# TABLE OF CONTENT

INTRODUCTION .............................................................................................................................. 1

RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF THE QUALITY ASSURANCE POLICY .................. 5

SITUATION ANALYSIS, POLICY ISSUES, POLICY STATEMENTS AND STRATEGIES .......... 8

MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENT FOR IMPLEMENTATING THE QUALITY ASSURANCE POLICY ............................................................................................................................... 36

BIBLIOGRAPHY ............................................................................................................................. 38
PREFACE

As Universities and Higher learning institutions have always regarded quality as a crucial factor in building reputation and winning admiration and support from the public, responsibility for maintaining and promoting the quality of academic programmes has always been vested in the Senate or School Examination Boards. Succinctly stated functions of the Senate have been:

- To satisfy itself regarding the content and academic standard of any course of study offered by the institution;
- To formulate by-laws regarding eligibility of persons for admission to any course of study;
- To formulate the standard of proficiency to be gained in each examination;
- To decide whether any candidate has attained required proficiency and therefore fit for receiving the particular academic award.

In carrying out these functions, the Senate relies heavily on reviews and judgments made by peers from within as well as from outside the institution. Such reviews largely focus on the academic contents and processes of the particular programmes. This arrangement has provoked three criticisms. First, Senate-sponsored reviews narrowly focus on the particularities of a subject or discipline without giving due weight to the interests of the immediate and ultimate clients. Secondly, the organ that is responsible for monitoring and ascertaining academic quality does not have adequate representation from the broader public. Thirdly, the issues that the reviews tend to focus on are often abstract, theoretical and sometimes somewhat mechanical.

Up to four decades ago universities were perceived as honest, self steering, self censuring and quality conscious centres of learning. Since about three decades ago, questions began to be raised as to whether this traditional trust was well founded and still valid. It is in the context of this questioning that calls were made for the establishment of external mechanisms for monitoring and evaluating the soundness of what was happening inside universities. UDSM (2008) citing Cloete (2002:163), for instance, stressed that universities be regarded as "service industries’ and that they accordingly be “formally evaluated” and “held accountable for their performances”.

It is in response to such calls that the 1990s witnessed the establishment of more than 50 national higher education quality assurance agencies in several countries around the world (UDSM 2008). They all arose because of the perception that traditional academic controls were inadequate to the challenges of a modern education and that more explicit assurances about quality were needed. This change of perception began to gain momentum in the last two decades largely because of four important developments:

- Demand for greater accountability and efficiency in respect of public financing;
- Trends towards mass participation in higher education even in the face of shrinking resources;
- Greater stakeholder scrutiny of education and training processes and outcomes;
- Lack of trust in the efficiency and effectiveness of internal quality assurance mechanisms; [Nemo judex in propria causa! = Nobody is a fair judge of his/her own case].
In terms of scope, the mandates and responsibilities of formal quality assurance agencies have varied considerably. Any or all of the following have featured in their responsibility.

- To assist and support institutions in their internal quality assurance activities in order to improve the quality of their output;
- To assess or evaluate designated institutions against a set of standards, benchmarks or intended outcomes;
- To review an institution’s systems of managing quality in order to establish whether they are appropriate, adequate and effective,
- To check whether an institution is good enough for some specified purpose, such as recognition, accreditation and/or State funding.

Thus, external agencies evaluate not only the curriculum contents and examination system but also the capacity of the units to deliver the intended products. The focus is on the institution’s policies, systems, strategies and resources for quality management of the core functions of teaching, research and public service. Admittedly, although the concept of quality assurance is not altogether new, the range of terms and methodologies now used to define, develop and apply it are relatively new. Given the growing importance of student mobility and the international labour market, there is indeed a need to have some reliable and explicit ways of measuring standards and qualifications in higher education across the globe.

This Policy intends to guide quality adherence of ARU programmes in a holistic manner by considering quality indicators in terms of input, processes, and outcomes in respect of teaching and learning. It is expected that implementation of this policy will result in an enhancement and remarkable improvement in the quality of teaching, learning, research and public service delivery activities. As quality assurance is a dynamic process of self appraisal and improvements, the policy statements and implementation strategies specified in this document are subject to regular reviews.
# ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

<table>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARU</td>
<td>Ardhi University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>UDSM</td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
</tbody>
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

With acquisition of a University status in 2007, Ardhi University in its efforts of being responsive to challenges of globalization at national, regional and international levels, has encountered increased students enrolment and expansion of undergraduate programmes from 6 in 2006 to 21 in 2009. A similar phenomenon is also witnessed at national, global and international levels, where there is a remarkable increase of higher learning institutions, coupled with a rise of students’ enrolment. Expansion of higher education at all levels has raised competition in enrolling of qualifying students and acute shortage of financial and human resources for these institutions. This has led to concern over the quality of education offered by Higher Learning Institutions.

It is within these contexts and indeed under provisions of Ardhi University Charter, 2007; Article 2 (a) which spells out that the functions of the University shall be to ensure a leading role in the responsibility for university education within the United Republic of Tanzania and to make provision for centres and places of learning, education (including continuing education), professional or vocational training, research and consultancy; and Article 2 (b) which spells out that the functions of the University shall also be to endeavour to excel in knowledge and human resource capacity building by ensuring balance between quantity and quality and avoiding imparting elitist values to the products of the university, that DVCAA decided to set up a committee for developing the University Quality Assurance Policy. The University commitment to quality is also reflected in the statements of the Vision, Mission and Objectives of the University.

ARU being a public higher institution whose primary business is training, research and public service for improved quality of life of the Tanzanian people, is thus guided by the statements of vision, mission, functions and values described hereunder.

1.2 ARU Mission and Vision

1.2.1 Vision
The vision of ARU is to be a centre of excellence in seeking knowledge and disseminating to a wide spectrum of beneficiaries at national, regional and global levels.

1.2.2 Mission
To provide integrated teaching, research and public services that are geared towards achieving sustainable social-economic development of Tanzania and the World at large
1.3 ARU Functions and Values

1.3.1 Functions

The main functions of ARU are:

(i) To provide facilities for study and training in the principles, procedures and techniques of Land Development Management, Environment Management, Human Settlements Development, and such other related disciplines as the University may from time to time decide;

(ii) To conduct quality and practice-oriented programmes in the disciplines specified in (i) above at the Undergraduate and Postgraduate degree levels and where the need arises, conduct courses at the certificate and diploma levels;

(iii) To engage in applied research in the disciplines specified in (i) above and use the results to improve teaching, learning and the provision of public service;

(iv) To routinely and adjust the quality of training so as to remain relevant to the needs of the community, the country and the region;

(v) To provide consultancy and advisory services;

(vi) To ensure and effective and efficient legal and institutional framework and to develop and maintain a supportive organizational culture;

(vii) To engage in resource mobilization activities that are within the mission of the university;

(viii) To promote effective and efficient Human Resource Management function at the University;

(ix) To employ modern library, technology and management techniques in the provision of training, research consultancy and advisory services;

(x) To promote gender balance and mainstreaming at the University and in the society.

1.3.2 Values

In order for ARU to achieve its vision, it will subscribe to the following values:

1. **Academic excellence and integrity** ensured in line with the international benchmarks in teaching, research and service to the public, and ensure that the same is well recognized and forms an important part of the academic and organizational life of the institution.

2. **Academic freedom** by upholding the spirit of free and critical thought and enquiry, through the tolerance of a diversity of beliefs and understanding as well
as fostering open exchange of ideas and knowledge amongst the staff and/or students.

3. **Internationalisation** through participation in the regional and global world of scholarship, by being receptive and responsive to issues within the international environment as well the enrolment of an increasing size of the international student body.

4. **Professional and ethical standards** by upholding the highest professional standards and ethical behavior, and through openness, honesty, tolerance and respect for the individual in all disciplines.

5. **Social responsibility** by promoting an awareness of, and providing leadership in responding to the issues and problems facing society with a view to ultimately solving and alleviating them.

6. **Student centred and holistic teaching and learning** by creating a holistic teaching and learning environment which is student centred and providing them with social, cultural and recreational opportunities that will facilitate the full realization of their potential for academic and personal growth.

7. **Institutional autonomy and entrepreneurship** characterized by self-governing structures guided by University Council and greater independence, innovation and entrepreneurship in action and while being responsive to societal and development needs or prescribed by the relevant legal instruments.

8. **Public accountability** by ensuring transparent decision-making and open review as well as the full participation of stakeholders in the development of the institution and major policy shifts.

9. **Developmental responsibility** by ensuring that most of the research conducted has an immediate or long term impact.

10. **Productivity, innovation and entrepreneurship** to be emphasized in all activities of the institution and be underpinned by a dedication to quality, efficiency and effectiveness.

11. **Student de-paternalisation** by treating all ARU students as adults who are fully responsible for their behaviour to the society.

