector Administration and Finance
 - Academic Registrar
 - Dean of each Faculty
 - Please attach an organizational diagram
 - Please attach post profiles for all senior posts
 - Please provide details of the procedures used for appointing the Rector/Principal and other senior staff

6. Ownership of the Private University

- Please indicate who the owners of the institution are.

7. Students and Student Numbers

(Please attach a list of students at each level by programme)

- a) Please list all the faculties and departments of the institution.

Notes: 1 See the Rwandan National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education

2 List programmes for full and part time (evening) and distance students' separately

- Please indicate for each programme the number of full time students recruited annually and provide a student number projections for the next four years
- Please indicate for each programme the number of part time students recruited annually and provide student number projections for the next six years
- Please indicate for each programme the number of distance students recruited annually and provide student number projections for the next six years
- Please list any additional programmes you plans to develop and indicate when it is hoped to begin offering them (Please note that you MUST get permission from the Council before you plan to open a new department/faculty)

• **Vision of the Private Higher Education Institution**

1. Mission
2. Vision
3. Specific objectives
4. Provide the logo of your institution

10. Signatures of the officers of the proposed private university

- a) Chairperson of Board of Directors
- b) Rector/Principal
- c) Vice Rector Academic/Vice Principal
- d) Vice Rector Administration and Finance
5. Owner/legal representative of the owner

Date

Official Stamp

We confirm that all the information submitted on this form and provided as additional information is true

Please provide the following information/documentation

- The legal name of the institution;
- The name and designation of the contact person;
- The location of the institution, telephone and fax numbers, email and web site;
- Legal status, company registration number and details of owners including if Rwandan or foreign;
- The name, telephone and fax numbers and email address of the Chief Executive Officer (head of institution);
- Names and designation of the current members of the Board of Directors of the institution;
- Evidence of its financial viability and of its non-profit making status;
- Name of the auditors of the institution's accounts;
- Mission, Objectives and Strategic and Operational plans;
- Organisational and administrative structure;
- The physical infrastructure and resources, including details of resources for each programme to be taught - existing and planned - with the timeframe for any planned developments and sources of funding;
- Standing orders and regulations for the Board of Directors
- An assets register;
- Risk Management Policy and Practices;
- Numbers of full-time equivalent academic staff employed, by subject, qualification and academic grade, and the projected recruitment of academic staff for the next five years. This should be supplied separately for local and expatriate staff;

- Numbers of tutorial staff and laboratory technicians by subject specialisation and qualification;
- The administrative and support staff by grade and function;
- A detailed specification of the financial management system;
- Financial viability reports and legal documents;
 - Business plan including financial forecasts or audited annual financial statements where applicable
 - Security and guarantee Documents
 - Company registration documents
 - Business registration certificates
 - Evidence of compliance with occupational health and safety requirements

19) The Self assessments for each Faculty (see *Handbook for Subject Review*)

20) Any other relevant information to demonstrate compliance with the Requirements for gaining an operating as set out in the *Law* or the *Code of Practice for Private Providers* or to demonstrate compliance with the Requirements of the Higher Education Council

21) Agreements with other Providers -Memorandum of Understanding and other legal documentation where the institution is to deliver programmes validated by another provider.

On Receipt of the Application the Higher Education Council will:

- a) Acknowledge receipt;
- b) Examine the information provided and determine whether to send a review panel to verify the information;
- c) Submit a draft report to you for factual verification within one month of the visit;
- d) Within two months of receiving your comments the Higher Education Council will submit its report and recommendations to the Minister of Education;
- e) The Minister of Education will notify you of the decision within six months of the date on which the Higher Education Council received this form and all the required information whichever is the later date.

APPENDIX 5

BASE ROOM FOR INSTITUTIONAL AUDIT PANEL VISIT

Institutions must provide accommodation for the audit team for the duration of their visit. The team will require a base room which should have at least four tables and chairs the audit team can use for working at, a computer and printer. The computer should if possible be connected to the Internet. (If this is not possible the institution should provide the audit team with access to the internet for the duration of the visit). Tea, coffee, water and soft drinks should be provided in the base room. The room should be large enough to take all the materials that **MUST** be available for the audit team during the visit.

In addition to the base room institutions will need to provide a room where the team can meet with groups of staff and students during the course of the visit. There should be somewhere close to the room where staff and students can wait for the meeting they are coming to, to start.

The Audit Room should have the following:

1. One copy of the briefing paper prepared by the institution in English;
2. A detailed timetable for the institution coming into full compliance with the Rwandan National Qualifications Framework, the National Admissions Policy and the Code of Practice;
3. One copy of all the papers listed in the index to the briefing paper;
4. The prospectus or other material giving brief details of all the taught programmes delivered by the institution;
5. The institutional organisation chart;
6. A list of all the managers, members of Executive Council, Senate and Senate Standing Committees together with contact telephone numbers;
7. The names and contact details of the Student Association Representative Council;
8. The institution's Strategic Plan and Operational Plan, and Risk Management Policy;
9. The Academic Regulations;

10. The Quality Manual – all policies, practices and procedures for the validation and operation of academic programmes;
11. The Research and Consultancy Policy and the Research Ethics Policy;
12. The Staff Manual and all policies, practices and procedures relating to staffing matters including Health and Safety Policy, Staff Discipline Policy, Appointment and Promotion Procedures;
13. All policies and procedures relating to students not separately listed;
14. The budget for the last three years;
15. The agendas and minutes for the Board of Directors, Executive Council, Senate and any Standing Committees of Senate for the last three years;
16. The reports of the validation panels for all award bearing programmes;
17. The reports of external examiners for the last two years;
18. The Staff Development Policy and the Programme of Staff Development provided over the past 12 months;
19. The Staff Appraisal/Review System;
20. A list of all academic staff with their position, qualifications by academic department and gender;
21. CVs for all academic staff;
22. A list of all staff publications for the last three years;
23. Details of all funded research projects awarded for the last three years;
24. Details of all consultancies awarded to staff for the last three years;
25. A list of all award bearing programmes offered by the institution;
26. Student Handbook;
27. The number of students by programme and year – separately for full time students and part time students (a part time student is defined as a student who is in paid employment for more than 20 hour a week on average);
28. Student progression and award data – the student numbers on each programme by year for the last four years together with the assessment (progression) results– separately for full time students and part time students (a part time student is defined as a student who is in paid employment for more than 20 hour a week on average.);
29. Staff/Student Ratio

30. A list of all administrative and technical staff by grade and function;
31. Details of student services;
32. Details of any graduate tracer studies undertaken by the institution;
33. Details of all collaborations the institution is involved in including formal collaborations at institutional and faculty/departmental levels for teaching, research, consultancy, knowledge and/or institutional development.
34. Details of institutional/faculty/departmental membership of international organisations/networks
35. A briefing paper prepared by students on behalf of the students of the institution

APPENDIX 6

BASE ROOM FOR SUBJECT REVIEW PANEL VISIT

Institutions must provide accommodation for the audit team for the duration of their visit. The team will require a base room which should have at least four tables and chairs the audit team can use for working at, a computer and printer. The computer should if possible be connected to the Internet. (If this is not possible the institution should provide the audit team with access to the internet for the duration of the visit). Tea, coffee, water and soft drinks should be provided in the base room. The room should be large enough to take all the materials that **MUST** be available for the audit team during the visit.

In addition to the base room institutions will need to provide a room where the team can meet with groups of staff and students during the course of the visit. There should be somewhere close to the room where staff and students can wait for the meeting they are coming to start.

The Subject Review Room should have the following:

1. One copy of the self assessment in English;
2. The programme specification document (programme validation document) for all programmes delivered in the faculty/subject;
3. The institutions Learning Teaching and Assessment Strategy;
4. The institution's Academic Regulations;
5. The institution's Quality Manual;
6. Programme annual monitoring reports;
7. Reports from analysis of responses to student satisfaction questionnaires;
8. The CVs of all the academic staff teaching in the faculty;
9. The CVs of all tutorial assistants;
10. A list of all the academic staff teaching the subject by grade and full and part time;
11. The teaching timetables of all staff teaching on the programme for the week of the visit;
12. The number of students on each programme by each year of the programme separately for full and part time students;

13. Details of the hours of class contact for students by year and programme;
14. All the examination papers and marking schemes for the last four years;
15. Details of any industrial placements;
16. Details of any community placements;
17. Any materials specifically written for use on the programme;
18. Details of course work set over the last four years and examples of student work;
19. The assessment results for the last four years;
20. All the student projects for the last four years;
21. Student programme and module handbooks;
22. A list of, and copies of all staff publications for the last four years;
23. Details of all staff development undertaken by staff in the last four years;
24. External examiner reports for the last four years;
25. Reports from programme validation panels for last four years;
26. Agendas and minutes from Faculty Council and departmental meetings for the last four years;
27. The teaching timetable for the week in which the visit is taking place;
28. Details of personal development planning;
29. Details of personal tutoring system;
30. Details of staff appraisal system;
31. Details of all collaborations the subject (faculty/department) is involved in;
32. Details of the membership of international organizations/networks that the subject has and/or individual members of academic staff;
33. Details of any national or international activities by members of academic staff e.g. member of a committee, member of the board of a journal, peer reviewer for a journal, supervising and /or examining PhD students, advisor in area of subject expertise etc

APPENDIX 7

REPUBLIC OF RWANDA



HIGHER EDUCATION COUNCIL

HANDBOOK FOR INSTITUTIONAL AUDITORS

HANDBOOK FOR INSTITUTIONAL AUDITORS

Introduction

This Handbook provides guidance for the members of panels for institutional audits. It should be read in conjunction with:

- *The Handbook for Institutional Audit;*
- *The Rwandan National Higher Education Qualifications Framework;*
- *The Code of Practice;*
- *Higher Education Institutional Infrastructure and Academic Standards;*
- *Requirements for the Base Room for Institutional Audit.*

The Handbook provides guidance for auditors in coming to judgement on the ways and extent to which the institution meets the criteria for institutional audit.

