



**EAST AFRICAN
CHRISTIAN COLLEGE
RWANDA**

EAST AFRICAN CHRISTIAN COLLEGE (EACC)

MASAKA CAMPUS

P.O.BOX 4129 KIGALI

RWANDA

INTERNAL, EXTERNAL MODERATION, AND PROGRAM REVIEW POLICY

KIGALI, MARCH, 2023

Table of Contents

1. PURPOSE.....	4
2. VISION.....	4
3. MISSION.....	4
4. MOTTO.....	4
5. CORE VALUES.....	4
6. GOALS.....	5
7. INTERNAL MODERATION.....	5
7.1 Objectives.....	5
7.2 General provision.....	5
7.3 Practices.....	6
8. External Moderation.....	6
8.1 Intent.....	6
8.2 Objectives.....	6
8.3. General Provisions:.....	7
8.4. Guidelines.....	7
8.4. 1. Nature of the Moderation.....	7
8.4.2. Documentation to be provided to the external examiner.....	7
8.5. Timing of the process.....	8
8.6. Reporting.....	8
9. NEW PROGRAMS EXTERNAL REVIEW.....	8
9.1 General provision.....	8
9.2. Practices.....	8
9.3 . Reporting.....	9
10. EXISTING ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES.....	9
10.1. Objectives.....	9
10.2. Scope.....	9
10.3. Roles and Responsibilities for conducting program review.....	10
10.4. Faculty /Department Self-Assessment.....	10
10.4.1 Content.....	10
10. 4.2. Distribution.....	11
10.5. External Review Committee.....	12
10.5.1 Configuration.....	12
10.5.2 Appointment.....	12
10.5.3 Committee Charge and Supplemental Questions.....	12
10.5.5 Communication.....	13

10.6. Campus Visit.....	13
10.7. Review Committee Report.....	13
10.8. Action on the Review Report.....	14
10.8.1 ERC’s Review Report.....	14
10.8.2 Faculty/ Department’s Response	14
10. 8.3 DQA’s Response.....	14
10. 8.4 Academic Senate Committee Response.....	14
10. 8.5 Closure Meeting.....	14
10.8.6 Closure Report	15
10.9. Implementation and Mid-Cycle Update Report.....	15
10.10. Timetable	15
10.11. Scheduling Reviews.....	16
10.12. Confidentiality of Documents	16
11. WHO SHOULD KNOW THIS POLICY	17
12. EFFECTIVENESS OF THIS POLICY	17
13. TRANSITIONAL AND FINAL PROVISIONS	17

1. PURPOSE

This Policy document comprises internal and external moderation for examinations objectives and practices in order to improve quality of teaching and learning at EACC, focusing on the quality of evaluation and assessment processes. It indicates the types of assessment and their moderation as part of the assurance of Quality. The Policy also comprises the procedures for the review of new and existing academic programs.

2. VISION

To be a Leading Christ-centered College that fosters knowledge, faith, Ethics and service through excellent academic and research programmes.

3. MISSION

To equip servant leaders for the church and the community and produce Professional graduates of character and commitment that will serve as agents of transformation.

4. MOTTO

With Heart, Hand and Mind, We Serve Professionally.

5. CORE VALUES

5.1. Christ-centeredness

We confess the Lordship of Christ, the authority of the Bible in matters of philosophy, morality and character. Therefore, our Education should be guided by those principles.

5.2. Integrity

We manage all resources of the College guided by biblical principles of upholding responsibility, honesty and transparency, truthfulness, faithfulness and exercising humility.

5.3. Professionalism and Excellence in Service Delivery

We find out the optimal and cost effective way to reach objectives, in changing environment and limitation of resources and keeps on being result and solution oriented.

5.4. Responsibility and Transparency

Teachers, students and administrative staff, to achieve their job, are expected to take decision, take upon their choices, delegate and report openly.

5.5. Justice and equity

We ensure that the fairness, equity without discrimination, clear delegation and decentralization are adopted at all levels of the College

5.6.Solidarity

We are convinced that all people bear the image of God, therefore we commit to promote a gender balanced culture and stressing on the needs of disabled people, and disadvantaged groups.

5.7.Innovation and creativity:

We make sure that teaching and learning processes are considering changing needs of churches and society and therefore programs are continually assessed and improved accordingly in a spirit of creativity and entrepreneurship at all levels.

