GHANA TERTIARY EDUCATION COMMISSION
GTEC

In case of reply, the number and date of this letter be quoted

My Ref No....................................

Your Ref No..................................

P.O. Box MB 28
Accra - Ghana
Tel; +233-30-7001666
        +233-20-9989414
        +233-20-9989413
www.gtec.edu.gh
info@gtec.edu.gh

19th August, 2025

VICE CHANCELLOR
KWAME NKRUMAH UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY
KUMASI

Dear Madam,

SUBMISSION OF REPORT ON THE FIVE-YEAR CYCLICAL INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW OF KWAME NKRUMAH UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY, KUMASI

We forward to you the report on the five-year Cyclical Institutional Review exercise conducted by the Ghana Tertiary Education Commission on Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology (KNUST) from 2nd to 6th June, 2025.

KNUST is required to study the entire report and provide concrete evidence(s) of action taken, along with detailed strategies/roadmaps for addressing the deficiencies identified during the review exercise.

It is expected that KNUST's responses would be submitted to the Commission on or before the close of work on 30th September, 2025.

We count on your usual cooperation.

Yours faithfully,

PROF. AHMED JINAPOR ABDULAI
DIRECTOR GENERAL

All HODs QAPO
pls do docs

GHANA TERTIARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

GTEC

Driving a World Class Tertiary Education System for National Development

A 5-year cyclical institutional review conducted through an independent external evaluation of a tertiary education institution to determine whether its quality assurance system conforms to its stated objectives, is effective and serves its purpose.

SECOND 5-YEAR CYCLICAL INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW REPORT ON KWAME NKRUMAH UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (KNUST)

2ND – 6TH JUNE, 2025

CONTENTS

The Education Regulatory Bodies Act, 2020 (Act 1023) mandates the Ghana Tertiary Education Commission (GTEC) to conduct a five-year cyclical institutional review of all public and private chartered tertiary education institutions in the Country. Pursuant to this mandate, a Select Committee of the Commission undertook a review of the entire operations of Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology (KNUST), Kumasi from Monday, 2nd to Friday, 6th June, 2025.

2.0 MEMBERSHIP OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE

The Select Committee that undertook the institutional review of KNUST comprised the underlisted Members:

1. Prof. Mohammed Salifu   -   Chairman
2. Prof. K.B. Omane Antwi   -   Member
3. Prof. Samuel Nii Odai   -   Member
4. Prof. Ahmed Jinapor Abdulai   -   Director-General

The underlisted officers from the Secretariat of the Ghana Tertiary Education Commission (GTEC) provided technical and administrative support to the Committee:

1. Mr. Emmanuel Oware   -   Director, QA&C Directorate
2. Mr. Kwaku Boateng   -   Head, Quality Assurance Department
3. Mr. Andrews Kuvena   -   Snr. Administrative Assistant (QA&C)

3.0 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE REVIEW

The cyclical review offered GTEC the opportunity to assess the policies, processes, and procedures of the Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology (KNUST). The specific objectives of the visit were to:

a) engage the University on its operations particularly after the last Institutional Review exercise which took place in 2017.

b) engage the University on its administrative, academic, research and community engagements.

c) assess the state of internal quality assurance mechanisms and efforts at continuous improvement; and

2

d) appraise the University's strategies in place to ensure growth and continuous improvements.

e) Ascertain the progress made by the University since the conduct of the last review exercise.

4.0 METHODOLOGY

The review process involved the following:

a. **Inception meeting**: - The Committee held an inception meeting with the management of the Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology (KNUST) to explain the purpose, objectives, and the structure of the exercise. This was followed by a presentation by the University's management on its entire operations.

b. **College-focused presentations and discussions**: - Each Faculty was given an opportunity to brief the Select Committee focusing on the following key indicators:

- Governance and management
- Curriculum design and Development
- Teaching and learning
- Student Assessment and Progression
- Post Graduate Studies
- Student dropout rate for the past three years
- Graduation rate for the past three years
- Teaching staff attrition rate for the past three years
- Distance Education
- Strength and quality of staff
- Research
- Innovation and Publication
- Internationalization
- Partnership/Collaboration
- Community Engagement
- Consultancy and Outreach
- Student Experience
- ICT Architecture and Systems
- Quality Assurance
- Financial Governance and Sustainability

- Information Resources and Deployment
- Infrastructure Development and Facilities
- Gender/Diversity
- Key Challenges
- Availability of Key Policy Documents
- Completion and dropout rates of students, especially for postgraduate programmes.
- Teaching staff attrition rate for the past five years.
- A trajectory of developments for all quality indicators for the past five years.

Each presentation was followed by discussions which mainly involved questions and clarifications from the Select Committee.

c. **Interaction with Students:** - The Select Committee interacted with students at the various school/faculties to understand their concerns and challenges pertaining to teaching and learning at KNUST.

d. **Interaction with Non-Teaching Staff:** - The Select Committee interacted with non-teaching staff to understand their level of involvement in the University's operations and their challenges.

e. **Inspection of library and physical facilities:** - The Select Committee visited the library and assessed the general state of physical facilities at KNUST.

f. **Debriefing:** At the end of the exercise, the Committee shared its observations and recommendations with the University, which focused on and agreed on a tentative roadmap to address the queries raised.

5.0 COMMENDATIONS, OBSERAVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

a. **OUTSTANDING DEFICIENCIES FROM PREVIOUS INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW VISIT**

The Team reviewed residual issues from the previous institutional review visit and made the following observations:

i. **Positive Developments:**

The review Team acknowledged significant progress made in several key areas. These are:

- About 80% of the previous deficiencies have been addressed and implemented.