The criteria cover two broad areas which will form the focus of evaluation during the visit to the institution:

Area 1: Mission of the institution; links between planning and resource allocation and quality management;

Area 2: Teaching and learning, research, consultancy, knowledge transfer and community engagement.

The criteria will guide the evaluation during the audit visit.

Institutional Visit

An audit is incomplete without verification of assets together with assessment of statements made by an institution. Such verification takes the form of an institutional visit which is an integral part of a quality audit.

The audit panel will visit the institution for a period of four days during which it will try to establish the thoroughness and accuracy of the self-assessment reported in the institution's briefing paper. It will be guided by a programme of activities previously agreed upon. As part of the exercise the panel will also visit any aspect of the

institution which is considered as significant with respect to quality assurance, quality enhancement or and/or the standards of the academic delivery of the institution.

Areas for Consideration by the Audit Panel during the Visit

Institutional Mission

The institution has a clearly stated Mission and purpose with goals and priorities, which are responsive to its local, national and international context and which provide for transformational issues. There are effective strategies in place for the realisation and monitoring of these goals and priorities. Human, financial and infrastructural resources are available to give effect to these goals and priorities.

- The institution has a Mission that is explicit;
- Aims and objectives are in keeping with the mission. They are realistic and achievable;
- Adequate attention is given to transformational issues;
- The Mission goals and priorities are understood and owned by staff;
- The institution has a strategic plan with clear timeframes;
- There are effective strategies in place for the realisation, monitoring and evaluation of the strategic plan through an implementation process;
- Human, financial and infrastructural resources are available to achieve the goals and priorities.
- Responsibility for implementation, monitoring and evaluation are allocated to the responsible senior managers.

Institutional Management of Academic Standards

The audit panel will examination the arrangements in place for ensuring that the graduates from the programmes achieve internationally credible qualifications. In making judgements about the extent that students are achieving appropriate standards the audit panel will give particular attention to the extent to which the institution is making strong and scrupulous use of independent external examiners in summative assessment procedures and the use made of independent external assessors in the internal validation and periodic review of programmes.

- The institution has a strategy for quality and standards;
- The institution has a clearly established quality assurance system that sets out the responsibilities of departments, faculties and individual;
- The institution has systems in place for external examiners, and external reviewers,
- The assessment policies and regulations are designed to ensure the maintenance of academic standards;
- External examiners are independent of the institution and are appointed for a specified period not exceeding three years.
- They are from reputable institutions and have the necessary expertise and experience.
- Terms of reference are explicit and include moderation of question papers and model answers, moderation of scripts and providing feedback on performance of students. A feedback on the curriculum should be included.
- Ethical practice is given due importance.

Institutional Management of Learning Opportunities

The use made of external examiners and reviewers, research and other scholarly activity to inform teaching, learning resources, admission policies, student support and guidance, staff appraisal and academic staff development including staff engaging with pedagogic developments in their discipline.

- Policies regarding admissions are clear, transparent and accessible by the public;
- Policy on equal opportunities is implemented;
- Consideration is given to physically disabled and mature students;
- The institution has well established policies for appointment, appraisal and promotion of staff and the policies are effectively implemented;
- Performance appraisal of academic staff is undertaken periodically in a transparent manner with the employment of clearly developed criteria;
- Staff are informed of management's recorded perception of their strengths and weaknesses

- Appropriate support and training is provided for academic staff to enable them to perform more effectively and stay abreast of recent developments both in their subject area and in higher education pedagogy;
- Continuing professional development is actively promoted

Academic Support Services

Academic support services include the library, learning materials, computer support services, teaching accommodation, specialist facilities, ancillary support for learning and teaching. It is essential that they are adequate to support teaching and learning needs.

- Academic support services which adequately provide for the needs of teaching and learning, research, consultancy, knowledge transfer and community engagement, and help to give effect to teaching and learning objectives. Efficient structures and procedures facilitate interaction between academic provision and academic support.
- Academic support services which are adequately staffed and resourced and have the necessary infrastructure in place. The institution provides development opportunities to support staff in enhancing their expertise and to enable them to keep abreast of developments in their fields;
- Regular review of the effectiveness of academic support services for the core functions of the institution.

Institutional approaches to Quality Assurance and Enhancement

The existence of a quality assurance handbook readily available to all academic staff, the use made of external examiner reports, internal and external review, student feedback, management information, dissemination of good practice and staff development to enhance quality.

- The institution has adopted a working definition of quality assurance which is compatible with its mission;
- A systematic and comprehensive approach to quality assurance affecting all the essential services of the institution is being implemented;

- An academic planning framework exists which articulates the institutional Mission and strategic goals, and is adequately resourced;
- A quality assurance handbook addressing all the affected activities is in evidence and is available to all departments for consultation by all staff members;
- Key quality improvement priorities with regard to teaching and learning have been identified and appropriate resources allocated to enable improvements within a given timeframe;
- Staff development policies and strategies which promote the professional competence of staff;
- Regular reviews of the effectiveness of systems of quality assurance and support for learning and teaching;
- The availability of up-to-date data to inform policy, planning, implementation and review of teaching and learning;
- Clear and efficient systems are in place for the design and approval of new programmes, courses and modules. The requirements are consistently applied and regularly monitored.

Institutional Arrangements for Postgraduate Research Students (where appropriate)

This includes the arrangements for supervision and the training of supervisors, student feedback, monitoring of student progress and the provision made for students;

Institutional arrangements for the quality assurance, development, support, increasing productivity and monitoring of research and consultancy activities.

- Students are clearly informed of their commitment to research through appropriate guidelines.
- Role of supervisors is explicit and expectations by students from them and vice versa are clearly understood.
- Students receive adequate support through regular tutorials and continuous monitoring of progress, together with feedback.
- Physical resources including appropriate equipment are readily available

Research and Consultancy

Institutional arrangements for the quality assurance, development, support, increasing productivity and monitoring of research and consultancy activities.

- A research policy and/or plan which indicates the role and nature of research conducted at the institution and the monitoring and evaluation of research undertaken;
- Regular reviews of the effectiveness of the arrangements for the quality assurance, development and monitoring of arrangements for the quality assurance, development and monitoring of research functions;
- A clear research policy and regulations which indicate the role and nature of research conducted at the institution.

Administrative and Management Issues

Objectives and mechanisms for quality management are integrated into institutional planning. Financial planning ensures adequate resources are allocated for the development, improvement and monitoring of quality in the core activities of teaching and learning, research, consultancy, knowledge transfer and community engagement

Including governance, leadership, academic management, the admission of students and support of students, staff appointment procedures, development opportunities, appraisal and promotion. The qualities and competencies of academic staff are appropriate for a provider with degree-awarding powers, including maintaining high professional standards and acceptance of the professional responsibilities of operating in a higher education environment.

- Academic programmes, research, consultancy, knowledge transfer and community engagement are clearly aligned to the institutions mission and strategic goals;
- There are clear links between planning, strategic choices, resource allocation and quality management;
- Institutional planning which includes: quality management prioritisation and target setting at all critical decision making levels; and, goal setting and allocation of responsibilities for development issues;

- Management of resources in a way which ensures :transparency and accountability; proper budgeting and rational use of funds taking into account short and long term goals; the cost effective of programmes and other academic activities; and, effective internal auditing
- Adequate resource allocation through financial planning for the development , implementation , review and improvement of quality management mechanisms at all relevant levels;
- Regular review of the effectiveness and the impact of the integration of the objectives and mechanisms for quality management with institutional and financial planning;
- Institution-wide participation in the formulation of policies encouraged;
- Leadership is demonstrated by senior management through: developing and communicating the institution's strategic plan with identifiable short term and long term goals and objectives; developing and communicating the institution's mission and plan; establishing effective links with external stakeholders; and, developing an organisational structure which reduces bureaucracy and improves communication, efficiency and effectiveness
- Management of academic activities to ensure that programmes are relevant; ensuring that academic standards are continuously monitored and improved, and ensuring that the institution's awards are recognised nationally, regionally and internationally.
- Recruitment, selection, development and support policies that facilitate the availability of suitability of qualified and experienced academic and support staff to deliver the programmes. Staff capacity in relation to programme needs regularly reviewed.