6. GOALS

- 6.1.**Provide the highest quality learning teaching and research environment for the greater wellbeing of the students and deliver an outstanding educational portfolio;
- 6.2.**Produce graduates fully equipped with character and knowledge to achieve the highest personal and professional standards;
- 6.3.**Make a significant, sustainable and socially responsible contribution to Rwanda, the East Africa and the world, promoting Christian Values, health, economic growth and cultural wellbeing;
- 6.4.**Enhance our position as one of the East African leading research and teaching universities and to measure our performance against the highest national and international standards;
- 6.5.**Deliver academic awards

7. INTERNAL MODERATION

7.1 Objectives

The internal moderation of marking – second-marking, check-marking of a sample – is done by the module teaching team, and has two objectives:

7.1.1: To help maintain consistency of standards between modules, and

7.1.2: To make deliberate bias in favor of or against a candidate more difficult. It adds to the work of the staff, however, it should not become so extensive as to double the marking load.

7.2 General provision

Each Academic year module assessment tasks shall be given for comment to another academic within the EACC competent within the teaching of the subject matter, along with the learning objectives of the module.

7.3 Practices

7.3.1: It is suggested that a sample of about twenty scripts is appropriate: all of a very small module (up to about 25 students) or a sample of about twenty from a larger course.

7.3.2: All assessment tasks counting for more than 10 per cent of the module score should be double- or check-marked in this way.

7.3.3. The sample should contain two elements; (a) fails, distinctions (marks of 80+) and cases from either side of border-lines (to maintain standards), and (b) a random sample chosen by the second marker from the main run of marking, plus all scripts handed in late, to assure against bias in individual cases. The size of the random sample should be such as to make the total up to 18 (before late scripts) once all fails, all distinctions and one script nearest above and below each borderline (50, 60, 70, 80) has been included – but the random element of the sample should include at least five scripts even if this takes the total above twenty.

7.3.4: For the final dissertation, the supervision will not mark. Only the average of the President of the panel and the Examiner are accounted.

8. External Moderation

8.1 Intent

The external moderation of assessment is an important part of the quality assurance process. It provides comparability of standards with regard to the judgments made by academic staff members, and ensures that students' results are able to be defended within the broader context of the higher education sector.

To reflect the principle of reliability and to maintain academic standards and education quality, all academic programs and summative assessment (including examinations) must be subjected to external reviewing and moderation process.

External moderation is also desirable as an 'audit trail' showing that the process has been carried out and as a check that the standards of one institution are credible to another.

Moderation of marking serves the same purposes and also demonstrates that the marking process has been carried out rigorously, fairly and without personal bias.

8.2 Objectives

8.2.1. To measure the quality of judgments made by academic staff with regard to student assessment.

8.2.2. To ensure the comparability of academic standards and outcomes of units within courses offered by EACC

8.3. General Provisions:

8. 3.1: External moderator will handle only a small sample of work, but a larger sample should be processed internally. Throughout the period of an academic year, each Faculty council will select a number of modules, for the external moderation of assessment.

8. 3.2: This moderation process is to be undertaken by persons who are external to EACC and who are qualified within the disciplines of the selected module. These persons may have current or recent experience in the public or private higher education sectors.

8. 3.3: Each Faculty Council in collaboration with the DQA will identify external qualified persons. The Dean of the Faculty will invite them to moderate the assessment contained in the selected modules. External moderators will be asked to provide a written report to the Dean of the relevant Faculty regarding their conclusion

8.3.4: EACC should consult a Register of staff inside Rwanda qualified to serve as external examiners compiled by Higher Education Council.

4.3.5: The Faculty Council will assess the report from the moderator within the context of the Faculty and will seek to implement appropriate recommendations.

8.3.6: Deans will, via the Faculty Annual Report, report the outcomes of the moderation process to the Academic Senate .

8.3.7: The External Moderation of Assessment process should be separate to that which is associated with the examining of post graduate such as Masters-level research dissertations by external personnel who will be appointed by the Academic Senate when EACC will be allowed to offer master's program

8.3.8: Remuneration will be offered to external moderators based on a special contract. The amount should be determined by EACC executive Council.

8.4. Guidelines

8.4. 1. Nature of the Moderation

8.4.1.1: In undertaking the moderation process, external moderators will be asked to assess the comparability of academic standards evident in the selected EACC modules against those of other Rwandan higher education providers.