12. **Strategic Planning culture** by inculcating it at all levels in the university

13. **Research relevance** by ensuring that research address relevant national or societal problems

14. **Equity and social justice** by ensuring equal opportunity and non-discrimination on the basis of personal, ethnic, religious, gender or other social characteristics.

15. **Information and communication technology orientated** – by application of ICT in enhancement of academic delivery and management.
1.4 Definition of Terms

**Quality Assurance**: is a generic term that can mean different things in different national and regional contexts. Quality Assurance can refer to all forms of internal and external quality monitoring, evaluation or review or the systematic review of educational programmes to ensure that acceptable standards of education, scholarship and infrastructure are being maintained. It is thus, a mechanism put in place to guarantee that the education offered is “fit for purpose” i.e. it is good and it meets expectations of stakeholders. It is thus the role of HEI to have appropriate and effective internal structures and mechanisms for monitoring its quality control procedures to ensure quality assurance.

**Quality Control**: is the process of ensuring compliance with standards and procedures set to maintain and enhance quality. Quality control is seen as an end-of-process solution, it’s the business of quality controllers rather than the responsibility of all stakeholders.

**Quality Audit**: is a process of checking or examining, to ensure that there is institution compliance with quality assurance procedures, integrity, standards and outcomes.

**Quality Assurance Assessment**: It entails internal self quality assessment and external peers quality assessment of the entire teaching and learning processes of a programme, through scrutiny of institutional documentation and students work, direct observations, interview and reference to performance indicators.

1.5 Structure of the Report

This report is presented in four chapters. Chapter one presents introduction in which the background, university mission and vision, functions and values, and definition of terms are provided. Chapter two comprise of rationale, objectives, context and scope of the policy. Chapter three provides situation analysis, policy issues, policy statements and strategies. Finally chapter four highlights on the policy implementation framework and mandates.
CHAPTER TWO

RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF THE QUALITY ASSURANCE POLICY

2.1 Rationale

Higher Education in Tanzania and elsewhere in Africa is currently faced by several challenges. These challenges include increased demand for Higher Education, Budget cuts, brain–drain, staff development, weak corporate industrial base, conservatism in Higher education, knowledge dependencies, poor perception to regimes of indigenous knowledge, lack of adequate scientists and science facilities, Information Communication Technology gap, unemployment of graduates, competition, economic contextual reality, dynamics of change in Higher Education and so on. These and many other are enormous challenges which Higher Education Institutions need to address if they are to remain competitive and to achieve their core missions.

Overall evidence show that Higher Education is growing fast in Tanzania. This trend is most likely to increase. To that effect; universities are bound to expand their programmes to widen access to higher education. However, the great concern is whether Ardhi University like other Universities is able to sustain the increased demand, particularly with respect to meeting acceptable standards, bearing in mind colossal overhead costs. As such, proliferation of Higher Education Institutions and programmes raises concern on the quality of academic programmes, if at all they meet stakeholders’ satisfaction. It is in this spirit that ARU subscribed to the Inter-University Council for East Africa (IUCEA) Quality Assurance Initiative which aims at ensuring that member Universities offer programmes that are internationally competitive. Additionally, the IUCEA Initiative aims at developing quality Assurance capacity at all member universities so as to ensure that teaching and learning, research and public services delivery meets internationally accepted standards as well as promoting curricula reforms so that graduates are equipped with skills and knowledge which meet needs of employers and national and regional development plans.

In the light of the above, ARU conducted a pilot quality self assessment of Bsc. Environmental Engineering programme with the view of building university, schools and departments capacity in undertaking programmes self assessment. Moreover has establishment a Quality Assurance Bureau.

For purpose of sustainability of IUCEA Initiatives, it's pertinent for ARU at this juncture to develop a Quality Assurance Policy. It is in this context that the DVC-AA formed a committee to develop the University Quality Assurance Policy.

2.2 Objectives

The main goal of the quality assurance policy is to ensure that relevant academic standards are achieved and quality education is provided to students by encouraging
and supporting continuous quality improvement at the university as well as at programmes level. In particular the QA policy aims to achieve the following objectives:

(i) To safeguard and improve academic standards and quality of education offered by Ardhi University;
(ii) To ensure the integrity of the academic awards offered by Ardhi University;
(iii) To develop and maintain, through enhanced support processes, quality and competitive academic programmes supported by Ardhi University academic expertise for internal and external markets;
(iv) To ensure that all programmes are of high standard and of continued relevance to graduate labour markets and responsive to societal needs and
(v) To develop and refine internal programmes’ self quality assurance assessments procedures as well as external peer review mechanisms that are appropriate and to apply such mechanisms systematically across all programmes offered by Ardhi University, all services rendered to the society and all support services provided to students and staff.
(vi) To continually improve quality of public services offered by Ardhi University
(vii) To continually improve quality of research undertaken at Ardhi University by ensuring that they directly focus on finding solutions to societal problems

2.3 Scope of the QA Policy

Quality is the outcome of interactions of many factors. All such factors are within the scope of this Policy. However, certain factors tend to stand out conspicuously as major determinants of quality in higher education processes.

Careful examination of the entire training process so as to identify strategic areas of focus from which to identify policy issues is important in this regard. In particular, the distinction between input, process, and outcome aspects is seen as adequately encompassing and thus relevant as a framework for identification of quality assurance strategic areas. Other core functions of the university are also considered. In the view of these, following areas are identified as being strategic for improving quality of teaching and learning, research and public services delivery at ARU:

**INPUT**

1. Programme Design:
2. Curriculum Design
3. Student Profile
4. Facilities and Infrastructure
5. Academic Staff Quality-Recruitment and development
6. Administrative Staff Quality-Recruitment and development
7. Information management systems
8. Library

**PROCESSES**

9. Teaching and Learning
10. Students Assessments
11. Students Advice /Support services

**OUTCOMES**
12. Students Evaluation
13. Benchmarking and feedback mechanism

OTHER AREAS

14. Research
15. Public services

The ultimately goal is to make quality an embedded feature of the University culture. It is through operationalization of this policy that the entire University would embrace quality firstly, as a mechanism through which the University promotes transparency and allows evaluation of its performance by stakeholders against established institutional goals and objectives and secondly as means of redefining relevance and efficacy of its products like any other service provider, thirdly as means of fostering regional integration through cross border harmonisation of Higher Education and lastly as an overarching principle of all its operations.
CHAPTER THREE

SITUATION ANALYSIS, POLICY ISSUES, POLICY STATEMENTS AND STRATEGIES

4.1 PROGRAMMES DESIGN

4.1.1 Situation Analysis

The Ardhi University (ARU) offers both Undergraduate and Postgraduate degree programs and a Technologist Diploma in Geo-Informatics. Also short courses are offered through the Centre for Continuing Education (CCE). Distribution of programs offered as in year 2009 with number in brackets is as follows: Diploma (1), Bachelors (21) and Masters (9). In addition PhD studies are offered in every school.

Requirements of Stakeholders

Stakeholders include the government, employers, academic world, students, parents, and the society at large. As far as possible, the university as a “supplier” should translate the stakeholders’ needs and requirements into the expected learning outcome of the program. In the development or review of programmes at ARU, some stakeholders are involved very often by way of administering questionnaires. Stakeholders are expected to indicate their needs among other things. Prior to submitting the proposal for new program, stakeholders’ workshop is organized, where the proposed program is presented and discussed. ARU does not have clear guidelines for stakeholders’ involvement. Response of stakeholders to questionnaires administered to them is very often unsatisfactory in terms of the fraction of respondents over total number of issued questionnaires. More focus has been on the involvement of potential employers, while ignoring the involvement of other categories of stakeholders listed above. Views of stakeholders are not always taken aboard in the new program, especially because, they are presented in the stakeholders workshop which is normally conducted just before the initiation of the approval process.

Objectives and Expected Learning Outcome

ARU programmes are guided by well defined objectives and professional requirements, although expected learning outcomes (ELO) were not clearly stated in the curricula documents. The objectives in every course (including the content as well as the methodology) were explicitly stated in the curricula documents. However there were no common goals concerning the knowledge, the skills and competences graduate have to acquire upon graduation.

Programmes Specification and Content
The course programs are up-to-date in most cases, and contain a lot of modern components. Semesters have a general theme (theme-centered semester). Semester projects and studio work are related to these themes. Experiments in the laboratory, fieldwork, and studio work are problem based. Programs contents are considered tight and it had high number of required courses. Four years undergraduate programmes have units ranging from 127 to 167 instead of the recommended 120 units by TCU. Five years program have 197 units instead of 150 units recommended by TCU. ARU programmes offer soft skills such as entrepreneurship, project management, communication skills, and ICT. However, programs in four of the schools at ARU have a mandatory requirement for students to take all courses in the program, leaving no room of flexibility, which would allow students to take some optional courses of their interest. Even in those programs where, optional courses are allowed, the approved options are from within the students’ major area of study. Optional courses provide an opportunity for students to take some courses according to their disposition, and it is the practice of modern study programs. English is the medium of instruction at ARU. There is deficiency in competency and fluency of English language as a medium of communication. Based on tracer study and external examiners’ reports, it has been reported that both students and graduates lack communication and presentation skills. Inadequate mathematical skills and analytical capabilities for most of the students.