Community Service and Good Governance:

The institution plays an active role in inculcating an ethic of community service and the ways these are linked to learning and teaching. Quality related arrangements for community engagement are formularised and integrated with those for teaching and learning where appropriate and are adequately resourced and monitored.

- The institution plays an active role in inculcating the spirit of a healthy community and in providing its services and expertise to promote socio-economic integration and development;
- The institution has in place procedures for the quality management of community engagement;
- The effectiveness of community engagement is regularly reviewed,

Deliberations and Decision of the Audit Panel

The audit panel takes note of all the findings. Members discuss their observations and decide on their conclusion, ensuring that it is a true reflection of the state of affairs at the institution. At the end of the audit the panel gives an oral feedback to the top management. Thereafter the institution is given a copy of the draft report within two months of the visit. This is followed by the final report which is sent within a period of three months.

Audit Programme

Day 1

08.00 - 09.30	Meeting with Institution's Director of Academic Quality, Academic Register, and institutional facilitator followed by orientation
09.30 - 10.15	Interview with Rector and Executive Management
10.15 - 10.30	<i>Review</i>
10.30 - 10.45	Coffee
10.45 - 11.45	Interview with Deans of Faculties/Heads of Schools
11.45 - 12.00	<i>Review</i>
12.00 - 12.45	Interview with Heads of Departments (one from each Faculty)
12.45 - 13.00	<i>Review</i>
13.00 - 14.00	Lunch
14.00 - 14.45	Interview with Lecturers (one from each department)
14.45 - 15.00	<i>Review</i>
15.00 - 15.15	Tea

15.15 - 16.00 Interview with Student Representatives
16.00 -18.00 *Review*

Plan for day 2

Day 2

09.00 - 09.45 Interview with Members of Senate
09.45 - 10.00 *Review*
10.00 - 10.15 Coffee
10.15 - 11.00 Interview with Members of the Board of Directors
11.00 - 11.15 *Review*
11.15 - 12.00 Meeting with Administrative and Support Staff
12.00 - 12.15 *Review*
12.15 - 1.15 Lunch
13.15 - 14.00 Interview with members of Staff Association
14.00 - 14.30 *Review*
Planning for day 3
14.30 - 16.30 Visits

Day 3

09.00 - 09.45 Interview with Quality Committee
09.45 - 10.00 *Review*
10.00 - 10.15 Coffee
10.15 - 11.00 Interview with Library Staff
11.00 - 11.15 *Review*
11.15 - 12.00 Interview with Employers
12.00 - 12.15 *Review*
12.15 - 13.15 Lunch
13.15 - 13.45 Interview with Director of Research and Knowledge Transfer
13.45 - 15.00 Meeting with Professors and members of Research and

Consultancy Committee

15.00 - 15.15

Tea

15.15 - 16.00

Meeting with Vice Rector Academic

16.00 - 16.30

Meeting with Vice Rector Administration and Finance

16.30 – 18.00

Review and preparation for Day 4

Day 4

08:00 – 09.00

Meeting with managers responsible for academic and generic staff development

09.00 – 10.30

Open Session – Students and Staff

10.30 - 11.00

Coffee

11.00 - 13.00

Private Panel Meeting to draft conclusions

13.00 – 14.00

Lunch

14.15 - 14.45

Closing meeting with Rector (and others): brief outline of Panel's main conclusions

APPENDIX 8:

REPUBLIC OF RWANDA



HIGHER EDUCATION COUNCIL

HANDBOOK FOR SUBJECT REVIEWERS

HANDBOOK FOR SUBJECT REVIEWERS

Introduction

This Handbook provides guidance for the members of panels for subject reviews. It should be read in conjunction with:

- The Handbook for Subject Reviews;
- The Rwandan National Higher Education Qualifications Framework (Appendix 1);
- The Code of Practice (Appendix 1);
- Higher Education Institutional Infrastructure and Academic Standards (Appendix 2);
- Requirements for the base room for subject review (Appendix 6).

The Handbook provides guidance for subject reviewers in coming to judgement on the ways and extent to which the institution meets quality and standards of teaching and learning, research, consultancy, knowledge transfer and community service in the subject area under review.

Six aspects of the teaching and learning provision are evaluated:

- Curriculum Design, Content and Organisation
- Teaching, Learning and Assessment
- Student Progression and Achievement
- Student Support and Guidance
- Learning Resources
- Quality Management and Enhancement

In addition the provision made to support research, consultancy, knowledge transfer activities and community engagement is considered.

The taught programmes delivered by the subject should be in line with the institution's mission, forms part of the institutional planning and resource allocation, meets national requirements, the needs of students and other stakeholders, and is intellectually credible. They must conform to the requirements of the *Rwandan National Higher Education Qualification Framework* and the associate *Code of Practice*.

Curriculum Design, Content and Organisation

- Programmes are designed to meet the needs of students, taking into account programme length/duration, modes of attendance, location, structure and sequence, optional elements etc;
- Programmes meet the requirements of the *Rwandan National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education*;
- Programmes go through a validation process which includes an external on the validation panel, and are subsequently approved by the Senate prior to their delivery;
- The validation process is an established procedure which is thorough, consistent, reliable and is in conformity with international norms;
- How well the intended learning outcomes relate to the overall aims of the programme and whether they enable the aims, to be met
- Programmes are periodically reviewed to ensure that they remain up to date and relevant to the needs of student, employers and the Rwandan economy;
- There is an established system of regular liaison between the institution and industry, public agencies, professional bodies and other potential end-users;
- Curricula aims and objectives are explicit and known to staff and students.
- The teaching staff establishment is sufficient to deliver the curricula.
- The teaching staff complement is suitable for the curricula, in terms of the mix of qualifications and skills, experience, aptitudes, age, status, etc.
- There is adequate support in terms of library, technician, administrative, student services, staffing, etc.
- Staff resources are effectively deployed: roles and relationships are well defined and understood; duties allocated are appropriate to qualifications, experience and aptitude; there is provision for review, consultation and redeployment.
- Staff development needs are systematically identified, in relation to individual aspirations, the curricula and institutional requirements.

- All staff, academic and non-academic, are given the opportunity with necessary support to undertake appropriate staff development related to identified needs: induction, in-service training, secondments, consultancy, research and other scholarly activities.
- The design and content of each programme will be evaluated in relation to the potential for enabling students to achieve the intended learning outcomes. Sources of information may include review reports, course and student handbooks and module descriptions. The reviewers will want to know how appropriate sections of the *Code of Practice* are met/ the timetable for coming into compliance.
- Reviewers will be able to judge whether the curriculum is appropriate to each stage of the programme(s) and to the level of the award(s).
- Students are required to gain a minimum level of competency in French and English.

The Teaching, Learning and Assessment Strategy

This is concerned with approaches used in teaching, learning and assessment and an evaluation of how successful they are. The self evaluation should review the effectiveness of student assessment in measuring the achievement of the intended learning outcomes.

- The academic environment, physical and social, is generally conducive to learning, and the level of research and other scholarly activities is appropriate to the level of teaching:
- Teaching accommodation is sufficient in quantity and is appropriate for the curricula on offer and for the full range of students.
- There are adequate specialist facilities - including practical and experimental learning facilities - for the curricula on offer.
- Ancillary facilities - staff accommodation, storage space, preparation rooms, amenity accommodation etc. - are adequate.
- The physical environment is adequately maintained in terms of safety, cleanliness, repairs and decor.

- Accommodation, especially specialist accommodation, is optimally used as evidenced by suitable plans, schedules, timetables and control systems.
- Teaching and learning are based on explicit learning outcomes which are consistent with programme aims.
- Teaching methods are innovative, varied, and appropriate to the stated learning outcomes and make effective use of available facilities, equipment, materials and aids.
- Teaching is well planned and prepared and effectively performed, taking account of the needs of all categories of students
- The style and pace of teaching and learning takes due account of the nature of the curricula, students' varied abilities and prior learning, and the specific needs of the very able or weak students equally.
- Teaching approaches encourage independent learning with critical thinking and students take responsibility for their own learning.
- Learning is enriched by appropriate reference to cross-curricular links, current research, industrial applications and development of generic skills such as communication and teamwork.
- Learning programmes are effectively organised and managed.
- Teaching programmes are clearly articulated, made known to students and regularly monitored.
- Coursework and assessment are systematically scheduled.
- Feedback is regularly obtained from students and employers, and analysed and acted upon as appropriate.
- Students' needs for guidance and support are recognised and provision made for advice and assistance in the curricular, vocational and personal domains.