8.4. 1.2: The moderation process may entail a consideration of module materials, with regard to aspects such as rationale, objectives/outcomes, content schedule, assessment schedule and resources.

8.4. 1.3: The moderation of assessment will involve the moderator making a judgement regarding the quality of the academic grading of student work within the selected unit.

8.4.2. Documentation to be provided to the external examiner

8.4. 2.1: EACC (Faculty) will provide to the external moderator the relevant materials for the selected unit. This will normally include the unit outline, Academic regulations

8.4.2.2: The external moderator will receive copies of representative student assessment tasks, from which all identifying features have been removed.

8.4. 2.3: The external moderator will be asked to mark copies within one week (five days)

8.5. Timing of the process

8.5.1: The moderation process will normally commence within one month of the date of the relevant deliberation meeting, at which student unit exit grades are ratified.

8.5.2: The moderation process will normally be completed within a three month period, to allow feedback to be incorporated into the preparation of the unit in the subsequent semester.

8.6. Reporting

8.6.1: External moderators are to provide a written report to the Dean of the relevant Faculty with copy to the Directorate of Academic Quality regarding such aspects as comparability of academic standards, the standard of student work and the appropriateness of lecturer judgments and comments.

8.6.2: Deans will summarize the report for inclusion in the Report to be submitted to the faculty council. The same report with measures by the faculty to respond to some questions raised in the report, will be submitted to the Director of Quality Assurance .

8.6.3: The Directorate of Quality Assurance will prepare an annual report highlighting themes arising from the Institutes' external examiner reports. This report will be received and discussed at a Plenary Meeting of the Academic Senate who will address any Institute-wide issues.

9. NEW PROGRAMS EXTERNAL REVIEW

9.1 General provision

The curriculum and design of new programmes are moderated during the validation process, by the input of Faculty members, Directorate of Quality Assurance , External Advisers and other stakeholders especially , Professional Bodies

The New modules are designed by team set by the faculty Council of the faculty that the proposed programs belong to. The program is presented to the stakeholders, professional bodies to assess their relevance to the need of the society.

Substantial changes to modules or programme between Validations should receive similar consideration – again, to ensure that the changes do not move the programme away from EACC Vision and mission and comparability with programmes offered elsewhere.

9.2. Practices

1. Programme reviewers should probably be appointed by the Senate after proposition of the Faculty Council in collaboration of Quality Assurance office
2. Reviewers should not have worked or studied at EACC two years before appointment, they should not be related to anyone in the institution, they should not have examined, supervised, employed or been employed or supervised by any member of the programme staff during the past three years, and they should not be in

close scholarly or research collaboration with anyone teaching on the modules they are examining.

3. They should normally be of at least senior lecturer grade
4. It is not necessary to appoint a separate module examiner for every module. Examination teams should be picked so that a relatively small number of people cover all topic areas, at least in terms of general familiarity with them.
5. Module external reviewers might also be used to comment on proposed substantial modifications to the learning outcomes or the weight or method of assessment of modules.

9.3 . Reporting

1. External moderators are to provide a written report to the Academic Senate
2. The report should comprise: The relevance of the Programme, the aligned with the National qualification framework, the relevance of learning out comes and their link with the objectives
3. The DPA will submit the report to the team in charge of Program design for correction

10. EXISTING ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES

10.1. Objectives

The EACC conducts periodic external reviews of all academic degree programs. Such reviews provide critical assessment of status and direction from the unit itself, from the campus community including administration and Academic Senate, and from external scholars. Program reviews serve as important evidence to accrediting and public agencies that the College is engaged in a continuous program of critical self-examination, evaluation, and improvement. As importantly, reviews allow departments to examine their current position and the research and educational effectiveness of their programs, raise critical issues within the department, and evaluate their future plans.

10.2. Scope

All undergraduate and graduate instructional programs administered by an faculty are subject to periodic review. If an Faculty administers an interdepartmental program or teaches a significant number of service courses for other units, advice from all participating departments and divisions will be sought. The unit under review will produce a self-assessment document that will be considered by the administration and Academic Senate. External scholars in the discipline will visit the campus to discuss the document with the department constituencies. A campus closure meeting and a mid-cycle update are integral components to record and monitor the review outcome.

The review goal is to focus on the department/faculty members as well as external units and reviewers on the following:

- Current status and effectiveness – Assess scholarly research and creativity, graduate

Program and undergraduate programs(s).