Programmes Organization

The programmes are well organized into subject themes and are project oriented with emphasis in learning by doing. In each semester there are 15 weeks of theoretical learning and project undertaking. The final semester for undergraduate students is devoted to dissertation on a problem geared toward solving an engineering problem while imparting research skills to students.

4.1.2 Issues:

1. Expected learning outcomes (ELO) are not clearly stated in the programme curricula documents

2. Contents for most of the programmes are considered tight and have high number of required courses

3. Most of ARU programmes require students to take all courses in the program, leaving no room of flexibility. Where options are allowed, they have to be from students’ major area of study.

4. There is deficiency in competency and fluency of English language as a medium of communication

5. ARU does not have clear and effective guidelines for stakeholders’ involvement in program development

6. Response of stakeholders to questionnaires administered to them is very often unsatisfactory in terms of the fraction of respondents over total number of issued questionnaires
7. Not all Higher Education stakeholders are involved in program design

8. Self and External Peer Assessment of most of ARU programs is yet to be done

4.1.3 Policy Statements

4.1.3.1 The university shall devise a procedure for programmes design, periodically review/develop programme, oversee programmes self assessment and external peer review.

4.1.3.1.1 Strategies

1. Provide a mechanism which will ensure that all key stakeholders are involved in programme design
2. Build capacity of academic staff in programme design
3. Assess performance of graduates in the market places regularly and make use of feedback in future programme designs
4. Institute a mechanism for regular internal and external programme assessment
5. Structure and organise the programs in a meaningful way in order to ensure flexible programs provide optional courses for students from other programs and/or school
6. Develop programme review procedures that will ensure inclusion of learning outcomes
7. Structure and organise programmes in order to ensure flexibility, provision of optional courses for students from other programmes and/or schools
8. Provide programme framework that ensures programme load is optimum, allows time for self study in libraries and other individual academically enriching activities.

4.1.3.2 The University shall devise strategies to improve students’ competency in Mathematics and English Language as a medium of communication.

4.1.3.2.1 Strategies

1. Establish Communication Skills and Mathematics units and clearly define their roles.
2. Institute English language entry examinations for all first year undergraduate students and postgraduate students. Those failing in these examinations should be required to pass English language courses to be developed for undergraduate and postgraduate students.
3. Develop a mechanism which will contribute effectively in improving students’ competency in English and Mathematics at primary and secondary school levels in collaboration with other stakeholders including the Ministry of Education and Vocational Training.
4.2 CURRICULA DESIGN AND EVALUATION

4.2.1 Situation Analysis

Design of curricula at ARU is spearheaded by academic departments. The department or the University can initiate the processes of curriculum design. If the idea is initiated by the university, it will also appoint a leading department, to oversee the process. Department will come up with a structure, and by using a questionnaires, consult stakeholders, who are expected to submit their views on the proposed program and indicate their needs in respect to proposed program. The actual curriculum design is left in the hands of academic department. Toward the end of this process, stakeholders are invited to a workshop, where they are expected to provide their opinion and suggestions after a presentation and discussion. Involvement of labor market in the curriculum design is mainly through the administration of questionnaire and stakeholders’ workshop mentioned above. The curriculum design is not benchmarked with other institutions. Students are expected to evaluate every course after it is taught. The current focus of this system is on the evaluation of lecturers. An evaluation system for the curriculum does not exist. Results of evaluation done by students take long time to be released, however, they are transparent once they are out. These results are expected to assist lecturers to improve their performance; however there is no follow-up mechanism, to ensure that individual lecturers utilize this information as such.

Nineteen new undergraduate programs were introduced in the year 2007. Prior to 2007, UCLAS, the predecessor of ARU used to offer only 6 undergraduate programs. Major curriculum review for these programs was done in 2001 when ARU was still part of UDSM, with minor reviews in 2004 and 2008. Major curriculum review of the old undergraduate programs has not been undertaken to date. Except for postgraduate programmes in Architecture and Construction Economics, the remaining postgraduate programs were introduced in the period from 1999 to 2002. Major curriculum review for postgraduate programs has not been undertaken. The former UCLAS relied on UDSM curriculum review procedure. ARU does not have own curricula review procedure. The curriculum review and curriculum development capacity of ARU staff is low. Major tracer study was last conducted in 2003, when the institution was still a constituent college of the UDSM. It is however worthy to note that, the tracer study did not feed into the major curriculum review, since the later was conducted after the completion of the former. Self Assessment and External Peer Review for one of ARU undergraduate program namely BSc Environmental Engineering was undertaken in 2008/2009 with a support from IUCEA and DAAD. Assessment of other programmes at ARU is yet to be done.

4.2.2 Issues:

1. Major curricula review of the old undergraduate and postgraduate programmes have not been undertaken to date

2. ARU does not have own curricula review procedure
3. Inadequate involvement of labour market and other stakeholders in the curricula design.

4. Improper sequencing of major curricula review and tracer study

5. The curricula review and development capacity of ARU staff is low.

6. The curricula design is not benchmarked with other institutions.

7. An evaluation system for the curricula does not exist.

8. Results of students’ course evaluation take long time to be released.

9. The current students course evaluation focus more on the evaluation of lecturers

10. There is no follow-up mechanism, to ensure that individual lecturers utilize evaluation results in improving their teaching and assessment of the course.

4.2.3 Policy Statements

4.2.3.1 The university shall devise a curricula review/development procedure and ensure effective implementation of the procedure.

4.2.3.1.1 Strategies
1. Establish a curricula development and review procedures.
2. Build capacity of academic staff in curricula development and review.
3. Provide a mechanism which will ensure that all key stakeholders including potential employers are involved in curricula review
4. Conduct tracer study prior to major curricula review.

4.2.3.2. The university shall devise mechanisms for evaluation and benchmarking of its curricula

4.2.3.2.1 Strategies
1. Develop procedures for curricula evaluation
2. Develop procedures for curricula benchmarking with other institutions

4.3 STUDENTS PROFILE

4.3.1 Situation Analysis

The students’ intake at ARU has been increasing for the past 5 years both undergraduate and postgraduate programmes. The intake has increased from 1,032 students in 2004/05 academic year to 1,701 in 2008/09 academic year which is about 65% increase. However, ARU has not been able to attract majority of highly qualified students at its undergraduate programmes. This might have been attributed to the following;

- ARU is a new University
- Programmes being inadequately marketed
• Competition from other universities.
With the introduction of new non-traditional programmes, intake of more qualified students is expected to increase.

The minimum entry requirements at ARU are set based on TCU’s minimum standards, and also depend on the requirements of each programme. The ARU Medium Term Rolling Strategic Plan 2009/10 – 2011/12 govern the intake of students at ARU and aims at increasing the intake.

In order to increase the female intake at the University, the following measures have been taken;
• Lower the cut off points by 1.5 to female candidates, but not below the minimum entry requirement.
• Introduce remedial course to female science students who have performed slightly below the minimum entry criteria.
• Prepared an Operational Policy and Procedures for Marketing and Public relations October 2009

In spite of all the above efforts, the current female student stands at 22% which is relatively low.
ARU programmes are structured in such a way that each programme has its own prescribed number of units/credits to be completed. The Units are fairly distributed equally per year. However some programmes appear to be overloaded. For example, the BSc. BE programme has a total number of units of 167, while the minimum number of units to be completed in a 4 year programme is 120. The 167 units is over and above the minimum requirements for a 5 year degree programme which is 150 units.

B. Architecture is a 5 year programme with a total of 197 Units. The additional 47 units is higher than the minimum of 30 units per one academic year.
Despite the fact that the two programmes appear to be loaded, an average student is able to complete the programmes within the specified period. Loading of the two programmes need to be re checked

4.3.2 Policy Issues
1. Inability to attract highly qualified students
2. Overloading of units/credits in some of the undergraduate programmes
3. Low female students enrolment
4. Inadequate marketing of university programmes

4.3.3 Policy statement
The university shall abide to its marketing strategies and review its curricula to attain required teaching loading standards.

4.3.4 Strategies
1. Operationalise Marketing strategies outlined in the ARU marketing policy.
2. Provide curricula development frame work which comply with loading standards
3. Operationalize Gender Policy with the view of increasing female students enrolment
4.4 ACADEMIC STAFF QUALITY, RECRUITMENT AND DEVELOPMENT

4.4.1 Situation Analysis

Currently the university has a total of 188 academic staff out of which 57 are PhD holders, 87 hold masters degrees and 44 bachelor degrees. Most of academic staff with doctorate and masters degrees have good teaching experience. Training opportunities for those with masters and bachelor degrees are limited and sometimes depends on individual efforts. Following the Government directive to expand the students’ enrolment in public universities, the university has been enrolling more students each year and new programmes have been introduced. A number of university academic staff has been aging others leaving the University for other employment. Consequently, the university is in constant need of academic staff of various qualifications and in some instances has to hire part-time lecturers who are less committed.