*0 Responsibility for particular aspects of student support is clearly located and effective liaison maintained between arrangements at all levels.

*1 Adequate provision is made for information and advice to potential students during the application and enrolment phases.

*2 Students are effectively supported during their studies by systems of induction, course tutors, personal tutors and provision for remediation and curricular choice.

*3 Students are adequately prepared for the next stage of study or employment by appropriate contacts, information, advice and training.

- A range of assessment methods including coursework, projects, research and examinations, etc. is used in a planned manner to serve diagnostic, formative and summative purposes.

*4 Assessment schemes are compatible with the aims and aspects of the curricula as taught.

*5 The scope and weighting of assessment schemes are clear and known to all concerned and the standards applied are explicit and consistent across the curricula.

*6 Procedures are regularly applied to ensure that, as far as possible, assessment schemes are valid, reliable and fairly administered.

*7 Coursework is regularly set and assessed and is at the appropriate level of attainment.

*8 Coursework faithfully reflects the full range of curricular aims, including the development of generic skills.

*9 Student achievement, as represented by their coursework, is comparable with that of students on similar courses elsewhere.

*10 Students' performance and attitudes indicate a positive and successful learning experience.

*11 A systematic procedure for keeping record of student progress, for providing feedback to students and taking corrective action where necessary is effectively employed.

*12 Students have ready access to reasonable appeal procedures.

- A committee comprising the institution and industry and other principal stakeholders meets regularly for the purposes of manpower planning.
- An active interface exists with industries for the purposes of identifying programmes of study and suitable work experience compatible with the students' programme.
- The industrial sector is encouraged to participate in curriculum design and validation.

*13 Results are monitored and analysed and appropriate action taken to enhance performance.

*14 Quality Control arrangements at institutional, department, subject and/or course level are consistent and coherent.

*15 Quality standards, policies and strategies, are consistently applied and periodically reviewed within the cognate subject area.

*16 There is a general commitment to excellence in teaching and learning, apparent in staff and student attitudes in all aspects of provision.

*17 Reviewers will evaluate whether student achievement meets expectations. Sources of information will include external examiner reports, assessment board minutes, samples of student work, and statistical data on achievement and career destination. Review activities will include discussions with teaching teams, internal examiners, students and graduates.

*18 As a result of these activities, the reviewers should be able to judge whether appropriate standards are being met.

Student Progression and Achievement

The effectiveness of the strategies for the recruitment, admission and academic support, and guidance to facilitate students' progression and completion of a programme

- The effectiveness of the arrangements for recruitment, admission and induction;
- The overall strategy for student support and its relationship to the student profile, and the overall aims of the programme;
- How learning is facilitated by academic guidance, feedback and supervisory arrangement;
- the arrangements for academic tutorial support and their communication to staff and students, and how staff are enabled to provide the necessary support to students;
- The quality of written guidance;
- The extent to which arrangements are in place and effective in facilitating student progression towards successful completion of their programme;
- The Reviewers will evaluate the appropriateness of the overall strategy for academic support, including written guidance, and the extent to which it is

consistent with the student profile, and the overall aims of the programme. They will evaluate whether there is appropriate matching of the abilities of the students recruited to the demands of the programme and whether there are appropriate arrangements for academic guidance and support to facilitate progression, completion and non-completion. Reviewers will consider progression within programmes as well as non-completion rates. Sources of evidence may include statistical data on applications, admission, progression and completion, policy statements on admission and learning support, course and student handbooks, student evaluation, induction and tutorial support and discussions with staff and students.

Student Support and Guidance

Student Support and Guidance provided by the subject team/faculty and otherwise in the institution:

- Personal tutoring system;
- Personal Development Planning;
- Student Guidance.

Learning Resources

- There are sufficient physical resources to deliver the curricula, including equipment, materials and Information and Communications technology.
- Equipment is up-to-date, readily available and effectively deployed.
- Library, audio-visual, internet access, appropriate software and hardware and other academic services are adequate for the curricula.
- Staffing levels and the suitability of staff qualifications and experience, including teaching and non-teaching staff;
- Staff development opportunities including induction and mentoring for new staff, and whether opportunities are taken;
- Computing hardware, and both general and subject specific software availability and currency;
- Accessibility, including times of opening and opportunities for remote access, and induction and user-support provision;

- Suitability of the staff and teaching accommodation in relation to the teaching and learning strategy and the provision of support for students.
- The reviewers will evaluate how effectively learning is facilitated through the overall deployment of resources, including whether appropriate technical and administrative support is made available and the appropriateness of staff development strategy and practice. Sources of information will include direct observation of physical resources, internal review documents and minutes of meetings, equipment lists, staff curricula vitae, external examiners/reviewers reports and staff development documents. The reviewers will meet staff and students.
- As a result of these activities, the reviewers will be able to judge whether the learning resources available successfully underpin the programmes and whether there are appropriately qualified staff who are contributing effectively to the achievement of the intended learning outcomes.

Quality Management and Enhancement

Quality Management and Enhancement policies, practices and procedures including:

- The institutions approach to quality assurance and the effectiveness of the approach for the subject(s) under review;
- The use made of quantitative data and qualitative feedback from students, external examiners and other stakeholders in a strategy of enhancement and continuous improvement;
- The institutions responsiveness to internal and external review and assurance processes;
- The accuracy of the self evaluation;
- The reviewers will evaluate how well the internal mechanisms for assuring academic standards and quality are working. Sources of evidence will include student and staff feedback, external examiners reports, quantitative data, employer's views, internal review reports.

Research, Consultancy and Knowledge Transfer

Research and consultancy undertaken by academic staff in the subject area including registration for masters and PhDs;

- The research undertaken by staff in the last three years is adequate to underpin the curriculum at the levels of qualifications taught;
- The research contributes to the social and economic development of Rwanda?
- A detailed list of all consultancies undertaken by staff in the last three years demonstrates that the institution is providing expertise to support the social and economic development of Rwanda.
- Staff are registered for post graduate qualifications in areas that will support the enhancement of higher education provision by the provider;
- PhD research is in areas that will support the social and economic development of Rwanda;
- In areas where staff are not engaged in research and/or cutting edge consultancy the evidence of scholarly activities being undertaken is sufficient to ensure that students are being given access to recent and relevant knowledge.

Compliance with the Rwandan National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education and the Code of Practice

- All qualifications conform with the Rwandan Qualifications Framework for Higher Education;
- The institution is in conformity with the requirements of the Code of Practice;
- The institution is using the toolkits provided with the Code of Practice.

Deliberations and Decision of the Subject Review Panel

The subject review panel takes note of all the findings. Members discuss their observations and decide on their conclusion, ensuring that it is a true reflection of the

state of affairs at the institution. At the end of the subject review the panel gives an oral feedback to the top management. Thereafter the institution is given a copy of the draft report within two months of the visit. This is followed by the final report which is sent within a period of three months.

Subject Review Programme

Day 1

08.00 - 09.00	Meeting with Institution's Director of Academic Quality, Academic Registrar and institutional facilitator followed by orientation
09.00 -09.30	Interview with Rector and Executive Management
09.30 - 10.30	Tour of teaching facilities
10.30 - 10.45	Coffee
10.45 - 11.45	Interview with Dean of Faculty, Deputy Dean and Heads of Departments
11.45 - 12.00	<i>Review</i>
12.00 - 12.45	Interview with Lecturers
12.45 - 13.00	<i>Review</i>
13.00 - 14.00	Lunch
14.00 - 14.45	Interview with tutorial Assistants
14.45 -15.00	<i>Review</i>
15.00 - 15.15	Tea
15.15 - 16.00	Interview with Student Class Representatives and the Student Members of the Faculty Council
16.00 -18.00	<i>Review</i> <i>Plan for day 2</i>

Day 2

08.00 -10.00	Teaching observations
10.00 - 10.15	Coffee
10.15 - 12.00	Review of assessed work and programme specifications
<i>12.00 - 12.15</i>	<i>Review</i>
12.15 - 1.15	Lunch
13.15 - 14.00	Meeting with Faculty Administrative and Support Staff
<i>14.00 -17.00</i>	Observation of teaching
17.00 – 17.30	Review of Day 1

Day 3

08.00 - 09.00	Interview with Faculty Quality Committee
<i>09.00 - 10.00</i>	
10.00 - 10.15	Coffee
10.15 - 11.00	Interview with Library Staff
<i>11.00 - 11.15</i>	<i>Review</i>
11.15 - 12.00	Interview with Employers
<i>12.00 - 12.15</i>	<i>Review</i>
12.15 - 13.15	Lunch
13.15 – 17.00	Observation of teaching/ review of assessed work/ review of programme specifications
17.00 – 18,00	Review

Day 4

<i>08.00 – 09.00</i>	Meeting Dean and Deputy of Faculty
09.00 – 10.30	Open Session – Students and Staff
10.30 - 11.00	Coffee
<i>11.00 - 13.00</i>	Private Panel Meeting to draft conclusions
13.00 – 14.00	Lunch

14.15 - 14.45 Closing meeting with Rector (and others): brief outline of Panel's main conclusions

Agenda Meeting with Current /Former Students

Introduction

- Meeting with students enables reviewers to establish student views on the questions being considered, and inform the reviewer's judgements on the quality of the student learning experience. The reviewers will hold meetings with current students and former students. These meetings provide an opportunity not only to hear the views of those present, but also to establish more generally whether there are effective arrangements for student feedback and representation;
- The meeting will be between the external subject review team and the students.