- Critical issues and strategic plans – Raise one to three critical issues from the department's self-examination of their current status, and discuss strategies to address these issues.

10.3. Roles and Responsibilities for conducting program review

The Deputy Principal for academics is responsible for general oversight of the review process. The DPA specifies the annual review cycle, approves the slate of reviewers, facilitates

Communication among participants, participates in review entrance and exit interviews, chairs closure and mid-cycle update meetings, writes closure reports, and informs the Deans, the Principal and the Council Chairperson

The Director of Quality is responsible for the day-to-day review management. This responsibility includes notifying the department or interdepartmental program faculty, distributing universal transmittal letter and the department self-assessment, nominating and soliciting External Review Committee (ERC) members, scheduling the ERC meetings, transmitting the review report, and submitting comments. The DQA is responsible for maintaining the review schedule as set by the DPA

The Head of the department chair, on behalf of the Dean of the faculty, is responsible for the preparation of the departmental self-assessment, the response to the review reports, and the preparation of the mid-cycle update.

The Academic Senate committees have three major responsibilities:

1. Reviewing the departmental self-assessment and submitting written comments and questions

Regarding specific concerns to the ERC;

2. Reviewing the review reports and providing written Senate perspective, including reapproval of non-degree programs such as minors and concentrations, at the closure meeting; and

3. Providing questions for the mid-cycle update report.

The Academic Senate and its committees may also take direct action as a result of any aspect of the review consistent with their authorities and responsibilities.

10.4. Faculty /Department Self-Assessment

10.4.1 Content

The unit will prepare a document, following the outline in Appendix B, which will consist of two parts: current status; and critical issues and strategic plans. As with all documents in the review

Process, the departmental self-assessment will be distributed in a specified electronic format.

The first section provides the department's assessment of its current quality, effectiveness, and direction in three primary areas:

1. Research, scholarship and creative activity of the department Teachers
2. The department's graduate program(s);
3. The department's undergraduate program(s);

The assessment should be supported by quantitative material provided by the department, the Quality assurance office or school, and the Directorate of Resources and Asset Management

The second section, building from the department's assessment, should address one to three issues important to the departmental and programmatic progress within the coming review cycle. These

Issues may be specific to one segment of the department's functions, such as established or planned

Undergraduate or graduate programs, or may crosscut functions, such as the diversity of the Department or integrating graduate and undergraduate programs more effectively.

Strategies for addressing these issues within available resources should be proposed. Strategies should emphasize the department's plans for development and improvement of scholarship, instruction and learning outcomes assessment, in the context of its current strengths and recent accomplishments and within available or foreseeable resource allocations.

10. 4.2. Distribution

The departmental self-assessment will be submitted to the DQA no later than JUNE 1 of the year prior to the review visit. The DQA will review the document for completeness and to inform the final appointment of the ERC.

No later than September 1 of the year of review, the DQA shall distribute the departmental self-Assessment the universal charge and transmittal letter, and divisional supplemental comments to the Academic Senate and DP A , copying the P .

The departmental self-study will be made available in the online review portal to the Academic Senate and administration for comment, discussion of issues raised, and the feasibility and appropriateness of the plans within the campus context.

The DQA shall distribute the universal transmittal letter, the departmental self-study, and any supplemental comments received from Senate committees and central administration to the ERC no later than one month prior to the campus visit.

10.5. External Review Committee

10.5.1 Configuration

The ERC shall be comprised of at least three external distinguished scholars and experts in the relevant field of study. At least one member will hold, or will recently have held, a teacher appointment at another EACC faculty or Campus. In unusual circumstances, including Program scope or size, exceptions to this policy may be proposed by the overseeing DQA and approved by the DPA.

10.5.2 Appointment

In parallel with the submission of the self-assessment no later than June 1 of the year prior to the

Review visit, the department nominates to the DQA a slate of respected scholars that includes, at a minimum, the candidates' brief biographies, or links to candidates' professional webpages where credentials and research focus are included. The list of candidates should include scholars whose standing and expertise are best suited to address the issues raised by the self-study and supplemental comments, and to produce an independent assessment.

The overseeing DQA may, and perhaps should, add additional nominees and shall formally recommend a final list to the DPA. The DPA approves the list submitted by the DQA prior to Appointment or contact, formal or informal, of any ERC candidate.

10.5.3 Committee Charge and Supplemental Questions

Academic reviews shall be governed by a charge that includes some general areas of examination and supplemental questions that focus the ERC's attention on the issues raised by the department, Senate committees and campus administration. The charge is incorporated into a universal transmittal letter .