The ARU recruitment policy, as enshrined in the Human Resources Management Policy (2005) is to recruit staff of the highest caliber through a fair and open process. Through this policy the university has been striving to recruit qualified academic staff at all levels that is tutorial assistants, assistant lecturers and even lecturers. The university traditional courses are a peculiar in the country and the regional at large which confines recruitment within own graduates who are sometimes not available for recruitment. In cases where potential employees are available university remunerations are not good enough to attract them. The university applies for recruitment positions from the Government, however in most cases these vacancies are not filled and when the financial year ends the university will have to start the process afresh in the following year.

The university has no staff enrichment activities. In most cases attending seminars and workshops, industrial training, getting involved in staff exchange programmes and going to sabbatical leave depend on individual efforts.

4.4.2 Policy issues

1. Limited resources to train all academic staff to attain qualifications required at different levels
2. Inadequate number of academic staff
3. Poor remunerations of academic staff to attract new recruits
4. Inadequate staff enrichment activities such as seminars, workshops, and staff exchange programmes, visiting lecturers and sabbatical leaves.
5. Lack of commitment among part – time lecturers
6. Poor remuneration of part-time lecturers

4.4.3 Policy statement

The university shall devise training and staff development programs which are practical and transparent, improve remuneration packages for academic staff including part time lecturers and reduce dependence on part–time lecturers.
4.4.4 Strategies
1. Institute mechanism that would enable training of staff with available resources from both internal and external sources
2. Develop a remuneration package that will motivate academic staff and attract new recruits
3. Devise a program for academic staff that would require and motivate them to participate in staff enrichment activities.
4. Develop a mechanism that would motivate academic staff to take up the courses taught by part–time lecturers.

4.5 ADMINISTRATIVE AND TECHNICAL STAFF QUALITY, RECRUITMENT AND DEVELOPMENT

4.5.1 Situation Analysis

The university employs technical staff as laboratory technicians, ICT technicians, survey technician and architectural draftspersons. Similarly administrative officers, secretaries, accountants and accounts technician are employed for smooth running of the university activities. Currently the university has 192 administrative and technical staff, out of which 1 is a PhD holder, 30 hold Masters degrees, 5 Postgraduate diploma, 10 Bachelor's degrees, 17 Advanced Diploma, 27 Diploma, 4 CPA and 98 certificates. Some of these employees have no appropriate expertise to properly support the academic activities and this is evident in ICT and secretarial disciplines. This is contributed partly by employees lacking career development programmes and partly by poor recruitment procedure. Others especially administrative are constantly leaving the University for other employment due to unattractive remuneration packages.

4.5.2 Policy issues
1. Inadequate number of administrative staff
2. Lack of objective staff appraisal system
3. Inadequate skills for Secretaries and ICT technicians
4. Lack of well structured career development programmes.
5. Poor retention scheme for administrative staff
6. Unattractive remuneration packages.
7. High turnover of Administrative staff

4.5.3 Policy statement
The university shall employ technical and administrative staff from accredited training institutions, improve remuneration packages, develop training programmes and establish a retention scheme.

4.5.4 Strategies
1. Introduce criteria for establish competence of prospective technical staff
2. Develop a retention scheme for technical and administrative staff
3. Develop and maintain career development programmes
4. Develop a remuneration package that will motivate administrative staff and attract new recruits

4.6 LIBRARY SERVICES

4.6.1 Situation Analysis

Currently the university accommodates up to 400 readers. In 2008/09 academic year the university enrolled 1701 students and the number is expected to increase this academic year and the years to come. Likewise, the number of university staff both academic and administrative has been increasing and the total to date is 380. For the noted increase in student enrollment and recruitment of staff, more space is needed to accommodate increasing number of library users. In 2006/07 academic year 400 spaces were created and by then the university had enrolled 1366 students. In the next five years, the university expects to enroll about 5000 students and therefore about 1500 spaces need to be created.

The increase in users should be in line with the increase in furniture (tables, chairs and shelves), human resources, books and journals, and ICT facilities. The new library is furnished by old furniture which were used in the old library and since then there have been no efforts to purchase furniture for the library users. The university library is served by both academic and administrative and technical staff. The skills of these staff are adequate at the diploma level but more skills are needed for the administrative staff at graduate and masters levels. Similarly, the library shares an ICT technical staff with CICT and other units. The university has a system in place to increase books in the library and journals. However, the system has led to increasing number of books with no corresponding increase in number of journals.

The library is lagging behind in the use of ICT. Apart from the increase in number of computer users, other ICT uses have remained stagnant. While there has a steady increase of books in library, very few titles are accessed through the library webpage. Access to library and book borrowing are done manually.

The directorate is in the process of preparing the Library Policy. The policy is expected to guide the services offered by the library and thus bring about quality services.

4.6.2 Policy issues
1. Limited space for library users
2. Insufficient and old furniture
3. Lack of clear mechanism in acquiring books and journals
4. Inadequate number and skills of administrative and technical staff
5. Slow pace of acquiring and use of ICT facilities.
6. Inadequate and outdated books and journals titles
7. Insufficient copies of available reference books

4.6.3 Policy statement
The university shall devise a mechanism to ensure that library services are expanded through provision of more space and furniture, acquisition of more books and journals, and speeding up acquisition and use of ICT facilities.
4.6.4 Strategies
1. To set targets for gradual expansion of library space
2. To set targets for acquisition of new library furniture
3. Devise a clear system to acquire Journals and reference books
4. Develop a mechanism to speed up the acquisition and use of ICT facilities

4.7 TEACHING AND LEARNING

4.7.1 Situation Analysis

Learning

Majority of students are direct entrants from advanced secondary school education, as such, they are not oriented to university learning processes, which, embraces individual search for knowledge and skills. Generally there is lack of reading culture amongst students, as a result most students lack abilities to synthesize and analyze taught materials on their own. Additionally, students do not comprehend different learning strategies, thus, they mostly depend on lecture notes as provided for in the face to face teaching approach. Consequently, most of students are unable to identify appropriate learning approaches for various aspects of the curricula. This is attested by poor literature citation and knowledge expressed by students in answering questions in home works, assignments, examinations and dissertations/thesis’s.

Most students have problems of using English as a media of instruction and communication. The Communication Skills Course, which, is taught in all programmes, tends to focus more on English Language per se than on learning techniques. Additionally, most of students have weak mathematical background, which limits them in comprehending materials taught in mathematically based courses, which are common in most of ARU programmes. Weakness in mathematics indeed limits students’ analytical skills.

The University lacks a bookshop from where students and staff can source reading materials for further reading materials for further advancement of their knowledge.

Teaching

Most of teaching approaches adopted by most of ARU staff do not articulate long term retention of knowledge and skills. Most of teaching is inclined towards memorizing rather than application of knowledge as evidenced by the nature and type of questions asked in examinations. This is a testimony of lack of pedagogical skills by teaching staff, most of who are not trained in teaching.

There is problem of low quality and inadequate teaching materials and consumables, ranging from White and Black Boards, Flip Charts, LCD Projectors to Marker Pens etc., all of which influence delivery of knowledge.

While university teaching ought to be facilitation of learning, by embracing action learning, which, is a continuous process of learning and reflection guided by peers,
teaching at ARU is inclined towards enforcement of a learning procedure. As such, students lack ownership of the learning process. That is students find themselves obliged to follow a rigidly set learning procedure, as already set by the programme design. This culminates in the lack of flexibility in learning processes such as part-time studentship, evening programmes and programmes modularization.

There is lack of adequate academic staff on post to teach all courses in programmes equitably as such, available staffs are overloaded with teaching, additionally, they are obliged to publish research papers to support their university's rating and appraisal. At the same time, they are required to deliver courses which meet both internally and externally standards. That is courses which satisfy home and overseas markets. Indeed, staffs are required to participate in peer groups’ discussions, departmental meetings, seminars/workshops/conferences. Also, they are required to supervise and give feedback to their students, with whom they are required to improve their relationships. Teaching staff are also expected to do some administrative duties and manage their consultancy and research projects. All these are necessary for the staffs to keep abreast of progress in their fields, and indeed for improvement of their skills, knowledge and pedagogy.

It thus goes without saying that in the light of the above there is overburdening of academic staff, leading to a general decline in morale towards teaching which is also attributed by lack of motivation, as such, most of academic staff prefer undertaking consultancy jobs at expense of teaching, leading to incomplete curricula coverage and poor students assessment by the end of a teaching session in some courses. Additionally some members of academic staff lack seriousness and commitment in teaching and students assessments/consultations.