Indicative Agenda

Intended learning outcomes and curricula

- Are students made aware of the intended learning outcomes by programme specification;
- What is the match between the expectations of students, the intended learning outcomes and the curricula content>
- What is the relevance to future employment?
- Are the workloads and timetables planned and manageable?

Assessment and Achievement

- Do students understand the criteria for assessment and the methods employed?
- Is there an assessment schedule, which is communicated clearly to students?
- Are assessments linked explicitly to learning outcomes?
- Is assessment formative as well as summative?
- What feedback do students receive on submitted work? Is it prompt, detailed and helpful?
- In their experience, do students feel they have achieved the intended learning outcomes?

- Are students' career aspirations likely to be satisfied?

Teaching and Learning

- Is the range of teaching and learning methods appropriate for delivering the curriculum?
- How do students perceive the quality of teaching?
- Is there effective support and guidance for group and independent studies?
- How are students' key and subject –specific skills developed?

Student progression and support

- What are the admission and induction procedures?
- How and when are students' learning and support needs identified?
- Do academic staff discuss students' progress with them on a regular basis?
- What are the arrangements for academic support?
- What career advice, guidance and support is provided? Is it effective?

Learning Resources and their deployment

- How good are the library services in terms of access, opening hours, the quantity, availability and currency of books and journals and other learning resources?
- What is the availability and location of the IT provision?
- Are the specialist accommodation, equipment, and consumables adequate in terms of quantity, currency and availability?
- Is teaching accommodation suitable? Does it facilitate large and small-group teaching and learning?

Student input into the maintenance and enhancement and quality

- How are student views sought? For example, are students represented on committees?

- Are they intended to attend re-validation or periodic events?
- Are there sufficient channels for eliciting student opinion?
- Are students' views influential? Can they provide examples?

Agenda Meeting with Employers

Introduction

- Meeting with employers enable the reviewers to establish employers' views on the programmes being taught ;
- The agenda should focus on the relevance and usefulness of the curriculum and knowledge and skills gained by students. The reviewers will be interested in establishing the extent to which the curriculum on offer is of direct benefit to employers.

Indicative Agenda for Meeting with Employers

Intended learning outcomes and curricula

- What role, if any, have employers had in the design of the curricula?
- Were employers consulted on the content of the curriculum offered?
- Are employers aware of the intended learning outcomes by programme specifications and /or other means?
- What is the match between the expectations of employers and the curricula content?
- Does the curricular content encourage the development of knowledge and skills? Are they of relevance to the employers'?
- What is the relevance of the curriculum to further study?

Assessment and achievement

- What contribution have employers made to student assessment?
- Do employers of graduates consider they have gained the necessary learning outcomes?

Teaching and learning

- What contributions have employers made to teaching and learning?
- Are employers aware of the range of teaching and learning methods used?

Student Support

- Do employers feel that students are adequately supported when they are on work placements?

Learning Resources and their Deployment

- Are employers aware of the library service and do they /their employees have access to the library?
- Do employers consider that the learning resources available to students, including technical equipment are adequate to prepare students for employment?
- Are employers given access to or demonstrated specialist equipment?

Employer contribution to the maintenance and enhancement of standards

- Are employers views sought about the content of programmes?
- Are employers involved I n the development of new programmes/reviews of existing ones?
- Are employers involved on validation panels?
- Do you think employers' views are influential?
- Do you think that employers should be involved in the development and delivery of higher education?

Satisfaction with employees from the higher education institution

- Overall how satisfied are you with your employees who have studied at the institution?
- What would you say they know/can do well?
- What knowledge and/or skills do they lack when they have completed their programmes that you would find it useful for them to have?

Observation of Teaching and Learning

1. The arrangements for the review of teaching carried out by the subject provider will vary to reflect the nature and scope of the visit. If the provider can demonstrate that they have in place a system of peer observation of teaching and the review team are confident that the student's assessed work demonstrates that they are achieving the intended learning outcomes observation of teaching by the review team may not be necessary. In all other cases members of the review team will carry out direct observation of teaching.
2. If observation of teaching is carried out at least one teaching session at each level for each degree programme offered by the subject provider will be observed. The review team will select teaching sessions from the timetables provided in the base room;
3. Before the observation of teaching takes place the review team member will meet the lecturer to discuss the overall objectives for the session, and to determine how students are intended to benefit from it. Understanding the purpose of the session is essential, For example, a lecture delivered for the express purpose of transmitting information will be structured differently from one designed to elicit student participation or stimulate extensive further reading.
4. The reviewer should not make comments during the teaching session and should not engage directly in the activity. On occasion the reviewer may talk with students engaged in practical learning activities or during independent learning sessions. The reviewers may be about student's experiences and how the activity being observed fits into their wider programme of study. It is important that the reviewer seeks approval from the member of staff before talking to students.
5. The reviewer should be as unobtrusive as possible when observing a class. An observer should observe a class that lasts longer than one hour for about an hour.
6. The observer should complete the *Evaluation of Teaching and Learning Form* for each class observed.

7. The reviewer should evaluate the quality of teacher and learning opportunities offered to students against the broad aims of the subject provider and the intended learning outcomes set to bring about the achievement of these aims

Summary of observation

Please summarise the effectiveness of this session in relation to curriculum and programme aims

Does the observation provide information to be considered in relation to
(Please give details)

Standards	Student progression	Learning resources

Does this class observation suggest that there may be exemplary features? Please give details

Please comment on the strengths and areas for improvement of the session in relation to the learning objectives

	Strengths	Areas for improvement
Clarity of objectives		
Planning and organisation		
Suitability of teaching method used		
Delivery (e.g. breadth, depth, pace, challenge)		

<p>Content (e.g. subject matter, currency, accuracy, relevance, use of examples, level, match to student needs, use of staff research scholarship/professional activity)</p>		
<p>Effectiveness of engagement with and participation by students</p>		
<p>Quality and use of teaching materials to support learning</p>		
<p>Transmission of intellectual knowledge and understanding</p>		

Development of practical knowledge and skills (if relevant)		
Effectiveness of development of transferable skills		
Use of Accommodation and other learning resources		

Signed:

Date:

REPUBLIC OF RWANDA



HIGHER EDUCATION COUNCIL

Review of Effectiveness of Assessment

Please evaluate and comment on the assessment process and indicate the strengths and areas for improvement. Please consult the aims and learning outcomes specified for the module, the assessment set, the marking schemes and student work.

(Please complete one form for each module for which assessment is evaluated – at least four modules should be considered for each year of each programme delivered by the subject provider.)

	Strengths	Areas for improvement
Does the assessment process enable learners to achieve the intended learning outcomes of the module? e.g. clarity of design, appropriateness to level, match to aims and leaning outcomes		
Are there criteria that enable internal and external examiners to distinguish between different categories of achievement? Are the criteria appropriate and are they implemented		
Can there be full confidence in the security and integrity of the assessment procedures?		

<p>Is there internal moderation, and verification and of marking? Is the marking consistent?</p>		
<p>Does the assessment strategy have an adequate formative function in developing student abilities? What forms of feedback are used? What is the quality of the feedback? Do students get feedback in time to benefit from it?</p>		
<p>Is the assessment method appropriate and effective for testing achievement of the intended learning outcomes? Does the assessment enable students to demonstrate that they have achieved all the intended learning outcomes?</p>		

Do the standards achieved by students on this module meet the minimum expectations for this assessment?