4

- There had been substantial improvement in financial management and compliance and ensuring that IFAC standards were met.
- There had been enhanced student services and digital infrastructure support, and this had enhanced teaching and learning.
- The University had adopted a comprehensive approach to the implementation of Quality Assurance systems.
- There is a Strategic plan which served as blueprint for the University and there was visible evidence of its implementation.
- Most colleges now have strategic plans to guide its operations. These were developed in line with the general institutional Strategic plan.
- An endowment fund had been established at the institutional level. In addition, some of the Colleges also had their own endowment funds in place. For example, the College of Engineering had an endowment fund of about nine (9) million dollars.
- Tracer study had been conducted at the institutional level and this was commendable.
- The University had been able to attract significant academic grants for research and to undertake various projects.
- Alumni engagements had improved considerably since the last visit by establishing the Alumni and Advancement Office with a Deputy Assistant Registrar in charge and it is aimed at coordinating alumni relations. In addition, the Alumni Connect app had been developed to facilitate global connections between alumni and the University.
- Access programmes have been discontinued as directed by the Commission after the previous visit.
- There is a well-structured Organogram developed for the University and the Colleges and this was due to end in 2025.

ii.   **Areas Requiring Immediate Attention from the previous review report:**

- There are still some unaccredited programmes and centers still operating, although considerable progress has been made in this regard.
- There are high student's dropout rates still persisting for some of the Colleges such as the College of Health Sciences (12.7%).
- Staff student ratios for some of the programmes are still high and above the GTEC norms.
- The percentage of PhD holders in the College of Health was noted to be 41% during the last visit, with a slight increase to 45%. There has not been much of an improvement in this regard.
- There was no evidence of the development of an Internal auditor's reporting structure as observed from the previous visit.
- Post graduate enrollment target of 25% was the benchmark during the previous visit but this is currently at 7% of total admissions.

b. COMMENDATIONS, OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM CURRENT REVIEW

Presented below are the Commendations, Observations and Recommendations made during the visit.

5.1 COMMENDATIONS

The University was found to have made progress in the underlisted areas per the presentation made and needed to be commended:

1. INTERNATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS

- KNUST had over 338 international partnerships and collaborations across the globe, and this situates the University within a global community. The highest number of international partnerships and collaborations were in Africa (172) followed by Europe (95).

2. STUDENTS' SATISFACTION SURVEYS

- KNUST conducted students' satisfaction surveys, which was commendable. A copy of the report should be submitted to GTEC.

3. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

- KNUST had an impressive community engagement strategy in place and this had been implemented across the Colleges.

4. GOVERNANCE

- Students were represented on the Governing Council, Academic and other keyboards of the University and this was commendable.
- KNUST operated a bicameral governance system which involved the Governing Council and the Academic Board with sub-committees with students duly represented on these sub-committees.

5. LIBRARY AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INFRASTRUCTURE

- KNUST's library system and infrastructure were impressive and worthy of note especially the library mall which was under construction.
- KNUST's IT infrastructure had seen considerable improvements and this had a positive impact on teaching and learning.

6. POLICY DOCUMENTS

- KNUST had over 40 approved policies which were available online and this was commendable. Some of these policies are the Quality Assurance Policy, Teaching and Learning Policy, Research Policy and Peer and Professional Evaluation of Teaching and Learning.

7. ALUMNI ENGAGEMENTS

- KNUST had had engagements with its alumni, and this had led to the development of the Alumni Connect app to facilitate global connections between alumni and the University.

8. GRANTS

- An amount of 129.2 million dollars had been received in terms of grants since 2020 for the University and this is worthy of note. The sources of these grants should be provided to the Commission.

9. ENROLMNETS

KNUST had experienced a considerable increase in enrolments since the last review exercise in the 2017/2018 Academic Year. Total enrolment was 42, 245 in 2017/2018 but this figure had almost doubled with total student population currently at 81, 271.

10. STRENGTH AND QUALITY OF STAFF

The University had a total academic staff of 1,213. Out of this number, 72.55% were terminal degree holders.

There had been an improvement in the number of academic staff who were full Professors compared to the previous visit. It was observed that 5.5% of the academic staff were full professors in 2017 but currently, 12% of academic staff are full professors.

11. RESEARCH AND PUBLICATIONS

KNUST experienced an increase in publications on SCOPUS between 2021 (1915) and 2024 (2614). Between the period under reference, there had been 98% increase in publications and this is commendable.

5.2 SHORTCOMINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee identified several shortcomings that necessitate prompt and strategic actions ⟨ by the management of KNUST. These are outlined below:

1. MISSION CREEP

The team raised concerns about the phenomenon of the "mandate creep" that has been frequently discussed, indicating a need for a review of the University's Act to address these concerns.

The Team was informed that the University is in the process of reviewing the Act that established it and the Statutes. A committee has been formed to synthesize the necessary changes, which will be presented to the Academic Board and subsequently to Council for approval.

KNUST is to submit a timeline by which the Act and Statutes would have been finalised to enable the Commission monitor progress made.

2. STRATEGIC PLAN

There was a concern raised regarding the lack of reference to the strategic plan of the University during the management presentation, which should have been a foundational document for the discussions.

It was noted that the current strategic plan, "Plan 2K25", will end in 2025, and it is expected that a new ten-year plan will be developed which will commence from 2026 to 2036. It was observed that a committee had been commissioned to work on the new Strategic Plan.

Informed by this, KNUST is to submit an implementation status report on the current Strategic Plan to ensure clarity on progress and future direction of the University.

It was also noted that some Colleges have started preparing their plans since the existing plans will end in 2025 without recourse to the University's Strategic Plan which would give the broad direction the University intends to take in the next ten years. These College Plans should dovetail into that of the University and therefore cannot precede it. KNUST is to provide direction on this.

3. VISION LIMITATION AND NON-ALIGNMENT OF THE COLLEGES VISION TO THE UNIVERSITY

The University's vision is limited to Africa and as a result the vision of all the Colleges are also limited to Africa. This raised questions about the University's international agenda beyond Africa.

The Vision of some of the Colleges/Institutes were not aligned with that of the University. For example, the vision of the Institute of Distance Learning was couched as if it was an independent institution not aligned to the University.

KNUST should ensure that the vision statements in the revised Strategic Plans of the Colleges/Institutes are aligned to that of the University since these are the catalyst or vehicles through which the University's vision would be achieved. The University's international agenda beyond Africa should be clearly explained and this should be reflected in the revised vision statements in the next Strategic Plan.