There is lack of staff to teach basic courses in most programmes, has lead to reliance on part-time lecturers, who, in most cases are less committed to teaching.

The teaching task has changed greatly in recent years, especially so with regard to deployment of the World Wide Web (WWW) and other ICT skills and in delivery of courses and teaching. As such, teaching staffs have to adapt very quickly to this rapidly changing technologies, particularly with regard to delivery of knowledge. Despite this development, there are inadequate computers at ARU for staff use, leading to staff using own funds to buy computers for teaching purposes.

Being a new University, like other Universities, ARU is bound to expand its programmes so as to be broader in producing the much needed manpower with skills to solve societal problems. For instance undergraduate programmes have increased from 6 in year 2006/07 to 21 in 2009/10 out of which 13 are related to traditional programmes and 2 are entirely new programmes at ARU. The trend is such that the university will continue introducing entire new programmes. This extent of expansion does not match with available human resources and facilities, thus causing more demand on teaching staff and facilities. The University does not have programmes expansion road map which is participatory.

4.7.2 Policy issues

1. Inadequate students’ learning skills,
2. Difficulties in comprehending English as a Language of instruction and communication by students,
3. Lack of mathematical background by students leading to non-comprehension of analytical based courses,
4. Inadequate and poor teaching and learning materials and ICT facilities
5. Lack of pedagogy and didactic skills by teaching staff,
6. Inflexibility in learning processes,
7. Declining morale of academic staff towards teaching,
8. Embracing consultancy than teaching activities by staff members,
10. Lack of enforcement of disciplinary measures to teaching staff who fail to fulfill their responsibilities properly.

4.7.3 Policy Statements

The University shall strive to improve teaching and learning environment, and expose its staff to basic pedagogy and didactic skills.

STRATEGIES

1. Develop mechanisms to enhance students’ learning skills and flexibility in learning processes.
2. Recruit adequate staff to teach basic courses in all programmes.
3. Regularly improve academic staff pedagogy and didactic skills.
4. Improve teaching and learning environment
5. Develop programmes expansion road map which is participatory.
6. Introduce system of monitoring teaching and students assessment
4.8 STUDENTS ASSESSMENT

4.8.1 Situation Analysis

Assessment of students’ academic performance in various courses or academic programmes at the ARU involves coursework assessment (CWA) and semester examinations. Coursework Assessment (CWA) is made up of assignments and tests. The assignments, tests, and examinations constitute important instruments for evaluation of the quality and standard of teaching and learning in academic units and the University as a whole.

Coursework Assessment

Components of coursework assessment vary from course to course depending on the nature and emphasis of the course. The components include: tests, quizzes, homework, seminar papers, laboratory reports, essay, studio reports, and project reports. Mode of assessments includes submission of written documents as well as oral assessment. Components of coursework assessment are specified in the curriculum for different programmes. Course instructors are expected to provide course outline with details of the coursework assessment including the number of different assessment components to be given to students in a particular course, weight of each component, and timing of the assessment. There are cases where details of course assessment have not been provided by instructors. Furthermore, there is no mechanism requiring instructors to provide such information, and as such the monitoring of the same is not done. Head of department are expected to monitor the implementation of the coursework assessment in accordance with the specified components in the curriculum and coursework assessment guidelines in a particular department. In some units, Class Representatives are expected to fill a form at the end of the semester indicating among other things, the number of tests and assignments given for various courses in that particular semester. These forms are normally submitted to Head of Department and forwarded to Faculty Dean. There is no formal system which will inform the School Dean on the extent of the coursework conduction during or at the end of the semester.

The proportion of CWA and Semester Examination depends very much on the nature of the course and the level of study. There is a variation of the proportions of CWA and Semester Examination for practical (studio) oriented courses and theoretical courses. Undergraduate and postgraduate programmes also have different proportion of CWA and Semester Examination. The proportions of CWA and Semester Examinations are presented in Table 2.1 below. Tests and other assignments submitted by students are supposed to be marked and returned to students in good time to help them correct any wrong answers. Feedback to students for coursework not given on timely fashion.

Table 2.1: The Proportions of Coursework Assessment and Examination in the Final Grade
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MINIMUM NO. OF TESTS</th>
<th>MINIMUM NO. OF ASSIGNMENTS</th>
<th>LEVEL OF STUDY</th>
<th>CWA</th>
<th>SEMESTER EXAMINATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>UG (Theory)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UG(Practical)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In most of the programmes, the specified type of assignments for theoretical courses is homework. Situations where students have been found to have copied homework from each other or from internet are not uncommon.

**Examination**

Quality assurance interventions employed during preparation, administration and marking of university examinations include:

(i) Moderation of examination papers by internal and/or external examiners
(ii) Securing examination papers in safe custody to avoid leaking
(iii) Invigilation of examinations by the instructors
(iv) Preparation of marking schemes prior to marking examinations
(v) Moderation and endorsement of examination results by a board of examiners
(vi) Adherence to other examination regulations prescribed in the Prospectus

**Setting of Examinations**

The setting and typing of examination is a responsibility of Internal Examiner(s). For courses taught by more than one Instructor, there are no course coordinators to oversee setting of examinations and overall course administration. Internal examiners are required to prepare marking schemes and model answers. Most of the examinations administered at ARU are of 3 hours duration. The criteria to help decide on the duration of the examination have not been developed. The University does not have approved format(s) for examination. Matters with regard to closed or open examination, types of questions (e.g. multiple choice, matching, etc) are left to be decided upon by individual schools, and even then, the position of schools has not been documented in any form of approved position.

**Examination Moderation**

The internal moderation is undertaken by a panel of senior staff. In most of the departments/faculties, Head of Department and Examination Coordinator are members of the internal examination moderation panel. The examination paper submitted to the panel may be vetted for forwarding to external examiner for further moderation or returned to the internal examiner(s) with some recommended revisions. Examination papers sent to external examiner may be whole cleared or returned with recommendation for some revisions. Implementation of revisions suggested by internal
moderation panel and external examiner are done by internal examiner(s). However there are cases where, examination papers are returned by external examiners when it is already too late to allow for implementations of recommended revisions, in which case comments of external examiners may not be incorporated in the examination paper. Late submission of examination questions by internal examiners has been observed. Also observed frequently by external examiners are examination questions submitted without marking schemes.

Examination Security

1. Examiners are encouraged to type own examinations. Formatting and photocopying is done in the office of School Administrators who is assisted by a Secretary. The School administrator is also the custodian of the examinations. Photocopying for mass production is done by School Administrators with the assistance of secretaries.

2. Personal Computers used for typing of examination are not supposed to be connected to the network. However not all examiners have access to university owned PCs or Laptop computer. Requirement that typing of examination should not be done in a computer connected to the network cannot be enforced easily.

Invigilation

Only academic staffs are involved in examination invigilation. One invigilator is used per room, due to small size of available rooms. Very often, candidates of the same paper have to take examination in two rooms which are close to each other. This way invigilators for the same examination paper are able to assist each other when there is a need to do so. Head of department is also expected to be on standby to assist invigilator. Invigilation of examination paper most of the time involves the internal examiner(s) as invigilator(s). Candidates are required to sign attendance registrar and fill-in the number of examination book(s) they have used in the attendance registrar. Desks are numbered, and candidates are given numbers by the Invigilator to match with the desk numbers. Literally it is the invigilator who determines where to sit the candidate. Presence of invigilator in the examination room cannot be guaranteed when there is only one examiner in a room, who might need to go out for a short call, or escort a student who wants to visit a wash room. In case of examination irregularity, the invigilator is required to submit a report and appear before the Senate Technical Committee for interrogations which in most cases intimidating.

Marking of Examination

Marking is done by internal examiner(s). External Examiner (EE) who visit the University at the end of academic year for one to two weeks are expected to go through all examination scripts (for small classes) or some sampled examination scripts for semester 1 and II examinations (for bigger classes) and assess the marking and marks allocation. External Examiners can change the grade when there is need to do so. In some departments external examiners attend oral presentations of projects, studio, and dissertations. With the increasing students’ numbers, the duration of two weeks allocated for marking of examinations is not enough. External examiners are few and very often overwhelmed by the volume of work which they have to finish in about two
weeks time. Their extent of coverage especially in respect to marking of examination script is very often reduced to going through some few sampled scripts.

Examiners

University examination is conducted by internal and external examiners. Internal examiner(s) is one or more of the instructors of the course who is/are from within the University. Internal Examiner (IE) is appointed from outside ARU (EE). The system of bringing in external examiners during the end of an academic year aim in providing some external validation of the standard of achievement and/or performance of students and academics. The relevant examination papers and answer scripts for first and second semester by candidates are submitted to the external examiners by the Head of Department for their assessment after the scripts have been marked by the internal examiners.