Please give details of any exemplary features

Signed

Date

APPENDIX 9

REPUBLIC OF RWANDA



HIGHER EDUCATION COUNCIL

GUIDELINES FOR UNDERTAKING A SELF-EVALUATION

Introduction

This document provides guidelines for institutions on preparing a self evaluation in preparation for institutional audits and subject reviews. It should be read in conjunction with *Handbook for Academic Quality Assurance and Enhancement and Maintenance of Standards in Higher Education* and in particular the section - *Handbook for Institutional Audit* and *Handbook for Subject Review*.

The HEC has the statutory responsibility to ensure the quality and standards of all higher education provisions in Rwanda. Towards this end, it has developed a Framework for Quality Assurance for Higher Education in Rwanda, which puts into perspective the quality assurance agenda for the higher education sector. In order to implement this agenda, the HEC has set out to:

- Assist the institutions in putting in place their specific quality assurance systems;
- Advise the Minister on the granting of in definitive operating licences to private institutions;
- Undertake periodic external quality audits of institutions;
- Undertake periodic external subject reviews of institutions.

Quality in higher education can be taken to refer to “**fitness for purpose** and can be extended to include “**fitness of purpose**”. Fitness for purpose is taken to mean that the institution has its own mission and objectives and that it is successfully fulfilling its mission and achieving the stated objectives, i.e. it is fit for the purpose of the responsibility it has assumed. Unlike earlier definitions which include an element of comparison with a reference point, in this case there is no requirement that an institution’s quality is subject to comparison with another’s statement of quality. To illustrate this point one can borrow an example from the motor industry; it does not do justice to compare a “Mini” with a “Rolls Royce” as each automobile is built for a different clientele in mind. Both vehicles are passenger cars, but they differ substantially in size, shape, performance, reliability, comfort and price, among other things. Nonetheless, each can be judged to be a high quality vehicle so long as they meet their stated specifications and guarantee. In the same manner, each higher educational institution offers programmes for specific groups of students who can

benefit from them in furthering their career. By way of the same argument, it is not justifiable to compare one institution with another as each one came into being for a specific purpose and was created with very different objectives from one another. This argument is particularly true in the Rwandan setting as each of the higher education institutions was created with their specific characteristics, missions and purpose. Thus, an institution's quality is judged against its own stated objectives rather than an external reference point. However, an institution must demonstrate sensitivity to the national requirements and interests. In this regard, built into its mission and objectives must be an undertaking to respond to national imperatives in an appropriate manner, thus embracing the concept of fitness of purpose. Hence, institutions have a responsibility to publicly demonstrate that they are sensitive to the national needs as well as demonstrating that the education and training they are providing are of standards such that the qualifications are recognised nationally, regionally and internationally.

The ultimate question that arises is how do institutions know whether they are adhering to their mission and achieving their objectives? The answer simply lies in the need for institutions to have adequate control mechanisms and an effective monitoring system to ensure that quality of educational provision is maintained and continuously improved. These are on-going exercises that are implemented by all responsible institutions. Over and above these continuing processes, institutions need to conduct periodic self-evaluation which can be regarded as an internal audit to ascertain that their quality assurance system is effective. Such an audit provides the institution tangible evidence of its achievements and strengths as well as weaknesses. Guided by the findings, it takes necessary measures to redress any imbalances.

Quality of educational provision can be ascertained by none other than the provider of the education and training. Since they are deemed to have the necessary expertise to design and offer programmes, they necessarily have the responsibility to determine whether a student has acquired the required knowledge, skills and attitudes to be able to practice/function at the level of a "graduate" or "professional". Thus, the lecturer who nurtures the growth and development of his/her students also checks their progress and extent of development before judging them as having achieved the

necessary standard for a pass or otherwise. The lecturer therefore acts both as facilitator and regulator, although some form of moderation is required.

While institutions are putting in place appropriate mechanisms to ensure that their students benefit from internationally credible education and training, it is necessary for independent bodies to confirm that the institutions in question have a “clean bill of health”. Taking another analogy from the motor industry, whereas the manufacturer of the vehicle can certify that the vehicle is in good condition, all eligible vehicles are required to undergo an independent test for road worthiness. Thus, they are examined to ensure that they meet the safety regulations for the safety and comfort of passengers and other road users alike. Similarly, educational institutions are subject to external verification to confirm or otherwise the soundness of their undertakings. In so doing they take a step in informing stakeholders about the quality of educational experience and academic standards at the institutions.

The HEC has the responsibility to ensure quality and standards of all higher education provision. In line with internationally established good practice, educational institutions are required to undergo external verification of institutional quality assurance and enhancement systems. The most common and widely used process of such verification takes the form of institutional academic audit and subject reviews. Academic audits and subject reviews will be conducted by the HEC.

Guidelines for Preparing Self Evaluations for Institutional Audit/Subject Review

The institution must prepare a self assessment (subject review) or briefing paper (institutional audit). The verification of this self-evaluation is the methodology used for both subject review and institutional audit. Self- evaluation is a valuable means of identifying whether an institution is adhering to its mission and achieving its objectives.

In undertaking the task of preparing the self assessment/briefing paper the institution should consider the following:

- Planning for the visit including the preparation of the self assessment/briefing paper;
- Scope of the evaluation – who and what are to be audited/ assessed;
- Persons who are to be involved in preparing for the audit/assessment who must be knowledgeable, dedicated and have a thorough understanding of the institution;
- Persons who will be involved during the audit/ assessment visit;
- The need for the assessment to be deductive and not inductive.

The work preparing the self-evaluation will generate lots of *information* and provide the evidence for the institution to support the claims it wishes to make with respect to its ability to assure the quality and standards of its educational provision.

In planning your work you may find it useful to identify the systems that underpin core processes and to determine if you have systems in place to support teaching, research, knowledge transfer, community engagement and research. A system can be defined as an integrated infrastructure of policies, structures, procedures, practices, resources, capacities, data and technology. Table 1 provides an example of a possible tool for collecting the information.

Table 1: System that Underpins Core Processes

System elements	Teaching	Research	Knowledge Transfer	Community Engagement	Quality Assurance and Enhancement
Policies					
Structures					
Procedures					
Practices					
Planning					
Human Resources					
Financial					

Resources					
Physical Resources					
Data					
Technology					
Monitoring and Evaluation					

Planning

The Action plan

Like any important transaction, self-evaluation requires careful planning to justify the required time and resources and, to ensure that all necessary preparations are made in good time. The person who has overall responsibility for quality assurance and enhancement in the institution should convene the staff that will form the steering group preparing for the audit/subject review. This group should take overall responsibility for preparations for the visit including preparation of the self-evaluation. It should discuss how the self-evaluation will be developed and approved and, the other necessary preparations. Agreement should be reached on: the purpose of the self-evaluation, a timetable drawn up, and responsibilities assigned and, general agreement reached as to who will do what, when and how. One person should be given overall responsibility for collating the self assessment and preparing the final draft. Reference should be made to the *Handbook for Academic Quality Assurance and Enhancement and Maintenance of Standards in Higher Education*.

Identification of areas to be covered

The action plan must specify all the areas that have been identified for the evaluation.

Identification of criteria

Self-evaluation, by definition, must result in an outcome - a judgement has to be made as to whether a particular practice is good or poor or otherwise. In the interest of objectivity, there must be clear guidelines and valid criteria for undertaking the evaluation. The planning phase can be used to identify the criteria and standards that would constitute achievement of objectives. The institution needs to refer to its strategic plan, the Higher Education Qualifications Framework for Rwanda and the associated Code of Practice, institutional policies, practices and procedures and, in the case of subject reviews, relevant programme specifications. These will guide the institution on the direction it should be taking and the actions it should be taking. The self assessment/briefing paper should evaluate the effectiveness of the implementation process. The assessment/briefing paper should reveal strengths, including good practice, as well as weaknesses, if any. In the light of the evaluation the self-assessment /briefing paper should indicate the areas the institution has identified for improvement and the steps it intends to take to carry out the necessary improvements. The process can be thought of as a continuous, cyclical process, with an emphasis on continuous improvement.

Identification of information and possible generation of data

The criteria identified will facilitate the identification of information and data to justify whether a goal/objective has been achieved. The plan will identify the persons responsible for collecting information and data. It should also state what use will be made of the data.

Who should be involved and what roles they will play

As mentioned above, planning involves identification of personnel who will be responsible for carrying out specific tasks. For an effective and meaningful self-evaluation, taking a faculty as an example, it is necessary to involve all persons having direct responsibility in the delivery of a programme. Similarly, in all other areas of the institution, participation of persons having direct responsibility must be secured in the preparation of self-evaluation.

Timetable

A well-planned self-evaluation must have a timetable for achieving the stated objectives on time, and it also means that allowance must be made for untoward occurrences. Progress on the plan must be monitored on a regular basis by the self-evaluation group and the timetable adjusted as necessary.

