COMMISSION FOR UNIVERSITY EDUCATION

PEER EVALUATION TOOL FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAMME ACCREDITATION

JANUARY 2014

PREAMBLE

Upon submission to the Commission of a curriculum of an academic programme by an institution of higher education, a panel of three (3) peer reviewers drawn from recognized universities and the industry, who have appropriate academic qualifications and experience in the area of focus, is selected and commissioned to evaluate the programme. The peer reviewers drawn from recognized universities must have been Senior Lecturers, Associate Professors or Full Professors for a minimum of five (5) years with doctorate degrees in the relevant field of the programme. (*For programmes where there is scarcity of doctorate level academic staff, Senior Lecturers who are holders of relevant master-level degrees are also considered).*The peer reviewers drawn from industry must be holder of master-level degrees in relevant field and with managerial positions in the field of the programme for more than five (5) years.

It is required that the peer reviewers do not have existing affiliations with the Institution whose programme they are evaluating. Therefore, they shall be required to declare their interests (if any) prior to accepting to evaluate a given academic programme. This will facilitate immediate replacement of the peer reviewer.

The evaluation of a given academic programme shall be carried out in two stages. The first shall be the evaluation of the curriculum and the second shall be the evaluation of the academic resources for the support of the programme. The evaluation of the academic resources for the support of the programme shall only be carried out once the panel is satisfied that the proposed curriculum is adequate.

The peer reviewers of a given academic programme shall be given three (3) weeks to individually evaluate the curriculum of the said programme based on set standards and guidelines for academic programmes; nationally adopted minimum standards for given academic disciplines; requirements of professional bodies; and global, continental and national trends in the academic discipline. As a peer reviewer, one is expected to give a broad overview of the programme and evaluate individual course units in terms of breadth, depth and appropriateness for the academic programme for which they are intended. The peer reviewer is also expected to make recommendations on possible additions and/or deletions, with a view to improving the quality of the programme.

A meeting of the panel of peer reviewers of the programme shall be organized by the Commission. The panel of peer reviewers shall, from among themselves, nominate a chairperson to provide direction to the meeting and a rapporteur to prepare the report based on consensus by the panel members. Under the leadership of the chairperson and with the assistance of the Commission's secretariat, the panel shall

prepare a comprehensive evaluation report of the programme in the format presented below, based on the individual panelists assessment of the programme and concurrence on the various components of the programme. The comprehensive evaluation report shall be submitted to the Commission by the chairperson of the panel for necessary action.

Three (3) overall recommendations are likely to be made with regard to a given academic programme, notably,

1. **Minor Revamp of the academic programme in readiness for verification of academic resources for the support of the programme.**

    This recommendation shall be made in a case whereby minor corrections are required in line with the aspects raised in the comprehensive report. The panel shall also embark on the verification of the academic resources as the institution revamps the programme in focus.

2. **Major revamp of the academic programme for re-evaluation by one peer reviewer**

    This recommendation shall be made in a case whereby major corrections are required in line with the aspects raised in the comprehensive report. The panel shall only embark in the verification of academic resources for the support of the programme once one of the peer reviewers has confirmed that the programme has been revamped in line with recommendations made by the panel in the comprehensive evaluation report.

3. **Re-design the programme for re-evaluation by the panel**

    This recommendation shall be made in a case whereby major structural corrections are required including overhauling and refocusing the programme in line with the aspects raised in the comprehensive report. The programme shall be re-evaluated by the entire panel and once satisfied with the curriculum, shall recommend the verification of resources for the support of the programme through the chairperson of the panel.

Three (3) overall recommendations are likely to be made with respect to the academic resources for the support of a given academic programme, notably,

1. **Recommend for Programme Accreditation**

    This recommendation shall be made in a case whereby the panel is satisfied that minimum academic resources have been provided for the support of the programme. The programme shall then be presented to the Commissioners for consideration for accreditation.

2. **Enhance academic resources for a follow-up visit by one peer reviewer**

    This recommendation shall be made in a case whereby the panel is not satisfied that some of the academic resources are adequate for the support of the programme. The programme shall only be recommended for consideration for approval once one of the peer reviewers has confirmed that the minimum academic resources for the support of the programme have been provided. One major concern shall be the adequacy and appropriateness of the academic staff for the support of the programme and, more specifically, the appropriateness of the academic leader of the programme.

3. **Enhance academic resources for a follow-up visit by the entire panel**

    This recommendation shall be made in a case whereby the panel is not satisfied that the majority of the academic resources are adequate for the support of the programme. The programme shall only be recommended for consideration for approval once the entire panel has confirmed that the minimum academic resources for the support of the programme have been provided.

