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ABOUT TRECCAFRICA

6 PARTNER UNIVERSITIES
1 TECH PARTNER

- University of Ghana | GHANA
- University of Nigeria | NIGERIA
- Mekelle University | ETHIOPIA
- University of Nairobi | KENYA
- University of Dar es Salaam | TANZANIA
- Stellenbosch University | SOUTH AFRICA
- Lund University (Technical) | SWEDEN
- University of Botswana | BOTSWANA (TRECCAFrIca II)
QUALITY ASSURANCE IN DEGREE PROGRAMMES

- Ascertained at the start / during application phase of partnership
- Partner institutions indicate the national qualifications frameworks used for programme outcomes
- All programmes are nationally accredited, with backing of certain decrees or ordinances and comply with national educational standards and frameworks
QUALITY ASSURANCE TOOLS / PRACTICES
ACADEMIC (SPECIFICALLY MOBILITY)

QUALITY ASSURANCE IN MOBILITIES
• Mobilities are handled case by case

COURSEWORK / CREDIT-BEARING MOBILITY
• student applies to host (after scholarship award)
• student indicates modules to be undertaken at host
• Home academic confirms student’s undertaking, declares mobility viable (through LA), host and student sign.
• Post-mobility: student completes only research component at home

RESEARCH MOBILITY
• student applies to host with blank / proposed learning agreement and research outcomes
• Home academic confirms research outcomes, declares mobility viable (through LA), student and host sign.
QUALITY ASSURANCE TOOLS / PRACTICES

MOBILITY EXPERIENCE

QUALITY ASSURANCE OF MOBILITY EXPERIENCE?

STUDENT CONSULTATION
1. LOC at specific partners: 1st point of contact
2. Coordinating partner: 2nd point of contact

ANNUAL SURVEY
1. Scholars – in mobility: focus on mobility experience
2. Supervisors feedback: focus on academic outcomes

END OF MOBILITY
1. Skype call at end of mobility
2. Mobility report submitted to coordinator ➔ actions implemented in further improvement of the mobility scheme
EXAMPLE FEEDBACK AND RESULTS FROM 2014 SURVEY
FOCUSED ON STUDENT EXPERIENCE

EXPERIENCE AS A SCHOLARSHIP HOLDER
• Considering experience of the mobility

GENERAL SUPPORT RECEIVED FROM HOST
• Considering any and all mechanisms of support from the host

RATE YOUR OWN ACADEMIC GROWTH
• Considering self-reflection

RATE ACCOMMODATION FACILITIES AT HOST
• Considering satisfaction with accommodation facilities

RATE ACADEMIC FACILITIES AT HOST
• Considering self-reflection

CHALLENGES EXPERIENCED
• At individual level (personal, academic, professional challenges)
• At structural level (challenges in the scholarship)
EXAMPLE FEEDBACK AND RESULTS FROM 2014 SURVEY
WHAT NEXT?

FEEDBACK ON ACADEMIC ASPECTS
• We learned that there are “seasons” for when transcripts are issued at certain partners. This survey response allowed to search for temporary solutions (temporary transcripts).

FEEDBACK ON INTEGRATION ASPECTS
• Students experience challenges upon arrival (challenging integration). Possible solution to develop a Beneficiary Guide that gives students a checklist of items to complete pre- during and post mobility. This is beyond EU regulations, but important things such as “how much can I expect to pay for…” etc.

FEEDBACK ON RESEARCH EXPENDITURE
• (recurring challenge for students). Students indicate need for dedicated research funding. This survey question should allow a feedback loop to the funders on the realities student face.
1. DOCUMENTATION: All partners have signed partnership agreement

2. Advice and guidance from the Technical Partner

3. UPSOFT System: more transparent and effective application process

3. Quality institutional services developed, specifically with regards to integration and orientation for scholars.

4. Regular Board Meetings

5. Financial Mgmt. in partnership: frequent lump-sum payment, traceable through invoicing and payment proofs.

6. Future and sustainability: bilateral agreements signed in the partnership, partners including ea. other in joint projects, access to external moderators and examiners
QUALITY ASSURANCE TOOLS / PRACTICES RECOMMENDATIONS (TA I AND THE FUTURE OF TA II)

DEVELOPMENT OF EXPlicit QA STRATEGY
1. Definition of our Quality indicators, stakeholders and approach to QA
2. Timeline that is realistic
3. Approach that is cost-effective

ENHANCING EXISTING QA APPROACH
1. Broader Stakeholder involvement:
   1. Scholars – in mobility
   2. Supervisors / Host environment of the scholarship holder
   3. Partner feedback

2. Increasing the frequency of surveys; also automate this process
   1. Move to Semester basis for supervisor feedback (thus far: annually)
   2. Move to Semester basis for student survey

EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS
1. Peer-to-peer partnership evaluation could be promoted.
2. Greater reliance on expertise of the Technical Partner, Lund
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