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Local Relevance: East Africa

Massification & Widening Participation

Increasing demand for higher education (enrollment more than doubled in the last 5 years to 664,000 in HEIs in EA)

Increasing number of higher education institutions (1960:3; Today:194 across EA)

Kenya’s HE GER is 4% (compared to less than 1% in Tanzania), though targeted to be 10% by 2022

Between 51% to 63% of the graduates were perceived by employers to lack competencies for the job market (IUCEA 2014)
The emergence of regional integration (EAC) requiring:

- Harmonization of the education systems
- Mutual recognition of qualifications for regional mobility

Need for systematic and structured QA systems: IUCEA and DAAD 10 year partnership based on:

- Experiences, guidelines and standards of national HE commissions of Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda
- Strong EQA without equally strong IQA does not guarantee real improvement in quality
IUCEA Analysis Model: Academic Quality Framework
AKU: A single integrated international university

• Adopted the regional IQA framework

Multi-country, multi-campus university
Global but local
One university, integrated
Common standards
Opportunities for students, faculty & staff to spend time at different campuses
Committed to a Quality Learning Environment

Made possible through the development of distributed networks

Network of Teaching & Learning

Network of Blended & Digital Learning

Network of Quality Assurance & Improvement
AKU GRADUATE ATTRIBUTES

1. Ethical, global leaders
2. Critical and creative thinkers
3. Evidence-based decision-makers
4. Effective communicators
5. Socially- and environmentally-aware citizens
6. Knowledgeable in their field to be change agents
7. Lifelong learners

In addition, particularly in graduate programmes:
G1. Able to create knowledge
G2. Able to solve multi-faceted complex problems
TL Framework: 7 principles
(Chickering and Gamson, 1987; HEA UK, 2010)

1. encourages contact between students and faculty,
2. develops reciprocity and cooperation among students,
3. encourages active learning,
4. gives prompt feedback,
5. emphasizes time on task,
6. communicates high expectations
7. respects diverse talents and ways of learning.
Dimensions of Quality
Gibbs, HEA (2010, 2012)

WHAT MAKES FOR BETTER STUDENT OUTCOMES?

Quality of Student Intake
Class size and close contact with faculty
Pedagogical practices that engender student engagement
Quality of faculty and a teaching qualification
Quantity and Quality of feedback (formative)

Total Student Effort
Funding allocation on education development
Whether teaching is valued, rewarded, supported and funded
Reflecting the limited evidence base of the IQA framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEA (UK), Gibbs, 2010</th>
<th>IUCEA Cells</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Student Intake (entry standards) is the best predictor of student educational outcomes.</td>
<td>Cell 10 so we favour privilege?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class size (and close contact with faculty, but not class contact hours, nor necessarily low student to staff ratios). <strong>Sts:Tchr ratio; contact hours</strong></td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical practices that engender student engagement (participatory teaching methods; collaborative learning; extent and quality of student-faculty interaction; level of academic challenge). <strong>No authentication</strong></td>
<td>Cell 6 only SETs; No observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty (and whether they have a teaching qualification). The fewer part time faculty the better! No relationship exists between teaching quality and engagement of faculty in research. Student course and faculty evaluations are reliable but these only improve quality if there are built in ways to act upon these.</td>
<td>Cell 8 <strong>focus on PhD qualification and not teaching</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity and Quality of feedback to students and clear expectations on goals, standards and assessments (rubrics) that promote ‘deep’ rather than ‘surface’ learning approaches. Formative assessment – more, better and faster feedback on student work.</td>
<td>Cell 7 partly Focus on rubrics/grade not feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Student Effort (class contact hours plus independent study hours).</td>
<td>Cell 5 partly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding allocation - spent on faculty development, teaching and learning centres and academic support targeted to weaker students and those with special needs e.g. English language, counseling, study skills development (but not Total Funding).</td>
<td>Cell 11 Partly –sts not faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of an undergraduate research opportunity scheme, but not the strength of the institution’s research.</td>
<td>Cell 4 partly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether teaching is valued, rewarded, supported and funded and opportunities exist for peer engagement for teacher improvement.</td>
<td>Cell 15 - staff dev not PED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For real improvements towards graduate competencies...

Currently, IQA and EQA processes are not adequately enabling Universities to enhance their teaching and learning.

In the next decade, EQA agencies and IQA mechanisms must align themselves with evidence of what affects the quality of the student learning experience.