Your task as a peer reviewer and member of the panel is to objectively rate the proposed academic programme against the relevant standards. The Commission for University Education is grateful for your participation in this exercise that aims at maintaining high quality Kenyan University Education.

SECTION A

EVALUATION OF CURRICULUM OF AN ACADEMIC PROGRAMME

1. **Name of Institution**: _____

2. **Title of Academic programme**: _____

Section A entails evaluation of the various components of the academic programme as presented in the curriculum. A score of "0" shall be given to items that are required and have not been provided the component in focus. The maximum score shall be provided in the scale. For items that do not apply to a given category, an 'X' score shall be provided and thus the item shall be omitted in determining the total percentage score of the programme.

COMPONENTS OF THE CURRICULUM	Score	Max
1. STRUCTURE OF THE CURRICULUM OF THE ACADEMIC PROGRAMME		
a) The structure of the curriculum is aligned to the standard format as provided for by the Commission		**5**
b) The university has clearly articulate the academic organization and structure of its programmes		**5**
SUB-TOTAL OF COMPONENT 1		**10**
Strengths of Component 1 _____ _____ _____ _____		

Weaknesses of Component 1

_____

_____

_____

_____

Recommendations for Improvement of Component 1

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. FOUNDATIONAL ELEMENTS OF THE ACADEMIC PROGRAMME		
a) Title of the programme		**5**
The programme title is reflective of the overall content of the programme		5
b) Philosophy of the programme		**5**
i. The underlying philosophy of the programme is consistent with the Institution's Philosophy		1
ii. The philosophy of the programme is appropriate		4
c) Rationale of the programme		**10**
i. The justification of the programme is convincing		5
ii. The rationale of the programme is evidence-based and involves a needs-assessment/market survey/situational analysis		3
iii. There is evidence of stakeholders' involvement in the designing of the programme		2

d) Goal of the programme		**5**
i. The goal of the programme is related to the Institution's vision and mission		1
ii. The goal of the programme is appropriate		4
e) Expected learning outcomes of the programme		**20**
i. The expected learning outcomes are linked to the goal of the programme		1
ii. The expected learning outcomes are concisely and precisely articulated		4
iii. The expected learning outcomes are learner-centered		2
iv. The expected learning outcomes of the programme are SMART, that is, Specific to the programme, Measureable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-Bound		5
v. The expected learning outcomes comprehensively cover the knowledge, skills, areas of professional development and attitudes that the learner is expected to have acquired and mastered at the end of a given period of time		8
f) Mode of delivery of the programme		**2**
i. The modes of delivery of the programme are clearly articulated		1
ii. The modes of delivery of the programme promote student engagement		1
g) Admission requirements		**3**
i. The minimum admission requirements for the proposed programme are comprehensively provided, including direct and alternative requirements		2
ii. The minimum admission requirements for the programme are in line with nationally accepted admission requirements		1
SUB-TOTAL OF COMPONENT 2		**50**
Strengths of Component 2 _____ _____		

_____

_____

Weaknesses of Component 2

_____

_____

_____

_____

Recommendations for Improvement of Component 2

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. ACADEMIC REGULATIONS OF THE PROGRAMME		
a) Regulations for credit transfer		**3**
i. The regulations for credit transfer are in line with the general national trends and/or those of the professional body		1
ii. The regulations for credit transfer are well articulated and include: • Type of certifications recognized for purposes of credit transfer • Maximum number of credits permissible for transfer; • Level of courses eligible for credit transfer; and		2

	• Minimum grade required for credit transfer.		
b)	**Course requirements**		**2**

	The course requirements are well articulated with respect to:
	
	   i. Student class attendance, attachment/practicum/internship, community service
	
	   ii. Obligations of the lecturer which should entail aspects of course delivery and facilitation
			2

c)	**Student Assessment Policy/Criteria**		**4**

	The student assessment policy/criteria is well articulated with respect to:
	
	   i. Continuous Assessment Tests (CATs)
	
	   ii. End-Trimester/Quarter/Semester
	
	   iii. Practicals
	
	   iv. Other Assessments
			4

d)	**Grading System**		**2**
	The grading system is well articulated in terms of marks and letter grades		2
e)	**Examination Regulations**		**4**
	The examination regulations, including examination malpractices, disciplinary action and mode of appeal are appropriate		4
f)	**Moderation of examinations**		**4**
	The regulations on moderation of examinations, including the process of moderation and the role of internal and external examiners are appropriate.		4
g)	**Graduation requirements**		**2**
	The graduation requirements, including the passmark and the total number of units/credits/lecture/instructional hours required for graduation purposes are explicitly provided		2
h)	**Classification of degree (where applicable)**		**1**
	The classification of degrees is well articulated		1
i)	**Description of Thesis/Dissertation/Project (whichever is applicable)**		**4**
	i. The operational definition of thesis/dissertation/project (whichever is applicable) is provided		1