Academic Audit Reports of 1998 and 2004

The First Academic Audit (AA1) of 1998 for UDSM (UCLAS the predecessor of ARU was part of UDSM then) recommended abolishing the external examiners system and in its place to institute an internal moderation system at departmental level and periodical review of academic programmes at faculty level. This recommendation was prompted by a number of weaknesses of the external examination system observed by the Audit Panel as follows:

1. The one or two week’s duration of external examination being rather short, the entire external examiner system is therefore not cost effective.

2. Some academic units do not give due attention to external examiners’ reports and recommendation there-in.

3. Financial constraints have continued to dictate the University to appoint external examiner from neighboring countries. This has essentially reduced the effectiveness of the system in safeguarding quality of academic programmes.

The second academic audit (AA2) of 2004 also observed that while external examinership is expected to safeguard quality control of academic programmes, and fairness in student assessment and award processes, the system as currently being administered on a yearly basis is too expensive and the duration is too short. Hence the system is not properly serving the intended goals. Thus the AA2 recommended reviewing of the frequency of external examiners’ visits so that the exercise is conducted every 2 or 3 years, and that, the terms of reference of EE be revised accordingly.

External Examiners Reports 2002 - 2005

The external examiners are expected to complete their task in a period ranging from one to two weeks. External examiners are required to assess the examination scripts which have already been marked by internal examiners. Depending on the nature of examination for different programmes, external examiners may also be required to attend and assess oral presentation of projects, dissertation, studio work, and practical work. Considering the current big size of most of our classes, complete marking of all
scripts by external examiner is rarely possible. The criterion used in the selection of scripts to be marked by external examiner is not defined. Every external examiner is expected to come-up with a criteria and approach, and use it in picking scripts for marking. The criteria used by different external examiners differ a lot. On the other hand, cases have been observed where even the same external examiner apply different criteria in sampling scripts for marking for different courses, based on internal examiners scores distribution. Marking by external examiner led to change of grades for few students in very few cases. Majority of external examiner provides suggestions on the marking and other quality assurance aspects without varying students’ grades. Most of those who vary candidates’ grades also provide very comprehensive reports. For grade to be varied, the script of a particular candidate must first of all fall within the criteria defined by external examiner for selecting script to be marked.

In some cases, the external examiners have discovered errors in the addition of marks. Such discovery may be based on the marks written on top cover of the script, or a form used for filling-in of grade by internal and external examiners, or the marks allocation in the scripts. Such errors are corrected once discovered.

**Examination Approval System and Procedures**

The University has in place an elaborate examination system which includes statutory organs from departmental level to university level. Participation of students’ representative is provided at the School Board, Committee of Undergraduate Studies, Committee of Postgraduate Studies and the Senate. These statutory organs functions adequately. The University has a clear and published grading system as well as an appeal system. The examination regulations take into account all possible consequences. The student assessment procedure has clear regulations covering student absence, illness, and other mitigating circumstances

**4.8.2 Policy Issues**

1. Late submission of examination questions by some internal examiners.
2. Examination questions submitted without marking schemes.
3. Examinations Questions going through too many hands and thus security cannot be guaranteed all the time
4. Lack of PCs and laptops for some member of staff leading to the use of computers which may have been connected to the internet
5. Presence of invigilator in the examination room cannot be guaranteed when there is only one examiner in a room, who might need to go out for a short call, or escort a student who wants to visit a wash room.
6. External examiners are few and very often overwhelmed by the volume of work which they have to finish in about two weeks time. Their extent of coverage especially in respect to marking of examination scripts is very often reduced to going through some few sampled scripts.
7. The criterion used in the selection of scripts to be marked by external examiner is not defined
8. External Examiner system focuses more or less exclusively on examination performance (questions and marking) for the particular examination season; and does not concern itself with wider contextual elements e.g. student coursework portfolio, overall course syllabus, interviews on the classroom teaching-learning
environment, staff-student relations, etc, all of which would together constitute a comprehensive 'External Review'

9. Security of examination paper on transit to external examiner for moderation in view of advanced communication and delivery network
10. Students copying from each other or from the internet as observed in home works and other related assignments
11. Course assessment information is not provided to students by Instructors and lack of a mechanism requiring Instructors to provide such information.
12. Feedback to students for coursework assessment not given on time.
13. There is no formal system which will inform the School Dean on the extent of the coursework administration during or at the end of the semester.
14. There are no criteria to help decide on the duration of the examination and no approved format and type(s) of examination.
15. Inadequate time allocated for marking of examinations.
16. Cumbersome procedures in handling examination irregularity cases
17. Cheating in examinations

4.8.3 Policy Statements

The University shall streamline students' assessment processes and minimize dishonest practices and cheating in examinations

4.8.4 Strategies
1. Develop procedures and mechanisms which would ensure that: Head of Departments and School Dean are informed frequently about coursework assessment administration; the number of people involved in the handling of examination papers is reduced in order minimize the chances of leakage,
2. Establish criteria for determination of examination duration and specify examination format and type;
3. Put in place a system which will require course instructors to provide course outline and course assessment information to students at the beginning of every course.
4. Cultivate the culture of honesty and adherence to ethical behavior in general, and in examinations in particular, among the students community
5. Enforce regulations prohibiting students bringing unauthorized materials including electronics gadgets into examination rooms
6. Introduce a monitoring system to ensure course work assessments and examinations are conducted and handled according to the set procedures
7. Review the role of external examiner in order to be more comprehensive so as to enhance quality assurance in the examination process and curriculum reviews.
8. Introduce a system which will ensure timely coursework assessment feedback to students and timely administration, marking and processing of examinations and submission of results.
9. Review examinations processing procedures and storage to improve security of examination papers
10. Establish criteria for allocation of examination/test venues
11. Regularly review regulations governing conduct of examinations to take into considerations new and emerging technologies that could facilitate cheating
12. Institute a mechanism to ensure that invigilation is properly done and invigilation regulations are enforced.
13. Review procedures for handling examination irregularity cases

4.9 STUDENT ADVICE AND SUPPORT

4.9.1 Situation Analysis

ARU has well structured participatory organs as provided for in the Charter: “Ardhi University Charter 2007”. It has put in place participatory organs and filled in positions of its top leadership and all other units. The University has strong staff and students associations that cater for welfare of their members. The following Operational Policies and Procedures are in place as guidelines for day to day operations.

- Ardhi University Gender Policy
- Operational policy and Procedures for Health Services
- Operational Policy and Procedures for Students Accommodation

The students Affairs policy is still under preparation

The existing infrastructure that runs from teaching and learning buildings, staff offices, staff quarters, students’ hostels, health centre and play grounds contribute to conducive learning environment at ARU. Constant water supply, electricity and easy accessibility to any point around the city add flavors to ARU environment. However, the available infrastructure is not enough. Inadequacy of cafeteria, hostels, play grounds and lack of provisions for indoor games and students centre have an adverse effect to students support functions. The available infrastructure does not have provisions for physically challenged staff and students. Budget constraints and Donors’ hesitation to fund infrastructure development has been a draw back towards ARU’s attainment of its objectives.

Guidance and Counseling services are offered within the campus. Basic health services are offered at ARU dispensary, while referral cases on health and Social problems are obtained within reach around the city. However, not all basic health services are properly handled due to insufficient resources. Each student is assigned an academic advisor; however, very few students make use of the advisors. Curricula and examination regulations at ARU are silent about remedial measures to be taken to assist students with learning difficulties. Religious activities are allowed on campus provided that laws of the country are followed. None existence of provisions for conducting of religious activities within the University has created a situation of uncontrolled conduct of religious services.

4.9.2 Policy Issues

1. Absence of Provision for physically challenged students
2. Lack of remedial measures to assist students with learning difficulties
3. Inadequate funds and Donors reluctance to assist in construction of infrastructures
4. Limited health services offered by ARU dispensary
5. Unsatisfactory guidance and Counseling services
6. Unregulated Religious Activities

4.9.3 Policy Statement
ARU shall institute mechanisms that support physically challenged students and provide remedial measures for students with learning difficulties. It shall also improve health services, guidance and counseling services and regulate religious activities at the campus.

4.9.4 Strategies
1. Establish provisions that will cater for physically challenged students, students with learning difficulties and students’ religious activities
2. Devise strategies that will convince the Government to increase its development budget and request Donors to assist in construction of infrastructure
3. Strengthen guidance, counseling and advisory services for students.
4. Strengthen health services offered by ARU dispensary

4.10 FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE

4.10.1 Situation Analysis
Facilities and teaching infrastructure ought to be in line with programmes goals and objectives, indeed, they are linked to teaching and learning philosophy. For example, if the philosophy is teaching in small groups, then small rooms must be available. As such, facilities contribute to teaching and learning environment.