The universal charge and transmittal letter and supplemental questions from the DQA shall be transmitted to the campus with the self-assessment by September 1. Supplemental questions may be incorporated into the universal charge and transmittal letter, at the discretion of the DQA .

Units participating in the review may provide comments on the self-study, and deans overseeing programs related to the unit or program under review may also choose to add supplemental questions. Supplemental questions from the DP A , DRAM...or the Senate must be received by the DQA no later than November 15 of the year of review.

All supplemental questions shall be enclosed with the universal charge and transmittal letter and distributed to the ERC. Comments received after November 15 may be enclosed at the dean's discretion if delay does not compromise the review timeline. All comments sent to the overseeing

DQA shall be copied to the department chair, Academic Senate office and DP A.

10.5.5 Communication

All communication between the department and ERC members is managed by the overseeing dean's office to maintain accountability and ensure appropriate document distribution. All documents provided to ERC are considered part of the campus review file and will be made available to all units involved in reviews.

10.6. Campus Visit

The overseeing DQA is responsible for scheduling the campus visit, including all meetings (see Appendix D). The ERC shall meet jointly with the DQA and the DP A in an entrance interview prior to meeting with members of the department. Following the entrance interview, the ERC shall meet, at a minimum, with the following representatives (in no particular order):

- Faculty (individuals or groups as appropriate);
- Faculty Undergraduate Committee;
- Faculty Graduate Committee;
- Undergraduate Students;
- Graduate students;
- Postdoctoral fellows;
- Chairs of departments served by the unit (where relevant); and
- Senior staff representative(s).

Two exit interviews shall be scheduled:

- Dean; and
- P and DPA.

The division or school is responsible for providing staffing and other support as requested. All senate faculty appointed to the unit under review shall have the opportunity to participate in at least one meeting with the ERC. Members of the ERC should not be separated unless necessary.

It is good practice to set aside at least an hour and a half on each day of the visit for the ERC to prepare a draft report.

10.7. Review Committee Report

The DQA shall ask the ERC to electronically submit a review report within four weeks of their visit. The review report should address the charge, and any supplemental comments received, and should be based upon the self-assessment and the interviews.

10.8. Action on the Review Report

10.8.1 ERC's Review Report

The ERC's report shall be submitted to the DQA . The DQA is responsible for immediate distribution to Deans of the Faculties, Head of Department , copying the DP A and P . The report should be presented to the next Academic Senate meeting

10.8.2 Faculty/ Department's Response

The Dean/HoD is responsible for immediate distribution the report to all faculty / Department council members . The department shall submit to the DQAa written response to the review report within four weeks. Department response deadline's falling in summer will be extended into fall quarter, treating summer as a void and beginning the clock at the start of fall quarter.

If the Dean /HoD's report does not represent department consensus, faculty minority reports may also be submitted at the discretion of individual faculty members.

10. 8.3 DQA's Response

Within two weeks of receiving the Faculty/ departmental response, the DQA shall prepare the EACC response and submit it, with the department's response, to the DP A and P

10. 8.4 Academic Senate Committee Response

The Research Committee Deans, (DRAM , representative of Executive council), Director of Postgraduate program) wshould make an **Academic Senate Committee and** will be asked to review the external review report and the departmental and responses, and provide written comments to the DP A. Comments from other Senate committees may be submitted at the discretion of the Senate. Senate comments should include recommendations for questions or action items to be incorporated into the department's mid-cycle Update report. Senate committees are asked to issue re-approval of non-degree programs such as concentrations or minors prior to the closure meeting.

10. 8.5 Closure Meeting

The DPA's office is responsible for scheduling the closure meeting upon receipt of the departmental responses. The closure meeting will be scheduled no earlier than six weeks following receipt of the DQA's response, allowing time for Senate committees to prepare their respective comments. The closure meeting is chaired by the DP A and will ordinarily

include:

- HoD
- Academic Registrar
- Deans;
- DQA
- DR ;
- Director of Post graduate programs
- 1 Senior Staff from each department

The closure meeting will provide an opportunity for a candid discussion of the results of the external review. Specifically, the following matters shall be addressed:

- Factual matters that are in dispute;
- Perspective on current priorities and future directions as viewed by each agency;
- Prospects for achieving the review recommendations;

10.8.6 Closure Report

The conclusions reached in the course of the discussion shall be summarized in a closure report

written by the DPA within one month of the meeting. The closure report shall normally include a list of questions and/or action items addressing any outstanding concerns raised in the review and the various responses. With the mutual concurrence of the administration and the relevant Senate committees, the questions may be omitted.