4. ORGANOGRAM

a. The organogram has been well structured, but the reporting lines of the Internal Auditor remain a challenge and does not reflect best practices in corporate governance. The current position of the Internal Auditor does not indicate a clear reporting line.

   Restructure the organogram to ensure that the Internal Auditor reports to the Council functionally (indicated by a thick line) and administratively to the Vice Chancelor (indicated by a dotted line).

b. The current position of the Pro-Vice Chancellor indicated a reporting line only to the Vice Chancellor. Beyond that, there is no other office or position that reports to the Pro-Vice Chancellor and the position has therefore been alienated within the governance system of the University.

   The concept of having a Pro-Vice Chancellor position that only reports to the Vice Chancellor as stipulated in the University Act/Statutes should be re-considered and re-positioned to perform a more critical role in the governance of the University especially when the University is in the process of revising the Act/Statutes.

5. COMPOSITION OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

It was observed that there was a maximum of 30 members on the Academic Board of the University. Most of these were ex-officio members.

KNUST should re-look at the composition of its Academic Board especially during the revision of the University's Statutes. The University's experience in operating with this Academic Board composition should be brought be bear on the revised Statutes.

6. LEAN MANAGEMENT

It was observed that the positions of Pro Vice Chancellor and Vice Deans did not have any specific/statutory roles prescribed for the positions. Their functions were only limited to

assisting the Vice Chancellor and Deans respectively. This therefore raised concerns about their functionality within the general institutional structure especially when the government is advocating for a lean management structure across the public space.

The on-going review of the Statutes should address this concern and ensure that specific functions/roles are assigned to these positions to prevent any ambiguity in the discharge of their duties.

7. ACCREDITATION STATUS

The Team expressed concerns about the accreditation and re-accreditation status of programmes and centers. Out of 639 programmes, 394 had accreditation representing 62% and 245 representing 38% were unaccredited.

KNUST is to note that accreditation is a process which starts with the submission of an application to be considered for accreditation, and which terminates when a certificate is issued specifying the duration of the accreditation for the programme. Although progress has been initiated in ensuring that programmes are duly accredited, additional efforts should be put in place to get all programmes accredited. Timelines for the submission of programmes that are due for accreditation should be enforced and this must be done one year prior to the expiration of the programme as stipulated in the GTEC provisions.

8. ADMISSIONS

It was observed that KNUST had a total student population or enrolment of 81,271. The Team was informed that KNUST had been increasing enrolments but at a decreasing rate. Data on admissions for the previous years was not provided to be able to determine this trend.

To enable GTEC appreciate the rate of increment in enrollments, KNUST should submit the underlisted data:

- *Total enrollments for the past 4years and this must be submitted according to Colleges/Institutes and also according to gender.*
- *Total full-time academic staff engaged for the past 4 years submitted according to Colleges/Institutes.*

9. ASSESSMENT POLICY

The team noted that the University had a course assessment policy of 70:30 as allocations for examinations and continuous assessment respectively. However, across the colleges, it was observed that there were some variations in the established policy particularly when the programme is practically oriented. This created the impression that some of the Colleges were not adhering to the established assessment policy.

KNUST Should provide clear guidelines on the implementation of this policy informed by the profile/orientation of the programmes offered in the various Colleges. A copy of a policy document that provides some flexibility for programmes with certain orientations to vary the assessment policy should be submitted to the Commission.

10. QUALITY OF STAFF

The Team expressed concerns about the low percentage of terminal degree holders in the College of Health Sciences. Only 45% of the teaching staff had terminal degrees compared to other Colleges such as College of Agriculture and Natural Resources (90%) and College of Science (86%) which had significantly higher number of terminal degree holders.

A roadmap with timelines should be submitted on how the percentage of terminal degree holders would be improved upon. In addition, a write-up on the peculiar circumstances that led to this development, in addition to the data on the number of staff with PhDs and fellowships should be submitted to GTEC.

11. PYRAMIDAL STRUCTURE

The pyramidal structure of the University had Assistant Lecturers constituting between 15% - 20% of the total staff numbers. It should be noted that this rank is not an established rank but rather a transitionary rank and steps should be taken to ensure that have met the requirements to be confirmed on the rank of Lecturer.

KNUST should provide timelines on when this category would be transitioned to the rank of Lecturer and how this would impact on the overall pyramidal structure of the University.

12. FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMMES

There were concerns raised regarding the need for accreditation of the fellowship programmes being developed, particularly in relation to its equivalence to academic degrees.

It is recommended that the fellowship program should remain distinct from academic programs, and that the college must ensure rigorous evaluation of the fellowship to be recognized as equivalent to an academic degree. The Team indicated that GTEC should be engaged especially when the Commission would be required to confirm its equivalence after students have completed the programme. This is to ensure that it is aligned with academic standards to ensure that the fellowship program meets the necessary academic requirements.

11

13. ACCREDITATION PROCESS FLOWCHART

During the presentations, it was observed that Quality Assurance was placed at the end of the process for the development and review of programmes. This created the impression that the Directorate was not involved in the entire process and were only at the receiving end of it. The Team therefore wanted to understand how quality assurance impacts the development of new programs and the entire accreditation processes.

It was also observed that programmes were developed without inputs from professional bodies and industry. This was not indicated on the flow chart for the development and review of programmes.

KNUST should submit a write-up on how the Quality Assurance Directorate of the University impacts on the development and review of programmes.

14. DISCONTINUED PROGRAMMES

It was observed that some programmes have been discontinued without informing GTEC. This does not give GTEC the opportunity to maintain accurate data on the programmes offered by the University.

KNUST should furnish GTEC with a policy document on the processes and considerations for the discontinuation of programmes. It is also recommended that GTEC should be informed of all programmes that have been discontinued as soon as the decision is made to be able to maintain accurate data on the programmes offered.

15. RESEARCH

There was a concern about the disparity in research output among staff, with a focus on the need for all faculty members to engage in research and publication.

KNUST should provide data on the rate of publications per Department according to Colleges. In addition, KNUST should clearly specify measures in place to support academic staff who are not publishing especially newly recruited staff.

In addition, KNUST should indicate which institutional categorization the University aligns with - research or teaching University and how this is reflected in the current Strategic Plan.