While the teaching and learning philosophy of most of ARU programmes is on “problem solving and practical oriented teaching “, ARU has limited facilities and infrastructure to fully realize that philosophy, particularly at this time of increased students enrolment and programmes expansion. The University has limited number of facilities and infrastructure, which minimally support running of programmes. For instance some programmes in SEST and SGST have to undertake workshop and laboratory training using UDSM facilities and other agencies such as MLHSD and NHBRA. Available facilities are as summarized below:

Teaching Space
1. Class Rooms
2. Seminar Rooms (DMTC)
3. Postgraduate Study rooms
4. Laboratories
5. Computer Clusters
6. Workshop
7. The Library
8. Learning Resource Centers in some schools.

Equipment
The University hosts a range of Environmental Engineering and Geomatics Equipment

Computer Facilities
1. Students Computer Laboratories
2. Some Schools have staff computer rooms
3. A LAN supported by a Fibre Optics Backbone Network
4. Computer Hardware and Software
5. LCD Projectors

Most of the facilities were put in place when the level of students’ enrolment was in the range of 500 students. Currently, students’ enrolment has increased by about 400%, rendering, the facilities inadequate.

Additionally, the facilities are not effectively serviced due to increasing maintenance costs, declining funding from the government and reluctance of private sector to invest in Higher Education.

Developments in Information Technology has resulted into most skills being automated, thus requiring students’ mastery of use of computers in the learning process. In this regard, a full computer-aided instruction becomes difficult to achieve, due to inadequate number of computers. The current computer to student ratio stands at 1 to 30.

The University is experiencing regular interruptions in teaching and learning process resulting from unreliable power supply.

Most of Lecture rooms are in poor state and lack regular maintenance. Additionally, they are limited in space to accommodate large classes. Indeed available Lecture rooms lack important provisions, such as stands for supporting LCD Projectors and Public Address Systems.

The University is currently connected to TTCL Internet Service Provider. The speed of Internet is still slow, causing downloading of learning resources from the Internet time consuming. This is attributed to insufficient Bandwidth.

Most of infrastructure and facilities shortcomings are attributed to the fact that ARU was initially built to be an institute rather than a University. In that regard, considering the current ARU status, most facilities are inadequate. To that effect, there is a critical shortage of students’ accommodation. On campus students accommodation is poor and inadequate, as a result, more than half of students’ population stays outside the University in privately owned accommodations, most of which are prone to inadequate services of water, electricity, access, noise etc., leading to non-conducive learning environment.

The Government Policy on university students’ accommodation does not support the ARU’s initiatives to provide accommodation to all students.

University recreational services are limited, particularly in games and sports. Additionally, there is lack of a students’ centre, which, ought to function as students’ common room.

4.10.2 Policy Issues
1. Inadequate facilities to meet minimum teaching and learning requirements
2. Non regular maintenance/repair/service of available facilities
3. Inadequate Computer Hardware and Software for staff and students use
4. Lack of important provisions in lecture rooms
5. Lack of Lecture Theatres for teaching large classes
6. Unreliable Internet Services
7. Unreliable Power supply
8. Declining Government financial support in building infrastructure
9. Reluctance of the private sector to invest in Higher Education

4.10.3 Policy Statement
The University shall strive to provide, regularly maintain, and optimize the use of facilities and infrastructures to accommodate increase in students’ enrolment

4.10.4 Strategies
1. Expand teaching and learning infrastructure and facilities to match with students enrolment,
2. Optimize the use of available facilities to accommodate more students as far as possible
3. Develop a system for ensuring regular service/maintenance/repair of available facilities and infrastructure
4. Provide fast Internet services using technologies of the day so as to meet the increasing demand of harnessing the potential of IT in achieving the University mission
5. Ensure steady supply of electricity so that core mission activities are not interrupted
6. Strengthen resource mobilization unit to ensure that sufficient funds are available for infrastructure and facilities expansion and maintenance

4.11 STUDENTS EVALUATION

4.11.1 Situation Analysis
In order to ensure quality of teaching and learning process at the University, one has to consider the evaluation of the process from stakeholders. Stakeholders are many but not limited to students and members of staff only.

Students’ involvement in the evaluation of teaching /learning process at ARU has not been done for the past two years. However, in the past students evaluation was being organized by the CCE in collaboration with CCE – UDSM. The CCE – UDSM collected data, analyzed them and sent back the results to ARU for further actions. Feedback from the UDSM took more than a year to reach the respective units at ARU. Moreover, the institution doesn’t have clearly defined evaluation information communication mechanism to lecturers. As such, the university cannot ascertain if the feedback has been ploughed back into the teaching process.

Beginning semester II of 2008/09 academic year, ARU has started conducting students Evaluations under the office of Director of Quality Assurance Bureau. The exercise aims at revealing problematic areas in the teaching /learning process at ARU. However, sensitization on both academic staff and students has not been done. The guidance that has been issued to students and staff as to how the whole exercise should be handled has not been sufficient. That includes; feedback time frame, forum for discussing the results, and guidelines for handling the results.
4.11.2 Policy Issues
1. Absence of clear procedure for administration of SCEF
2. Technical staffs are not evaluated.
3. Inadequacy of staff/students sensitization on SCEF exercise
4. Feedback communication to staff and students not adequately done

4.11.3 Policy Statement
The University shall set and communicate to staff and students a procedure for administration of SCEF.

4.11.4 Strategies
1. Develop a procedure for administration of SCEF
2. Sensitize students and staff on the essence of students evaluation
3. Review SCEF to include technical staff and necessary teaching facilities.

4.12 BENCHMARKING AND FEEDBACK MECHANISMS (STAKEHOLDERS SATISFACTION)

4.12.1 Situation Analysis
In efforts to ensure that academic programmes meet goals and objectives set by stakeholders, the University has in place following mechanisms:
1. Rules, Regulations and Guidelines to govern inputs, processes and outputs of academic programmes,
2. Tracer Study undertakings,
3. Academic Audit undertakings and
4. Institutional self assessment undertakings
5. Recently established Quality Assurance Bureau

However, the above mechanisms are not well structured, leading to lack of constant monitoring mechanisms. There is lack of regular tracer studies, academic audits, institutional self assessment, external institution assessment; internal programmes self assessment and external peer review. This is attested by the fact that, the last tracer study and academic audit were conducted in 2003 and 2004 respectively under the UDSM guidelines and that ARU does not have own guidelines.

While it is acknowledged that main stakeholders of academic programmes are students, alumni, the industry and the society, there is generally lack of structured feedback mechanism from the stakeholders.

The University has a large alumni base which is not effectively used in informing programmes quality improvement. There is lack of mechanisms to contact the alumni base.

The Industry is contacted in the course of tracer studies (which are inadequate), Industrial Training, semester projects, consultancy services and so on. Such contacts are limited in the sense that only a narrow number of stake holders are contacted.

There is little involvement of the University in community/national and regional development initiatives so as to win recognition of the importance of academic programmes offered and the university’s expertise.
4.12.2 Policy Issues

1. Lack of mechanisms to conduct regular tracer studies and academic audits
2. Limited involvement of the University in community, national, regional and international development initiatives
3. Poor links with industries
4. Lack of institutional internal and external assessment plan
5. Lack of programmes internal and external assessment plan
6. Lack of mechanisms to gather feedback from alumnae and employers

4.12.3 Policy Statements

1. The University shall devise mechanisms and plans to undertake institutional and programmes assessments, tracer studies and academic audits
2. The university shall develop mechanisms to enhance its involvement in development initiatives and secure feedback from industry, alumnae, community, national, regional and international partners.

4.12.4 Strategies

1. Devise mechanisms and plans to undertake institutional and programmes assessments, tracer studies and academic audits
2. Develop mechanisms to enhance ARU involvement in development initiatives and secure feedback from industry, alumnae, community, national, regional and international partners

4.13 INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

4.13.1 Situation Analysis

ARU has ever since it inception continued to use the traditional system of Information Management. That is physical movement of information either by staff member or hard copies in form of files, memos, letters; routing slips etc. storage of such information is still in hard copies in form of files or bounded books or folders. This can be evidenced by the existing hard files in staff offices and piles of bound folders or books that contain instructions, decisions and policies made by different organs of the University.

Retrieval of such stored information becomes very difficult because it requires physical handling of hard files from one office to another. The situation becomes even worse when the custodian of such information is not in office or does not recall the exact file where the required information is stored.

Problems that have been raised by staff members and students on the management of information at the university include the following.

- Students’ academic records not properly kept and updated. Access to such information by responsible officers is very difficulty
- The university does not have a software package for processing examinations results. As such examinations results processing is largely manual leading to many errors and inconsistencies
- Accessibility to students registration and fee payments status by academic units is lacking and thus leading to difficulties in determining bona-fide students
- Misplacement of hard files as they move from one office to another
• Information being delayed or not reaching its destination at all
• There have been unnecessary delays in making decisions
• Accuracy of information is not guaranteed
• Staff offices have turned out to be stores of hard copies of information
• Closed files occupy space
• Non existence of systems that would be used in the Information Management at the University. For example, database for storing and managing information for students, staff, research and consultancy.