Scope of the evaluation

The self-evaluation group needs to identify the scope of the exercise. Certainly, the major functions of the institution have to be addressed and, by implication, all the departments lending support to the main functions also need to be addressed. The group should refer to *Handbook for Academic Quality Assurance and Enhancement and Maintenance of Standards in Higher Education* and in particular the section - *Handbook for Institutional Audit* and *Handbook for Subject Review* which are authoritative.

Persons involved in the assessment must be knowledgeable, dedicated and have a thorough understanding of the plan

For the successful outcome of a self-evaluation, without labouring the point, it is crucial for all personnel involved in this exercise to have a thorough understanding of the plan. Without the basic understanding and the necessary drive, a self-evaluation may suffer from serious weaknesses that can thwart the whole initiative. Hence, careful selection of the team cannot be overemphasized.

The evaluation should be deductive and not inductive

A deductive approach implies that the evaluation is carried out in an objective manner, moving from the known, assembling evidence to arrive at conclusions. On the other hand, an inductive approach implies that the evaluation is carried out with the objective of providing evidence to support an opinion. In this case it is subjective.

A self-evaluation is not merely a paper exercise designed to prove that a certain practice exists or that an institution is working in perfect harmony. Such an approach is self-defeating as the objective of this exercise is to improve, and improvement

cannot be entertained if weaknesses are not identified. Areas of weakness should be identified as well as areas of good practice. It is important to be objective.

Assembling the Information and Evidence

Information

Information for the sake of it serves no purpose in a self-evaluation. It must be useful and add weight to certain assertions or arguments in relation to the functions of the institution. It can be quantitative and qualitative and is generally obtained from surveys, performance indicators, etc. Information can be obtained through questionnaires and interviews from many sources. A good way to approach this task is to adopt the strategy formulated by the former HEQC (1996) of the UK, which is encapsulated in the questions that follow:

3. What are you trying to do?
4. Why are you trying to do it?
5. How are you doing it?
6. Why are you doing it that way?
7. Why do you think that is the best way of doing it?
8. How do you know it works?
9. How do you improve it?

This strategy may be employed to check whether the objectives of the exercise are being achieved.

The following is a list of possible areas that can be explored for gathering the necessary information and evidence.

Sources of Information

The Institution in Context

- Vision and Mission
- Aims and Objectives
- Strategic Plan

Curriculum Development and Programme Assessment

(Including input from employers)

- Programme design
- Programme validation and approval including the reports of validation panels
- Programme Specifications
- Assessment, including moderation and external examiner reports
- Programme reviews

Students

- Registration, admission, entry qualifications, etc.
- Equal opportunities, access, mature students, etc;
- Numbers on full-time and part-time/flexible mode or distance education;
- Attendance, dropout rates and reasons;
- Completion, pass rates, awards, value added.

Feedback from Students and Alumni

- Evidence, views and recommendations from staff/student meetings, course/programme committees, etc;
- Students' views on effectiveness of teaching;
- Tracer studies, employment within six months of qualifying, etc

Staff perceptions

- Staff perceptions of courses, course materials, assessments, staff-student ratio and factors affecting their performance. Part-time lecturers must be included.

Staff development

- Who has responsibility for policy and implementation of staff development and how this is organised and implemented?
- What mechanisms exist for identification of staff development needs?
- Record of who has benefited and how, over a given period.

External perceptions

- External examiners' reports and action taken
- Feedback from examination and assessment board meetings
- Feedback from employers/trainers
- Feedback from faculty/school advisory groups

Resources

- Physical and financial: quantitative data and policy
- Human: numbers, qualifications, experiences, age, equal opportunities. Noteworthy achievements, including research and scholarship. Links with employers and professions. Support staff numbers, qualifications, etc.
- Library/learning resource centre: quantitative and qualitative data, policy, responsibilities and links between library subject specialists and teaching staff.
- Welfare: facilities and policy

Research

- Institutional approach to research; relative importance given to it, etc
- Collaboration with industry or other institutions
- Achievements and contribution to country's development

Quality assurance and enhancement

- An outline of the quality assurance system, policy and responsibility
- Quality assurance in the provision and design of programmes of study
- Review of established courses and programmes
- Quality assurance in teaching, learning, research and communications
- Quality assurance in relation to academic staff – staff appointment procedures, staff development and training, staff appraisal, promotion, evaluation of teaching quality, etc.
- Quality assurance in relation to assessments
- Mechanisms for quality assurance in the validation of courses, internal and external to the institution
- Verification, feedback and enhancement – external examiners, appointment of external examiners, student evaluation of courses and

programmes, staff/student liaison committees and views of professional and external bodies

- Problems identified, actions taken and outcomes
- Future developments

Evidence

Mere information cannot be considered as evidence without supporting criteria. Criteria are necessary for a judgement to be made and information becomes evidence when it is linked to the criteria on which judgements are made. Thus,

Information + Criteria = Evidence

In carrying out the self-evaluation it is necessary to structure questions that will provide necessary information. Following receipt of the information, it will be possible to identify whether it is valid and reliable and whether it can be used to support an argument/judgement.

Judgements

A necessary part of self-evaluation involves making a judgement to determine whether something/a practice is good or might benefit from change/improvement. Information *per se* does not provide evidence and it cannot be used to make a judgement, whereas, self-evaluation requires judgement, judgement that the standard or a certain course is appropriate and acceptable or simply in need of improvement or radical change. Therefore, criteria must be developed to be able to assess information as to whether it can be used for making a judgement. All judgements need to be supported by evidence – they need to be verifiable.

A self-evaluation, therefore, should not be merely descriptive. It requires critical self-analysis and this has to be reflected in the report. The reader must not be left guessing as to what is implied in a statement. It has to be explicit. If a particular practice is found to be excellent, then it is necessary to give the reasons for such a statement and how other institutions could benefit from it. On the other hand, if a practice is deemed to be lacking in quality, then it must be spelt out in what way it is poor, what is lacking and how it can be remedied. Only then a self-evaluation will serve its purpose.

Therefore, a self-evaluation, by its nature, must contain judgements and reasons for them.

Much of the information obtained from students, tracer studies, employers, professional bodies and external examiners are judgemental in nature and can be usefully incorporated in the report.

Judgements, therefore, should demonstrate the following:

- That the evidence on which the judgement is made is clear, valid and reliable
- That weaknesses as well as strengths are identified
- That the reader should not be left to guess on them; they should be explicit
- Assertions about quality without supporting evidence are avoided.

Reporting

The team assuming the responsibility for carrying out the self-evaluation should decide at the planning stage on the preparation of the report, assembling information and making the judgements.

The purpose of the self-evaluation will, to a large extent, determine the presentation of the report. The working group entrusted with the responsibility for preparing the self-evaluation takes responsibility for compiling data and preparing drafts. However, for consistency of style and coherence of arguments, the final responsibility for writing the report has to be assumed by a single person. Invariably, it is assumed by the person having overall responsibility for quality assurance in the institution. The final self evaluation/briefing paper should be approved by the Senate, the Executive Council and the Board of Directors before submission to the HEC.

Content and Structure of the Self Assessment / Briefing Paper

The requirements are set out in the relevant sections of the *Handbook for Academic Quality assurance and Enhancement and Maintenance of Standards in Higher*

Education and in particular the section - *Handbook for Institutional Audit* and *Handbook for subject Review*. The self assessment/briefing paper should conform to the requirements as set out.

Confirmation of the accuracy of evidence and the report

Before finalising the report, it is always a good idea to check on the accuracy of the data, evidence and the overall report. This can be done by consulting those who have provided the information with the explicit request to verify the information and not comment on the judgements. The working group can then endorse the final draft before it is put together as the final report.

Impact of the report

Readers of the report should get a clear picture of the views expressed by the self-evaluation group about itself and the institution as a whole, including its strengths and weaknesses. It should also state how the strengths will be maintained and there must be a frank appraisal of the weaknesses with identification of the reasons for their presence and a realistic way of dealing with them.

Guidelines for writing the self assessment/briefing paper

The self assessment/briefing paper must contain sufficient information to enable reviewers/auditors to obtain an overall picture of the institution, including the range and complexity of its undertakings. It does not have to be exhaustive to the extent that it becomes voluminous.

At the very outset of the process, the working group should decide the following:

- Who will do what, how and when;
- Who will prepare the draft;
- The timetable, including dates for submission;
- The structure;
- Confirm evidence with sources.

Conclusions should:

- Reflect judgements based on evidence;
- Avoid assertions which cannot be supported with evidence;
- Be approved and owned by all the members of the self-evaluation group.

Recommendations should be:

- Explicit and attainable within the time frame;
- Addressed to a specific person or body having the necessary power and responsibility for action.