16. MENTORSHIP

It was observed that KNUST had a mentorship policy but there was no indication if there were provisions made for peer to peer and junior to senior mentorship.

KNUST should indicate if provisions for peer to peer and senior to junior mentorship are in the mentorship policy.

A copy of annual reports compiled on mentorship should be submitted to the Commission for its review.

17. PARTNERSHIP AND COLLABORATIONS

The team noted that there are 171 inactive MOUs and suggested a need for more active engagement and follow-through on agreements. The effectiveness and benefits to be derived from partnerships and collaborations should be indicated.

KNUST should undertake a comprehensive review of all available MOUs with partner institutions and organisations taking into consideration the purpose, benefits and time frame. All inactive MOUs should either be reviewed or struct out of its records to ensure that only active ones are captured and implemented. Feedback of this review should be submitted to the Commission.

18. STUDENT DROPOUT RATE

It was observed that there was high student dropout rates across some of the Colleges. This, was worrying since it borders on the quality of teaching and learning. Some programmes, such as the School of Medical Sciences, had as high as 30.88% dropout rates. Similarly, in the 2023/2024 academic year, an attrition rate of 20.26% was recorded against the School of Dentistry.

There is the need to identify the main challenges that students faced, which has been a recurring issue over the past seven years and provide actionable remedies to address the situation. KNUST is to identify:

- *Root cause analysis of high dropout rates.*

- *Student support systems for struggling learners.*

- *Provide data to differentiate between undergraduate and graduate dropout patterns.*

19.   GRADUATION RATE

Data on graduation rate according to cohorts indicated that this was reducing for some of the Colleges. For example, the College of Engineering had a reducing graduation rate of 81.1% in 2019-2022 cohort to 63.8% in the 2021-2024 cohort.

KNUST should put measures in place to ensure that the reducing graduation rate is curtailed since it is a very critical indicator of an institution's performance over a period of time.

20. STUDENTS EVALUATION OF LECTURES AND COURSE CONTENT

KNUST had a very robust system for evaluating lecturers and course content. However, there was no indication how feedback from these evaluations have impacted on teaching and learning. This had become necessary because most of the students the Team interacted with from one particular College indicated that they unanimously complained about a particular lecturer during the evaluation and yet this same lecturer taught them the following semester.

KNUST should submit a write up on how feedback from student evaluations are used to improve the quality of teaching and learning and how effective the current systems in place has been.

21. STUDENT STAFF RATIOS (SSR)

There are concerns regarding the student-lecturer ratio being high for some programmes and very low in other programmes, raising concerns on measures to take to address these.

For some programmes, especially Electrical and Electronic Engineering (I:133), Computer engineering (1:85) and computer science (107:1) the SSRs were very high and this had implications for quality of teaching and learning. The SSR for some programmes were also low, such as Silviculture and Forest Management (1:1) and Agroforestry (2:1). These programmes are not cost effective and efficient to run.

In addition, none of the Colleges, at the institutional level, was able to meet the GTEC norm on staff-to-student ratio. The College of Health Sciences had the highest SSR (86:1) as compared to the GTEC norm of 27:1

There should be a policy to cap admission numbers, the concept of increasing at decreasing rate should be looked at in regulating the SSR. Admissions into such programmes with high SSR should be reduced drastically until the SSR situation with respect to the GTEC norms have been met or improved considerably. Specific and time bound actions should be submitted to be able to reduce the SSRs.

22. KEY CHALLENGES AND FUTURE OUTLOOKS

Both management and College's presentations outlined some key challenges but perusing through the challenges, it was observed that they were not hinged on the Strategic Plan. The key challenges were listed without making any recommendations on how these challenges would be addressed.

KNUST should provide remedies with timelines on how key challenges identified would be addressed. In addition, Key challenges should also be linked to the strategic plan so that they do not appear isolated.

23. DISTANCE LEARNING

It was observed that some programmes were offered in distance learning modes under the Institute of Distance Learning. It was, however, unclear how programmes offered on distance learning modes compared to the regular programmes.

KNUST should submit data/information with respect to the following:

- *Availability of study manuals for these programmes.*
- *Are the programmes taught with DL approach?*
- *What is the duration of the programmes as compared with the regular programmes?*
- *What is the graduation rate for the past three years as compared to the regular students?*

24. FIDELITY OF IMPLEMENTATION OF AFFILIATION AGREEMENTS WITH MENTORING INSTITUTIONS

It was observed that KNUST was mentoring some institutions. The Commission had noticed that there were some challenges identified with the mentoring process, and these were identified during quality monitoring activities such as Academic Audits.

KNUST should indicate:

- *Number of institutions currently under mentorship (list them).*

- *Support services provided and availability of annual mentoring reports.*

- *Challenges identified by the University in the mentoring process and suggested remedies.*

- *Specific roles played by KNUST to ensure that these institutions are able to obtain Charter and wean themselves from mentorship.*

- *How quality is ensured in these mentoring institutions such that the quality culture at KNUST will be comparable to these institutions under mentorship.*

6.0 OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE COLLEGES OF KNUST

This section deals with observations and recommendations pertaining to each College/Institute.

6.1 COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING (CoE)

1. VISION AND MISSION STATEMENT

The vision statement of the College of Engineering (CoE) was limited to an African context without a global perspective. It lacked focus and ambition necessary to effectively drive the College's strategic growth. Further, it did not meet the criteria of being 'SMART, thereby making it not measurable. Additionally, the presentation did not include any information or reference the College's mission statement.

CoE is advised to revise its vision statement to ensure they are focused and ambitious, while clearly reflecting the College's strategic growth. The revised vision statement should meet the 'SMART' criteria making it measurable.

In addition, submit to the Commission the College's mission statement, ensuring that it is aligned with and reflective of the overarching mission of the University.

2. *THE ORGANOGRAM*

The presentation by the CoE regarding its organogram did not include the position of Vice Dean meanwhile the position is operational. In addition, the presentation did not indicate the position of the Advisory Board on the organizational chart to be able to determine how it fits into the governance structure of the College.