ii.	The description of the thesis/dissertation/project (whichever is applicable) is well expounded to include the: • Rationale of the thesis/dissertation/project in the programme • Facets of the thesis/dissertation/project • Regulations of the thesis/dissertation/project		3
j)	**Course evaluation**		**6**
i.	The procedures for course evaluation are provided		1
ii.	The course evaluation is well expounded to include all aspects of the course: the course content, instructional process, infrastructure and equipment for the delivery, instructional and reference materials and assessments		5
k)	**Management and Administration of the Programme**		**3**
	The management and administration of the programme is well expounded to include aspects the programme placement/housing, academic leadership and internal quality assurance mechanisms		3
SUB-TOTAL OF COMPONENT 3			**35**

Strengths of Component 3

_____

_____

_____

_____

Weaknesses of Component 3

_____

_____

_____ _____		
Recommendations for Improvement of Component 3		
_____ _____ _____ _____		

4.	**COURSES/UNITS OFFERED IN THE PROGRAMME**		
a)	The distribution table comprising of the number of courses/units/credit hours/lecture hours allocated to the Institution's common courses, core courses of the programme, specialization/option area courses and electives is clearly articulated		**5**
b)	The list of courses to be undertaken in the areas of Institution's common courses, core courses of the programme, specialization/option area courses and electives are clearly articulated		**5**
c)	The matrix showing the courses that will be covered by each expected learning outcomes of the programme and specialization areas are clearly articulated		**5**
d)	The list of courses comprehensively address the expected learning outcomes of the programme and the specific specialization/optional areas		**5**
e)	The courses proposed for this programme are appropriate for the programme's degree level		**2**
f)	The courses promote the vision and mission of the institution and national and global goals		**2**
g)	The courses proposed for this programme are in line with the trends of the		**1**

courses offered globally for similar programmes		
h) There is a systematic flow of courses from foundational courses to application/practical courses		**2**
i) The credit/units/lecture/instructional hours provided for each course is adequate		**2**
j) The programme structure showing the courses to be taken by the students by quarter/trimester/semester is appropriate for the level of the students		**1**
k) The minimum student workload for the programme is appropriate for the level of students		**1**
l) The total credit/units/lecture/instructional hours required for graduation are adequate for the programme and are in conformity with the Commission's Standards, the minimum national standards and the professional bodies standards (where available)		**1**
m) The course codes are unique to each course of the programme		**1**
n) The course codes are descriptive of the type of course and the level of the programme for which the course is intended		**2**
SUB-TOTAL OF COMPONENT 4		**35**

Strengths of Component 4

_____

_____

_____

_____

Weaknesses of Component 4

_____

_____

_____

_____

Recommendations for Improvement of Component 4	

_____

_____

_____

_____

5. COURSE OUTLINES OF THE ACADEMIC PROGRAMME

a) Titles of the courses			**5**
i.	The titles of the courses are short, clear, descriptive of the content and appropriate for the courses		4
ii.	The pre-requisites (where applicable) are appropriate for the course		1
b) Purpose of the courses			**4**
i.	The purpose of the course is well articulated		1
ii.	The purpose of the course relates to the course title		1
iii.	The purpose of the course is realistic in scope		1
iv.	The purpose of the course is appropriate for the level of students intended for		1
c) Expected Learning Outcomes (ELOs) of the courses			**10**
i.	The ELOs of the courses learner-centered		1
ii.	The ELOs of the courses are well formulated and SMART, that is, Specific to the course, Measureable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-Bound		5
iii.	The ELOs of the courses are link to its purpose		1
iv.	The ELOs of the courses comprehensively cover the knowledge, skills, areas of professional development and attitudes that students		3