It must contain adequate information to enable auditors to obtain an overall picture of the institution, including the range and complexity of its undertakings. It does not have to be exhaustive to the extent that it becomes voluminous, nor should it be overly conservative to the extent that important facts go undetected. Should the reviewers/ auditors need additional information on specific items before the visit, they will make a request it to be forwarded.

Actions and Monitoring

The self-assessment/ briefing paper should identify actions that will need to be taken to overcome identified weaknesses. It should also identify how monitoring of the actions taken with respect to the recommendations will be carried out and who will carry them out.

The Portfolio of Evidence

In addition to the self assessment/briefing paper the institution has to prepare a portfolio of evidence which provides the basis for the conclusion reached. A base room should be provided for the reviewers/auditors with all the key documents as set out in the *Handbook for Academic Quality Assurance and Enhancement and Maintenance of Standards in Higher Education* and in particular the section - *Handbook for Institutional Audit and Handbook for Subject Review*.

The information provided in the base room must be laid out so the reviewers/auditors can find it easily. Given that it is the basis on which an institution is assessed, the

auditors scrutinise the document and make an appraisal of the quality and standards of the educational provision against the institution's stated mission and objectives.

Submission of the Self Evaluation/Briefing Paper

When a final version of the self assessment/briefing paper has been approved, it should be submitted together with supporting documents to the HEC in ten copies (in French and English).

REPUBLIC OF RWANDA



HIGHER EDUCATION COUNCIL

PROGRAMME PROPOSAL FORM

1. PROGRAMME DETAILS

1 <u>Programme Title</u>				
2 <u>Exit Awards</u>				
3 <u>Modes of Attendance</u> <i>(please tick)</i>	Part-time		Full-time	
	Distance Learning		Work-based Learning	
	Other (please		Short course	
	1		5	
	2		6	
_____	3		Other (write in)	
_____	4			
4 <u>Resource group:</u> (See Notes of Guidance)				
5 <u>First year of presentation</u>			Current Session (short courses only)	

2. PROGRAMME FUNDING AND ADMINISTRATION

1	<u>Programme</u>				
	<u>Organiser/Leader:</u>				
2 <u>Programme Development Team</u>					
Name					Faculty
(Chair)					
(Library Representative)					
(CIT Centre Representative)					
3 <u>Faculty/ School/Centre administratively responsible for the programme</u>					

FOR PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS

4. <u>Projected Student numbers</u>	First year of presentation					
Government Sponsored						
YEAR						
Level 1						
Level 2						
Level 3						
Level 4						
Level 5						
Level 6						
TOTAL						

FOR PUBLIC AND PRIVATE PROVIDERS

5 Projected student numbers –Private:

YEAR								
	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time
Level 1								
Level 2								
Level 3								
Level 4								
Level 5								
Level 6								
Short Courses								
TOTAL								

6 WILL THE PROGRAMME BE RESOURCED FROM THE EXISTING RESOURCES OF THE CONTRIBUTING FACULTY(S), SCHOOL(S) CENTRE(S)?

YES		NO	
------------	--	-----------	--

If 'No' please indicate the resource requirements, including the proposed source of funding.

7 STAFFING (numbers of staff at each grade – or estimate)

	Year				SOURCE OF FUNDS
Academic Staffing					
Full professors					
Associate professors					
Senior lecturers					
Lecturers					
Assistant lecturers					
Tutorial assistants					
(Other – e.g. short-term expatriate)					
Support Staff					
Technical & Other Staff					
Equipment					
Library					
Other					

.

8 General accommodation requirements

(Please give details of the classroom and laboratory space required to deliver the programme and whether the space is currently available)

3. PROGRAMME BACKGROUND, RATIONALE AND INDICATIVE CONTENTS

(See Notes of Guidance)

4. UNIT APPROVAL

Faculties/Schools/Centres contributing to Programme (this table should be signed by the Deans/Heads of all Units contributing to the programme to confirm agreement with the proposal).

Faculty	Dean /Director	Date
1	Signature	
	Print Name	
2	Signature	
	Print Name	
3	Signature	
	Print Name	
4	Signature	
	Print Name	

Seen and noted

Library	Signature	
	Print Name	
ICT	Signature	
	Print Name	
Quality Office	Signature	
	Print Name	

5. CENTRAL AUTHORISATION

Estimated cost in FRw

Staffing - total					
Equipment					
Library					
Other					
Overall total					

Resource Confirmation _____

Date:

VRAF

Approved

Date:

VRA

Appendix 11

REPUBLIC OF RWANDA



HIGHER EDUCATION COUNCIL

INSTITUTIONAL FACILITATOR

1. Introduction

An institution that is undergoing a visit for definitive operating licence, institutional audit or subject review may nominate a member or members of staff (normally no more than three) to take on the role of institutional facilitator. For definitive licence and institutional audit visits the director of Academic Quality would normally be one of the institutional facilitators. For subject review a senior member of academic staff from the faculty being reviewed may be more appropriate. The purpose of this is to provide effective liaison between the auditor/reviewers and the institution and its staff, and to ensure that the auditor/reviewers obtain accurate and comprehensive information about the institution.

Staff who are nominated to act as institutional facilitators should:

1. Have been trained by the Higher Education Council and be on the Council's *Register of Auditors, Facilitators and External Examiners*;
2. Have a thorough knowledge of the structure, policies, priorities, procedures and practices of their institution;
3. Extensive knowledge and experience of working in higher education;
4. Extensive experience of quality assurance procedures;
5. Be fluent in spoken and written English;
6. (For Subject Review) qualifications and experience in a subject area being reviewed;

7. An ability to maintain confidentiality.

It is preferable that the facilitator(s) are either senior members of academic staff or a senior administrator or manager. **(Note the Dean of the Faculty and/or Heads of Academic Departments that are involved in a subject review may not act as facilitator).**

2. General Matters

The Chair of the Panel is responsible for the organisation and management of the review. The institution is primarily responsible for ensuring that the panel is provided with appropriate evidence to allow it to reach judgements. The facilitator's role is to ensure that the channels of communication between the two work effectively. Discussions between the institutional facilitator and the Panel Chair should ensure that the institution is aware of the issues being addressed by the auditors/reviewers and the evidence needed to help them reach judgements.

Throughout the visit the institutional facilitator helps the panel to come to a clear and accurate understanding of the structures, policies and procedures of the institution, and the nature of the provision under scrutiny. **The institutional facilitator is not a member of the panel and will not make judgements about the provision.**

The role requires the institutional facilitator to observe objectively, to communicate clearly with the panel to respect protocols on confidentiality outlined below, and to establish effective relationships with the Panel Chair and the team. Institutional facilitators should refrain from acting as advocates for the institution but they may legitimately:

- Assist the institution in understanding issues of concern to the panel members;
- Respond to requests for information and comment;
- Draw the panel members' attention to matters that they may have overlooked;
- Identify the location of evidence;
- Provide advice on matters relating to the operation of the institution.

3. Activities preceding the Visit to the Institution

Institutions may find it helpful to involve institutional facilitators' in preparing for the visit. The institutional facilitator should take responsibility for the preparation of the base room and ensuring that all those required to be involved during the visit are fully briefed and available at the times required.

4. Activities During the Visit

The institutional facilitator should be available to work with the panel for the duration of the visit.

They are responsible for:

- Preparing the base room;
- Organising the scheduled meetings;
- Arranging for visits to various parts of the institution as the panel may request;
- (For subject review) making the arrangements for the observation of teaching as requested by the panel;
- Getting such additional information as the panel may request during the visit.

Institutional facilitators may attend the following:

- All meetings of the panel except those at which judgements are being discussed;
- Formal meetings held between the panel members and the institution to investigate matters specific to quality and standards, except those with current and former students;
- Meetings held between the panel and members of the institutions staff.

5. Confidentiality

Institutional facilitators will observe the same conventions of confidentiality as panel members. In particular no information gained during a visit should be used in a manner that allows individuals to be identified. Institutional facilitators may take notes when they are present in meetings to help them brief staff on the subjects being addressed by the panel.

Appendix 12

STUDENT BRIEFING PAPER

The students are invited to submit a briefing paper when the institution is scheduled for institutional audit or has applied for a definitive operating licence. The paper will normally be prepared by the student representatives on the Board of Directors and Senate. The paper should comment from the perspective of students.

The Paper should be structured under the following sections:

- Student representation on institutional committees;
- The quality of the teaching and learning provided;
- Personal tutoring/academic support;
- The adequacy of the library resources;
- The adequacy of computing facilities;
- The adequacy of student services including counselling and guidance, medical services and residential accommodation;
- The systems in place for student appeals and complaints;
- Careers guidance and perception of employment prospects on completion of programmes of study;
- Engagement in community service;
- Sporting and cultural facilities;
- Any other matters the student body wishes to bring to the attention of the auditors.

Student representatives will have the opportunity to meet with the auditors during their visit to the institution.