It is recommended that the Centre of CoE revises its organizational chart to accurately reflect all operational and administrative positions, including the Vice Dean and the Advisory Board. This will enhance transparency and ensure alignment with actual governance structures, and facilitate clearer understanding of roles and responsibilities within the college.

3. *ACCREDITATION FLOW CHART*

The college's accreditation flow chart revealed that the Quality Assurance Programmes Office (QAPO) is positioned at the final stage of the process. This placement potentially obscures the extent of QAPO's influence on programme development and accreditation-related matters. As a result, it became challenging to fully recognize or appreciate the role and impact of QAPO in ensuring academic quality and standards throughout the accreditation lifecycle.

It is recommended that the accreditation flow chart be revised to position the Quality Assurance Programmes Office (QAPO) more strategically within the process. Placing the QAPO earlier in

the flow will better reflect its integral role in guiding programme development and ensuring compliance with accreditation standards, thereby enhancing clarity and institutional effectiveness.

4. ACCREDITATION OF PROGRAMMES

While the presentation provided a general overview of the accreditation status of academic programmes, it lacked detailed, disaggregated data by department and accreditation timeframe (i.e., specific dates of accreditation and expiry).

Furthermore, the presentation disclosed that out of the 94 academic programmes currently offered at the college encompassing both undergraduate and graduate programmes, 21 programmes do not possess valid accreditation. This finding raises significant concerns regarding the institution's compliance with established regulatory and quality assurance standards.

CoE should provide detailed, departmental-level data on the accreditation status of all academic programmes, including both active and expired dates. Urgent steps must also be taken to regularize the accreditation of the 21 unaccredited programmes to ensure full compliance with regulatory and quality assurance standards.

It must be emphasized that operating academic programmes without valid accreditation is unacceptable. Furthermore, Policy Approval and Administrative Approval do not constitute formal accreditation. In addition, the School must undertake an immediate review of the accreditation status of all its programmes and ensure that the re-accreditation process is initiated at least one year prior to the expiry of existing accreditation.

5. STUDENT ATTRITION RATE

The presentation by the College of Engineering (CoE) indicated an average student attrition rate of 1.67% over the past five years. However, the visiting panel expressed concern over the high attrition rate for specific academic years. Notably, in the 2021/2022 academic year, 105 out of 3,801 Level 200 students dropped out, representing an attrition rate of 2.76%. Similarly, in the 2022/2023 academic year, 88 out of 2,660 Level 200 students dropped out during the first semester, resulting in a 3.31% attrition rate. Despite these figures, the presentation lacked disaggregated data by department across the five-year period. The College acknowledged this as a significant limitation affecting its strategic growth and development efforts.

Submit to the Commission a detailed report on student enrolment over the past five (5) academic years, disaggregated by department. The report should also include an analysis of the factors contributing to the observed student's dropout rate, particularly from the past five years. Additionally, outline the strategies that have been implemented or are being planned to address this declining trend.

6. POSTGRADUATE STUDIES

The presentation on postgraduate studies primarily highlighted the administrative framework, detailing the role of the Director and processes related to thesis management for MSc, MPhil, and PhD programmes under the School of Graduate Studies (SGS). However, it lacked critical data, including total student and staff enrolment, graduation trends, programme durations, and other relevant statistical information.

Submit to the Commission, for consideration, a comprehensive report on the management of postgraduate programmes at the College. The report should be supported by relevant data and should include information on programme structure, student and staff numbers, graduation trends, duration of programmes, and other key operational details such as supervision of thesis.

7. STUDENT ASSESSMENT

The College of Engineering (CoE) reported the use of various assessment and progression methods, including individual and group assignments, mid-semester and final examinations, thesis, and project work. However, the presentation did not specify the mark allocations for each assessment component. Although the College indicated the use of a 30% continuous assessment and 70% examination structure, as noted during the last cyclical review, no supporting policy document was provided to substantiate this claim for the review team's consideration.

The CoE is required to submit a detailed report on the student assessment methods, clearly indicating the mark allocations assigned to each assessment component. It must be emphasised that the choice of assessment methods should be aligned with the intended learning outcomes of each course.

Furthermore, justification is required to determine the relevance of the 30:70 assessment mode, especially within the context of 21st-century quality tertiary education delivery. Additionally, the development of a comprehensive assessment policy, led by the university's central administration, is essential to ensure adherence and institutional alignment.

8. TEACHING STAFF PROFILE

The presentation provided departmental data on faculty composition within the College of Engineering, indicating that out of 186 faculty members, 149 hold PhDs (88%), while 37 do not (12%). This high proportion of terminal degree holders was acknowledged and commended by the visiting panel. However, the submission lacked a detailed staff list outlining individual qualifications, institutions attended, programmes pursued, courses currently taught, years of teaching experience.

The College of Engineering (CoE) is required to submit comprehensive academic staff profile information to the Commission, disaggregated by department. This should include faculty members' academic ranks, institutions attended, programmes pursued, courses currently taught, and years of professional experience.

9. PYRAMIDAL STRUCTURE

The presentation revealed that out of the 186 teaching staff within the College of Engineering (CoE), the distribution by academic rank is as follows: Professors – 17.7% (GTEC norm: 10%), Associate Professors – 14% (GTEC norm: 15%), Senior Lecturers – 29.6% (GTEC norm: 35%), Lecturers – 29% (GTEC norm: 40%), and Assistant Lecturers – 9.7%. While the proportion of Professors exceeds the GTEC norm, the percentages of Senior Lecturers and Lecturers fell below the required benchmarks. Furthermore, the presentation did not provide information on strategies in place to support Assistant Lecturers in pursuing their terminal degree (PhD) to enhance academic progression.

CoE should submit to the Commission a detailed roadmap, including concrete timelines, outlining the mechanisms instituted by management to support faculty members currently serving as Assistant Lecturers in obtaining their PhDs.