	are expected to have acquired and mastered by the end of the course		
d)	**Course Content**		**10**
i.	The course content is clearly articulated with topical and sub-topical areas to be covered in the course		2
ii.	The course content is relevant to the courses in focus and presented in a systematic manner		6
iii.	The course content comprehensively addresses the expected learning outcomes of the courses in focus		1
iv.	The loading of the course content is sufficient for the duration allocated to the various courses		1
e)	**Mode of delivery**		**2**
i.	The modes of delivery are appropriate for the nature of the courses in focus		1
ii.	The modes of delivery are comprehensively provided		1
f)	**Instructional Materials and/or Equipment**		**2**
i.	The instructional materials and/or equipment are appropriate for the nature of the courses in focus		1
ii.	The instructional materials and/or equipment are comprehensively provided		1
g)	**Course Assessment**		**2**
i.	The course assessments resonate with the programmes's student assessment policy/criteria		1
ii.	The course assessments are appropriate for the nature of the courses in focus		1
h)	**Core Reading Materials for the courses**		**5**
i.	There is consistency in the application of a referencing style across all course outlines		1
ii.	The core reading materials are relevant to the courses in focus		1
iii.	Current core reading materials are provided		1
iv.	The reading lists are diversified to include textbooks, journals and e-materials		1
v.	The list of core reading materials include local authors		1

i) Recommended Reference Materials		5
i. There is consistency in the application of a referencing style across all course outlines		1
ii. The recommended reference materials are relevant to the courses in focus		1
iii. Current recommended reference materials are provided		1
iv. The reference materials are diversified to include textbooks, journals and e-materials		1
v. The list of reference materials include local authors		
SUB-TOTAL OF COMPONENT 5		**45**

Strengths of Component 5

_____

_____

_____

_____

Weaknesses of Component 5

_____

_____

_____

_____

Recommendations for Improvement of Component 5

_____

_____

_____

_____

6.	OVERVIEW OF THE ENTIRE ACADEMIC PROGRAMME		
a)	The curriculum is clearly written and void of editorial, both typographical and grammatical, errors		**5**
b)	The curriculum is cohesive, with the various components linked to each other		**5**
c)	The academic programme facilitates a balanced learning process		**5**
d)	The academic programme enhances appropriate attributes for the proposed level and is appropriate for the type of field and level of students intended		**5**
e)	The programme is contextualized and relevant		**5**
SUB-TOTAL OF COMPONENT 6			**25**

Strengths of Component 6

_____

_____

_____

_____

Weaknesses of Component 6

_____

_____

_____

_____

Recommendations for Improvement of Component 6		
_____ _____ _____ _____		
TOTAL SCORE OF SECTION A (COMPONENTS 1-6)		**200**
TOTAL PERCENTAGE OF SECTION A (*TOTAL SCORE/MAX SCORE*100)*		**100%**

SUMMARY REPORT OF THE EVALUATION OF THE ACADEMIC PROGRAMME

To be completed by the Evaluation Panel

(Should not be availed to the Institution)

C NO.	COMPONENTS OF THE PROGRAMME	ACTUAL SCORE	MAXIMUM SCORE
1.	Structure of the curriculum of the academic programme		10
2.	Foundational elements of the academic programme		50
3.	Academic regulations of the programme		35
4.	Courses/Units offered in the programme		35
5.	Course Outlines of the academic programme		45
6.	Overview of the entire academic programme		25
TOTAL SCORE (Y)			**200**
TOTAL PERCENTAGE SCORE (Y/MAXIMUM SCORE*100%)			**100%**

Overall Percentage Score Judgement (please tick (√) appropriately in left most column)

Tick (√)	Score	Conclusion
	70% and above	Minor Revamp in readiness for verification of resources
	50 - below 70%	Major Revamp for re-evaluation by one peer reviewer
	Below 50%	Re-design for re-evaluation by entire panel

Overall Comments of the Evaluation Panel

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Name of Panel Leader: _____

Signature of Panel Leader: _____

Date: _____

Names and Signatures of Other Panel Members

	Name	Signature	Date
1.			
2.			
3.			

SECTION B

EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC RESOURCES FOR SUPPORT OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMME

1. **Name of Institution**: _____

2. **Name of Vice Chancellor**: _____

3. **Title of Academic programme**: _____

4. **Name of Academic leader**: _____

Section B is only filled once a satisfactory percentage is obtained on Section A. It entails verifying the adequacy and appropriateness of academic resources as provided for in the appendices to the curriculum and the site visit on the verification of academic resources.

A score of "0" shall be given to items that are required and have not been provided. The minimum score for an availed measure shall be "1" and the maximum score shall be provided in the scale. For items that do not apply to a given category, an 'X' score shall be provided and thus the item shall be omitted in determining the total percentage score of the programme.