The DP A shall transmit the closure report to the P with copies to the Board Chairperson , relevant units and Academic Senate. The Dean/HoD shall make the report available to all department faculty members.

10.9. Implementation and Mid-Cycle Update Report

The DQA shall implement or otherwise address recommended actions and monitor conditions placed by Senate committees and/or the administration on the department. No later than two years subsequent to the closure report, the Dean/HoD shall prepare a response to any specific questions appended to the closure letter. Chairs shall consult with relevant faculty constituencies in preparing the response. The DQA shall submit the department's mid-cycle update report to the DP A with a copy to the department. The DP A transmits the mid-cycle update to the P , and Academic Senate.

Contingent on concerns addressed in the mid-cycle update report, the DP A recommends to the Senate the schedule for the department's subsequent review, on a six to eight year cycle. Senate committees may decide to exercise control of curriculum at this time. If concerns by the DQA , DP A, and/or Academic Senate have not been sufficiently addressed, the next department review may be accelerated.

A mid-cycle review meeting may be convened if the current status of the unit needs immediate discussion. This meeting may be requested by the Academic Senate or the DP A and shall include Dean , HoD and Senate Committee representatives who wish to participate. The DP A shall chair the meeting and prepare a written report to the P summarizing recommendations.

10.10. Timetable

The review process shall be completed in a timely way to ensure prompt attention to areas of concern. To achieve this, all units involved are expected to manage their respective roles and

responses within the prescribed timelines (Appendix E). The DP A may convene the closure meeting without receiving unit responses if deemed necessary to maintain an effective timetable.

10.11. Scheduling Reviews

All academic departments and degree programs will be reviewed regularly every 5 to eight 7 years.

The duration of the review cycle will be determined by the DPA contingent on the mid-cycle update and Senate consultation. New degree programs will be asked to provide interim self-assessments three years after their establishment, and subsequently will be incorporated into their administering department's review schedule.

Reviews of interdepartmental degree programs may be incorporated with their administering department's review, conducted autonomously, or follow a modified process approved by the

DP A in consultation with the DQA. The program review procedures are identified when programs are established. The DP A may reassign an interdepartmental program's review process at the recommendation of the DQA to best fit the specific program.

The DP A's office will transmit an updated review schedule at the beginning of fall quarter.

Suggestions for procedural improvements that improve the overall usefulness of reviews, or that reduce workload without compromising value, may be submitted to the DP A at any time.

Subsequent changes to review procedures will be announced with the annual fall quarter schedule transmittal.

In isolated cases where there is a justifiable need to defer, accelerate, or otherwise reschedule an external review, the department chair will make a written request to the overseeing DQA that sets out the justification for deferral or acceleration. Requests for deferral or acceleration may also originate with the DQA or the DPA.

. The DQA will forward the request in writing, together with his or her independent opinion and recommendation, to the DPA. Deferral requests should be submitted no later than October 15 of the year prior to the campus visit. The DPA will consider such requests on their merits, consult with the relevant Academic Senate Committees , take into account the institutional need to maintain the regularity and timeliness of the review process, and will make the final determination regarding whether and how the review will be scheduled.

10.12. Confidentiality of Documents

The good practice is to treat external review materials as confidential and release them only to those with a business need to know.

. It is recommended any initial request for documents from campus employees not directly involved in the external review be justified with a business reason. Justified requests should be reviewed and approved by the DQA, Dean/HoD , or DPA before releasing materials.

11. WHO SHOULD KNOW THIS POLICY

DPA office, DQA , Deans, HoD all academic staff, Academic senate members, Academic Registrar,

12. EFFECTIVENESS OF THIS POLICY

Performance Indicators: The inclusion of moderators' reports addressing a number of units in each Faculty, number of the report from external reviewers on programs reviewed

13. TRANSITIONAL AND FINAL PROVISIONS

This policy is effective from the day of adoption by the EACC authorities.

Approved by College Senate and Senior Management Committee

1. Secretary of the Academic Senate:

Signed by _____ Date _____

2. PRINCIPAL and Chairman

,
Signed by _____ Date _____