10. GRADUATION AND PROGRESSION RATE

The presentation showed the following data from 2016 to 2022:

Cohort/year	Progression rate (%)	Graduation rate (%)
2016/2017	95.64	93.2
2017/2018	97.31	93.3
2018/2019	96.81	94.6
2019/2020	96.74	91.7
2020/2021	95.57	89.57
2021/2022	94.28	N/A

The data presented above indicates consistently high progression and graduation rates across cohorts from 2016/2017 to 2020/2021. However, a closer examination of the actual enrolment and graduation figures reveals a declining trend in student retention and completion. For instance, while the 2016/2017 cohort enrolled 1,801 students, only 1,467 graduated within the standard four-year period. Similarly, the 2020/2021 cohort began with 3,694 students, but only 2,890 completed the programme within the expected timeframe.

Moreover, the data provided was not disaggregated by department, limiting the Commission's ability to conduct a more detailed and meaningful analysis of progression and graduation trends across the various academic units.

It is recommended that the college undertake a comprehensive review of student retention and completion trends, with a particular focus on identifying the underlying causes of attrition despite high overall progression rates. Additionally, future data submissions should be disaggregated by department to enable more granular analysis and targeted interventions. This will support the Commission in making informed decisions to enhance academic outcomes across all units.

11. QUALITY ASSURANCE OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The presentation on quality assurance of graduate studies outlined several initiatives undertaken by the College, including:

- Consideration of academic results at various board levels
- Internal audit of results
- GTEC accreditation processes
- International accreditation of five postgraduate programmes
- Requirement of lead supervisors at the rank of Senior Lecturer or above for PhD supervision
- Student evaluation of learning resources and course facilitators
- Monthly seminars for postgraduate students
- Integration of digital tools (e.g., MATLAB, SolidWorks, AutoCAD) in teaching and learning

Despite these commendable efforts, the College did not provide documented evidence detailing the implementation of these activities. Additionally, an Annual Quality Assurance Report was not submitted for the review team's assessment.

It is recommended that comprehensive documentation be made available to substantiate the implementation of these activities. Furthermore, the submission of an Annual Quality Assurance Report should be made available to the Commission for review so as to facilitate effective monitoring, evaluation, and continuous improvement of postgraduate education standards.

12. STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Based on the information provided, the staff development initiatives at the CoE focused on the following areas:

- Staff pursuing Master of Education in Higher Education Pedagogy
- Staff training in digital literacy tools
- Quality Assurance

- Grant Writing and Administration

- Intellectual Property Management

- Staff supported to attend conferences both in Ghana and abroad

Despite the efforts of providing comprehensive information regarding the number and names of staff members who have participated in some of these initiatives, the College did not submit any corresponding implementation report on the outcome of these staff development initiatives for verification by the review team.

It is recommended that the College of Engineering develop and submit a formal Staff Development Policy along with corresponding implementation reports. These measures will enhance effective evaluation of the College's efforts in building academic and professional capacity.

13. PUBLICATIONS

The information presented to the review team on research publications trend at the College of Engineering (CoE) was limited to aggregate publication counts over the past five years, with no disaggregated data by individual faculty. Additionally, no details were provided on research funding, financial support, or notable research breakthroughs.

CoE is required to submit a detailed report on research publications from the past five years, disaggregated by department and by individual faculty members (both part-time and full-time), and indicate any notable research breakthroughs. This will enable the Commission to evaluate the consistency and impact of scholarly output across the faculties. In line with University policy, CoE must also develop and submit a list of credible journals and recognised publishing houses where faculty are encouraged to publish.

14. AFFILIATIONS AND MENTORSHIP

The presentation by the College of Engineering (CoE) outlined several affiliated institutions, including Lakeside University College, Ghana, Radford University College, and Accra College of Technology, among others. It also referenced the KNUST Mentorship Policy (2018) as the formal mentoring scheme used by the College. However, no mentorship report was submitted, nor was

there any documentation on the benefits gained by affiliated institutions in terms of mentorship and institutional development.

It is recommended that the College of Engineering (CoE) ensure the submission of comprehensive mentorship reports for all the affiliated institutions, in alignment with the KNUST Mentorship Policy (2018) and the Formal Mentoring Scheme. These reports should clearly document the nature of mentorship activities undertaken and outline the tangible benefits derived in terms of institutional development. The College should also develop a mentorship policy tailored specifically to the needs and context of the College of Engineering (CoE).

15. PARTNERSHIPS AND COLLABORATION

- The College of Engineering reported having over 30 active Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs) with both local and international partners. International collaborators include institutions such as: The Massachusetts Institute of Technology
- Stanford University
- Duke University
- Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
- Olin College of Engineering

Local partners include:

- the Ghana Standards Authority (GSA)
- Volta River Authority (VRA)
- GRIDCo
- Ghana National Gas Company
- Bui Power Authority
- Energy Commission
- National Petroleum Authority (NPA), among others.

However, the information provided did not include essential details for each partnership or collaboration, such as evidence of signed Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs), the detailed content of the MOUs, their respective time frames, objectives, expected benefits, and current status (i.e., whether active or inactive).

Submit comprehensive details on all institutional collaborations and partnerships. This should include information on the time frame for implementation, stated objectives and anticipated benefits, as well as the current status of each partnership (i.e., active or inactive).

16. KEY CHALLENGES AND FUTURE OUTLOOK

The key challenges outlined in the presentation were not coherently aligned with the College's stated future outlook. Furthermore, the future outlook of CoE lacks clear linkage to the overarching Strategic Plan of the University. The proposed actions are also not articulated in a manner that reflects the "SMART" criteria.

The College of Engineering (CoE) should provide a detailed roadmap with clear timelines for addressing the key challenges identified. The faculty's future outlook must be firmly aligned with the University's Strategic Plan to ensure coherence with institutional priorities. All proposed actions should meet the 'SMART' criteria (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound) and directly respond to the challenges outlined, offering a realistic and actionable path for the Faculty's development and growth.

17. INSTITUTE OF DISTANCE LEARNING (IDL) – OBUASI CAMPUS

It was noted during the presentation that Engineering is the primary programme offered by the Institute of Distance Learning (IDL) at the Obuasi Campus. The review team observed that faculty from the main College also teach at the Obuasi Campus, resulting in high teaching loads. This arrangement raises concerns about the quality of teaching and the sustainability of academic delivery.