ACADEMIC RESOURCES	SCORE	MAX
APPENDIX 1: FACILITIES		
a) The checklist of facilities, including the number, capacity and usage (specific to department/shared) of conference halls, lecture rooms and theatres, lecturers' offices, laboratories, workshops, studios, farm and field facilities and internet access points is comprehensive		**5**
b) The facilities proposed for the support of the programme are adequate and appropriate		**10**

SUB-TOTAL OF APPENDIX I		15

Strengths of Appendix I

_____

_____

_____

_____

Weaknesses of Appendix I

_____

_____

_____

_____

Recommendations for Improvement of Appendix I

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX II: EQUIPMENT AND TEACHING MATERIALS

a) The checklist of equipment and teaching materials including type, number,		5

capacity and usage (specific to department/shared) of desktop computers (PCs), laptops/notebooks, projectors, computer software, laboratory equipment and special equipment is comprehensive		
b) The equipment and teaching materials proposed for the support of the programme are adequate and appropriate		**10**
SUB-TOTAL OF APPENDIX II		**15**

Strengths of Appendix II

_____

_____

_____

_____

Weaknesses of Appendix II

_____

_____

_____

_____

Recommendations for Improvement of Appendix II

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX III: CORE-TEXTS AND JOURNALS		
a) The list of core-texts and journals, including subject areas, number of titles and volumes for both print and electronic materials is comprehensive		**5**
b) The core text and journals proposed for the support of the programme are relevant		**3**
c) The core texts and journals proposed for the support of the programme are current		**3**
d) The core texts and journals proposed for the support of the programme are adequate		**4**
SUB-TOTAL OF APPENDIX 111		**15**

Strengths of Appendix III

_____

_____

_____

_____

Weaknesses of Appendix III

_____

_____

_____

_____

Recommendations for Improvement of Appendix III

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX IV: ACADEMIC STAFF

a) The list of teaching staff and their experience in University teaching, professional experience, publications and patents and academic qualifications, showing dates and where they obtained their qualifications is comprehensive		**5**
b) The list of teaching staff, specifying academic ranks, listed according to departments/disciplines/ subjects and showing full-time and part-time staff and lecturer's average workload per academic year indicating the leader of each subject/discipline is comprehensive		**5**
c) The list of relevant academic support/technical staff listed according to departments/disciplines/ subjects and showing qualifications and years of working experience is comprehensive		**5**
d) The teaching staff proposed for the support of the programme are adequate and appropriate		**10**
e) The teaching load of the teaching staff is sufficient for the support of the programme		**5**
f) The academic leader is appropriate for the support of the programme		**5**
g) The academic support/technical staff proposed for the support of the programme are adequate and appropriate		**10**
SUB-TOTAL OF APPENDIX IV		**45**
Strengths of Appendix IV		

_____

_____

_____

_____

Weaknesses of Appendix IV

_____

_____

_____

_____

Recommendations for Improvement of Appendix IV

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX V: UNIVERSITY POLICY ON CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT		
a) The University Policy on Curriculum Development is well articulated		**5**
b) the University Policy on Curriculum Development is comprehensive		**5**
SUB-TOTAL OF APPENDIX V		**10**
Strengths of Appendix V		

_____

_____

_____

_____

Weaknesses of Appendix V

_____

_____

_____

_____

Recommendations for Improvement of Appendix V

_____

_____

_____

_____

TOTAL SCORE OF SECTION A (APPENDICES I-V)		**100**
TOTAL PERCENTAGE OF SECTION A (*TOTAL SCORE/MAX SCORE*100)*		**100%**

SUMMARY REPORT OF THE VERIFICATION OF RESOURCES FOR THE SUPPORT OF THE ACADEMIC PROGRAMME

To be completed by the Evaluation Panel

(Should not be availed to the Institution)

A NO.	APPENDICES OF ACADEMIC RESOURCES	ACTUAL SCORE	MAXIMUM SCORE
I.	Facilities		15
II.	Equipment and Teaching Materials		15
III.	Core texts and Journals		15
IV.	Academic staff		45
V.	Policy on Curriculum Development		10
TOTAL SCORE (Y)			**100**
TOTAL PERCENTAGE SCORE (Y/MAXIMUM SCORE*100%)			**100%**

Overall Percentage Score Judgement (please tick (√) appropriately in left most column)

Tick (√)	Score	Conclusion
	70% and above	Recommend for Programme Accreditation
	50 - below 70%	Enhance academic resources for a follow-up visit by one peer reviewer
	Below 50%	Enhance academic resources for a follow-up visit by entire panel

Overall Comments of the Evaluation Panel

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Name of Panel Leader: _____

Signature of Panel Leader: _____

Date: _____

Names and Signatures of Other Panel Members

	Name	Signature	Date
1.			
2.			
3.			