The University can establish Information systems that can support storage of data/records in a computer system and automate some of the information processing activities, especially if they are data intensive applications. The University has managed to introduce the financial management system at its Accounts Department, however, the system still depend on data/information from hard files simply because other units/Departments are yet to be automated.

Information management systems in the following major areas can be integrated with the existing accounting system at the University.

1) Academic Information management system that will cater for central administration functions and other units in Schools Directorates and Departments.
2) Human Resource Information Management System that will handle all Human Resource Matters at the University, such as maintenance of employs records, integrates them with Academic Information system and Financial Management System.
3) Library Information Management Systems will support the University library in the retrieval of catalogues within or from Schools/Institute/Centers and connectivity external research databases. The system should also be integrated with other systems so as to have a complete sharing of information within the University.

4. 13.2 Policy Issues

1. Old ways of handling and storage of information
2. Students’ academic records not properly kept and updated.
3. Access to students academic records such as examination results, registration and fee payment status is difficult
4. Examinations results processing is largely manual leading to many errors and inconsistencies
5. Misplacement of hard files as they move from one office to another
6. Information being delayed or not reaching its destination at all
7. Lack of database for storing and managing students and staff records, as well as research and consultancy information.

4.13.3 Policy Statement
The University shall improve its handling and storage of information by establishing information Management systems.

4.13.4 Strategies
1. Develop/Acquire and link information management systems
2. Develop capacity for information management
4.14 RESEARCH

4.14.1 Situation Analysis

Research is one of an important function of any University. Research, seeks to expand frontiers of knowledge for development purposes. Staff and students undertake applied research in areas of competence. Much as traditional departments have Research agendas which were developed during the UCLA era, current schools have not developed research agenda and programmes. Moreover, there is inadequate funding to support research activities which have resulted into staff low morale towards research. In addition, there is no university research policy. Research activities within the University are regulated by the University of Dar es salaam research guidelines and procedures (1995), which have since been updated. While most of the world is embracing multidisciplinary research, research conducted at ARU mostly are profession specific, as such they are not responsive to broader issues/problems facing our society.

Research can effectively be achieved by forging synergy with external stakeholders’ particularly professional bodies and the industry. The University does not have mechanisms for forging research collaborations with the industry. Most of the existing collaborations are at departmental level rather than the institution and they are oriented towards public service delivery rather than research per se. Generally there is lack of vibrant linkages between the University and the Industry; as manifested by lack of collaborative as well as contracted research projects.

Administration of research is undertaken by the Directorate of Research and Publication. The directorate is understaffed and thus unable to support researchers, for example in searching for research funds, coordination of multi disciplinary proposal writing and approval of research proposals and final reports. Generally, there is no effective research administration at the University, School and Departmental levels. Currently, Schools and Departmental HDRPCs are not functioning properly in respect to research administration.

For research results to bring about changes or impacts, they need to be disseminated to a wider and right audience. Outputs of most of research undertaken at ARU are not widely disseminated. This testifies lack of well defined mechanisms for research results dissemination.

In order to operationalize research results, the results ought to influence teaching, curricula development and programme design. This aspect is yet to be explored at ARU as such; there is lack of integration of research results into teaching and learning process.

There is a need of ensuring that research undertaken are relevant to the mission of the university and are responsive to needs of the society. The existing mechanism for research monitoring and research output approval is not properly followed at all levels.

4.14.2 Policy Issues

1. Lack of University research policy and Schools research agenda.
2. Inadequate linkages with Industries
3. Inadequate funding to support research activities
4. Poor monitoring of research activities
5. Lack of institutional support towards dissemination of research results
6. Inadequate motivation for staff to undertake research
7. Ineffective research administration

4.14.3 Policy Statements

1. ARU shall endeavor to develop policy to regulate research and ensure schools develop research agenda and programmes.
2. ARU shall consistently monitor, evaluate the quality and relevance of research at different stages and strive to collaborate with the industry in research undertakings,
3. ARU shall devise mechanisms to motivate staff to undertake research and support dissemination of research results.

4.14.4 Strategies

1. Develop University research policy and agenda
2. Device a system to monitor and evaluate the quality and relevance of research at different stages
3. Put in place a mechanism to enhance research collaborations between the university and the industry
4. Devise mechanisms to motivate staff to write winning research proposal, undertake research
5. Devise guidelines to support dissemination of research results.
6. Strengthen the Directorate of Research to support research

4.15 CONSULTANCY AND PUBLIC SERVICES

4.15.1 Situation Analysis

One of the university missions is to offer consultancy and public services. In the year 2008/9 the university through the Directorate of Consultancy Services secured 211 projects of which 80 were from public sector and 131 from private sector. Initially the quality of services offered by the consultants was guided by UCU policy of 2001 and its rolling strategic plan of 2002/03 – 2006 / 07. Despite the existence of these documents, some deficiencies were noted including inadequacy in monitoring mechanism, checks and balances in the implementation process / stages; inadequacy in the feedback mechanism after the implementation process and inadequacy in assurance standards. This led to the introduction of the mechanisms for quality control and assurance for consultancy services at ARU (the then UCLAS) in 2006. However, it is not clear if those mechanisms are well known to all consultants as consultancy services are offered by all university staff. A number of consultants (University staff) are undertaking consultancy work without referring to the mechanisms resulting to delivering service beyond pre – estimated time, above the budget and with poor quality /functional services.

The mechanisms for quality control and assurance for consultancy services at ARU need to be reviewed to appropriately respond to the quality control and assurance aspects. The mechanisms document has to provide for adequate resources to facilitate quality assurance in various stages of the project such as having a committee to assess the project progress instead of depending entirely on the Director of University
Consultant Unit. The mechanisms also have to provide for regular review of the effectiveness of quality related arrangements for consultancy and public services.

4.15.2 Policy issues

1. The mechanism for quality control and assurance for consultancy services at ARU have not been properly disseminated
2. Lack of enforcement of ACU quality control and assurance mechanisms.
3. ACU quality control and assurance mechanisms not well structured to capture all quality related issues in a project.
4. Built in bureaucratic procedures in ACU quality control and assurance mechanisms that hinder its enforcement

4.15.3 Policy statement

The university shall ensure ACU mechanisms for quality control and assurance are regularly reviewed in order to make them relevant and user friendly, disseminated and adhered to.

4.15.4 Strategies

1. Disseminate quality control and assurance mechanisms to all potential consultants
2. Develop a monitoring system to check adherence to quality control and assurance mechanisms.
3. Review ACU mechanisms for quality control and assurance for relevance and practicability
CHAPTER FIVE

MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENT FOR IMPLEMENTATING THE QUALITY ASSURANCE POLICY

5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the actors, mandate and roles in rationalizing the Quality Assurance policy. It takes cognizance of existing university administrative structure, the institution transformation and corporate plan of the university.

Implementation of the Quality Assurance Policy shall require the following:
- Setting up University Quality Assurance Bureau
- Defining the role and position of major stakeholders within the University community as regards the quality assurance issues.
- Establishing a framework for coordinating, monitoring and evaluating the implementation of the policy.
- Reviewing and setting up of enabling policies and necessary institutional arrangement.

5.2 THE ROLE OF DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS WITHIN THE UNIVERSITY

The stakeholders who are to oversee the implementation of the Quality Assurance Policy include the University Council, the University Senate, School Boards, the Planning and the Quality Assurance Bureau, the University Central Administration, Schools and Institutes, Academic Departments, Administrative Units, University staff and student community. Once the policy has been approved different stakeholders shall be required to ensure that it is implemented. Commitment shall be required from all University stakeholders by endorsing and executing activities of implementation plan of the Quality Assurance Policy. The Quality Assurance Bureau shall develop a strategic action plan, identifying areas for mobilization of financial and human resources, responsible organs and key individuals for implementation.

5.3 MONITORING AND EVALUATION

ARU shall establish mechanism of accountability for monitoring and evaluating the implementation of the policy. This calls for establishment of a framework that shall provide a basis for monitoring and evaluation of the quality assurance policy implementation at all levels of the University.

5.4 INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

The implementation of the Quality Assurance Policy requires a sound institutional framework for translating the goals, objectives and strategies into actual programmes at all levels of the University. The University, therefore, shall put in place an institutional framework to ensure that the Quality Assurance Policy is implemented. In
addition, political commitment, collective responsibility and accountability are key elements to effective implementation of the policy.

It is important that the implementation framework is spelt out in the Quality Assurance Policy Strategic Action Plan which will be the main instrument guiding the attainment of the Quality Assurance Policy objectives. The instrument shall further elaborate the institutional arrangements that shall facilitate effective coordination and linkage of various actors with distinct responsibilities and accountability in the implementation of the Quality Assurance Policy. In order to ensure the implementation of the Policy, the University Quality Assurance Bureau should be strengthened and supported, as it shall play the key role to oversee the implementation. The figure below shows the Quality Assurance Bureau position within the university organization structure.
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