The College of Engineering's Institute of Distance Learning should urgently provide timelines and a roadmap on the mechanisms deployed to address the situation. A review of the current faculty deployment strategy at the Obuasi Campus should be undertaken to reduce excessive teaching loads. Measures should be put in place to ensure adequate staffing, enhance teaching quality, and promote sustainable academic delivery.

18. STRATEGIC PLAN

No information was provided or reference made to the Strategic Plan of the College of Engineering (CoE), which provides a roadmap for achieving its mission and vision, ensuring resource allocation and fostering a culture of continuous improvement.

Submit the Strategic Plan of the CoE to the Commission, ensuring that it is aligned with the overarching Strategic Plan of the University.

19. MISSION STATEMENT

The presentation lacked any reference to the College's mission statement, which is essential for articulating its purpose and guiding its actions and decision-making processes.

Submit the College's vision and mission statements to the Commission, ensuring that they are aligned with and reflective of the overarching vision and mission of the University, for consideration.

20. STUDENT STAFF RATIO

The submitted data on the staff–student ratio (SSR) for the past five years was not disaggregated into departments and did not specify the number of full-time and adjunct faculty. The reported overall average SSR of 66:1 significantly exceeds the GTEC recommended norm of 1:18. Most programmes at the College have high SSRs, with the Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering at 133:1, Computer Engineering at 85:1, and Mechanical Engineering at 75:1, which are all substantially above the GTEC norm.

CoE should submit a report on urgent measures to address the high current staff–student ratios in line with the GTEC norms. Additionally, the computation of the number of faculty should include part-time lecturers. The College must establish robust monitoring and control mechanisms to ensure the effective delivery of teaching by part-time lecturers. Efforts should also be made to strengthen the recruitment and retention of full-time academic staff.

21. TRACER STUDIES

The presentation did not include any information on the conduct of tracer studies by the College of Engineering (CoE) over the past five years, thereby limiting the panel's ability to assess graduate employability outcomes.

Submit to the Commission a detailed report on tracer studies conducted by the CoE over the past five years, aimed at tracking the career progression and outcomes of its graduates. The report should demonstrate how the findings have been used to evaluate the relevance and effectiveness of academic programmes, inform curriculum improvements, and ensure alignment with labour market demands. The CoE is further advised that the conduct of tracer studies will henceforth be a mandatory requirement for programme re-accreditation.

22. OUTSTANDING ISSUES FROM THE PREVIOUS FIVE-YEAR CYCLICAL REVIEW AT KNUST – COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING (CoE)

A number of outstanding issues identified during the last five-year cyclical review of the College of Engineering at KNUST remain unresolved. The Commission, therefore, directs that a comprehensive status report be submitted for review, addressing each of the following outstanding matters:

- **Post-Retirement Contract Staff:** Clarify the current status regarding the engagement of staff on post-retirement contracts, particularly in relation to the 20% cap.
- **Female Faculty Representation:** Provide an update on efforts and current figures related to increasing the number of female lecturers in the College.
- **Staff–Student Ratio (SSR):** Outline measures taken thus far to address the high SSR across departments.
- **Student Mentorship Policy:** Submit the College's policy on student mentorship, including details of its implementation strategy and progress to date.
- **PhD in Water Resources:** State the current status of the PhD programme in Water Resources, including implementation milestones.
- **Distance Learning Improvements:** Report on specific steps taken to enhance the quality and delivery of Distance Learning programmes.
- **Student Innovation:** Submit a progress report on initiatives undertaken to promote and support student innovation.

- **International Student Recruitment:** Outline strategies implemented to attract international students, including any staff deployments abroad for promotional purposes.
- **GNPC Demonstration Allowance:** Provide an update on the current status of the GNPC demonstration allowance.
- **Tracer Studies:** Submit reports on tracer studies conducted, highlighting graduate outcomes and programme impact. This can be at the College/University level.
- **Mentoring of Affiliated Institutions:** Present a detailed report on the supervision of mentoring activities involving affiliated private institutions.
- **Hands-On Teaching Concerns:** Respond to student feedback regarding inadequate hands-on teaching methods and indicate steps taken to address this issue.
- **Mathematics Lecturers:** Address student concerns about the limited number of mathematics lecturers and confirm whether additional lecturers have now been engaged.
- **Postgraduate Programme Diversity:** Provide information on student exposure to a range of postgraduate programmes and efforts to broaden academic offerings.

This report is to be submitted to the Commission for review and further action.

6.2   COLLEGE OF HEALTH SCIENCES

1. VISION STATEMENT

The vision statement of the College of Health Sciences (CoHS) is limited to an African context without a global perspective. It lacks focus and ambition necessary to effectively drive the College's strategic growth. In addition, it did not meet the criteria of being 'SMART', thereby making it not measurable. However, the presentation did not include any information or reference the College's mission statement.

CoHS is advised to revise its vision statement to ensure they are focused and ambitious, while clearly reflecting the College's strategic growth. The revised vision statement should meet the 'SMART' criteria, making it measurable.

2. MISSION STATEMENT

The mission statement is essential as it defines the institution's core purpose and guides its strategic direction by reflecting the key activities of the College. However, the mission statement presented by the College fails to adequately capture these core activities.

Submit the College's mission statement to the Commission for consideration, ensuring it aligns with the University's overarching mission and accurately reflecting the core activities undertaken by the College.

3. ACCREDITATION PROCESS FLOW CHART

The college's accreditation flow chart reveals that the Quality Assurance Programmes Office (QAPO) is positioned at the final stage of the process. This placement potentially obscures the extent of QAPO's influence on programme development and accreditation-related matters. As a result, it becomes challenging to fully recognize or appreciate the role and impact of QAPO in ensuring academic quality and standards throughout the accreditation lifecycle.

It is recommended that the accreditation flow chart be revised to position the Quality Assurance Programmes Office (QAPO) more strategically within the process. Placing the QAPO earlier in the flow will better reflect its integral role in guiding programme development and ensuring compliance with accreditation standards, thereby enhancing clarity and institutional effectiveness.

4. ACCREDITATION OF PROGRAMMES

While the presentation provided a general overview of the number of programmes offered and accredited at the faculty level, data was not submitted according to departments.

Furthermore, the presentation disclosed that out of the 83 academic programmes currently offered at the college encompassing both undergraduate and graduate levels, 23 programmes do not possess valid accreditation. This finding raises significant concerns regarding the institution's compliance with established regulatory and quality assurance standards.

CoHS should provide detailed, departmental-level data on the accreditation status of all academic programmes indicating validity periods. Urgent steps must also be taken to regularize the accreditation of the 23 unaccredited programmes to ensure full compliance with regulatory and quality assurance standards.

It must be emphasized that operating academic programmes without valid accreditation is unacceptable. Furthermore, Policy Approval and Administrative Approval do not constitute formal accreditation. In addition, the School must undertake an immediate review of the accreditation status of all its programmes and ensure that the re-accreditation process is initiated at least one year prior to the expiry of existing accreditation.

5. STUDENT ASSESSMENT AND PROGRESSION

The College of Health Sciences (CoHS) reported the use of various components within the assessment modes including individual and group assignments, mid-semester and final examinations, thesis, and project work. However, the presentation did not specify the mark allocations for each assessment component. Although the College indicated the use of a 30% continuous assessment and 70% examination structure, as noted during the last cyclical review, no supporting policy document was provided to substantiate this claim for the review team's consideration.

The CoHS is required to submit a detailed report on the student assessment modes, clearly indicating the mark allocations assigned to each assessment component. It must be emphasised that the choice of assessment methods should be aligned with the intended learning outcomes of each course.

Furthermore, justification is required to determine the relevance of the 30:70 assessment structure within the context of 21st-century quality tertiary education delivery. Additionally, the development of a comprehensive assessment policy, led by the university's central administration, is essential to ensure coherence and institutional alignment.

6. POSTGRADUATE STUDIES

Information provided on the Graduate Studies highlighted that the School of Graduate Studies (SGS) co-ordinates all the postgraduate programmes in the departments. The presentation also stated that statutes 44 mandates SGS to liaise with HoDs on postgraduate education in KNUST and that the Director of SGS oversees admissions, student progression and graduation. However, there was no data submitted on total student enrolment and total number of staff involved in teaching postgraduate programmes, graduation trends, programme durations, and other relevant statistical information.

Submit to the Commission, for consideration, a comprehensive report on postgraduate programmes at the College of Health Sciences. The report should be supported by relevant data and should include information on programme structure, student and staff numbers, graduation trends, duration of programmes, and other key operational details.

7. STUDENT DROPOUT RATE

The presentation by the College of Health Sciences (CoHS) indicated an average student attrition rate of 12.7% over the past three years. However, the visiting panel expressed concern over specific academic years. Notably, in the 2021/2022 academic year, School of Medical Sciences recorded a dropout rate of 30.88%. Similarly, in the 2023/2024 academic year, an attrition rate of 20.26% was recorded against the School of Dentistry. Despite these figures, the presentation did not indicate data by department across the three-year period. The College acknowledged this as a significant limitation affecting its strategic growth and development efforts.

Submit to the Commission a detailed report on student enrolment over the past three (3) academic years, disaggregated by department. The report should also include an analysis of the factors contributing to the observed high dropout rate in some of the programmes, particularly

30

from the past three years. Additionally, outline the strategies that have been implemented or are being planned to address this high dropout rate trend and to enhance student retention.

8. ACADEMIC STAFF PYRAMIDAL STRUCTURE

The presentation revealed that out of the 342 teaching staff within the College of Health Sciences (CoHS), the pyramidal structure was as follows:

- Professors – 14.16% (GTEC norm: 10%)
- Associate Professors – 17.16% (GTEC norm: 15%)
- Senior Lecturers – 28.3% (GTEC norm: 35%)
- Lecturers – 29.9% (GTEC norm: 40%)
- Assistant Lecturers – 10.5%.

While the proportion of Professors exceeds the GTEC norm, the percentages of Senior Lecturers and Lecturers fall below the required benchmarks. Furthermore, the presentation did not provide information on strategies in place to support Assistant Lecturers in pursuing higher qualifications (PhD) to enhance academic progression.

CoHS should submit to the Commission a detailed roadmap, including concrete timelines, outlining the mechanisms instituted by management to support faculty members currently on the rank of Assistant Lecturers in obtaining their PhDs.

9. STUDENT – STAFF RATIO AND STAFF PROFILE

The submitted data on the student-staff ratio (SSR) lacked disaggregation by department over the past five years and did not specify the number of full-time and adjunct faculty used in the calculation. The reported overall average SSR of 32:1 significantly exceeds the recommended GTEC norm of 15:1 for Health Science programmes. Most programmes at the College had high SSRs such as Medical Diagnosis at 74:1, School of Nursing and Midwifery at 75:1, and Occupational and Environmental Health at 50:1—all substantially above the GTEC norm. The list of teaching staff profile including names, academic qualifications, programme of study, courses taught, years of professional experience and academic ranks were not provided for review.

CoHS should submit a report on urgent measures to address the high student-staff ratios (SSRs) and align them with the GTEC-approved norms of 1:15 for Health Science programmes. Additionally, the computation of the SSR should include part-time teaching staff. In addition, the college should submit the list of teaching staff profile including the names, academic qualifications, institutions attended and programmes pursued, courses taught, professional experience and academic ranks. The College must establish robust monitoring and control mechanisms to ensure the effective delivery of teaching by adjunct lecturers. Efforts should also be made to strengthen the recruitment and retention of full-time academic staff.

10. DISTANCE EDUCATION

During the presentation, it was noted that the School of Public Health and Allied Health Sciences runs three diploma programmes under the Institute of Distance Learning (IDL) within the College. The review team observed that there were no standardized study manuals provided to students; instead, the regular University modules are currently in use. It was indicated that the study manuals would be ready by the end of the academic year. Additionally, faculty from the main College also teach on the IDL programmes, leading to high teaching loads. This arrangement raises concerns regarding the quality and sustainability of academic delivery.

The College of Health Sciences should urgently provide timelines on the mechanisms deployed to address the unavailability of study manuals. A review of the current faculty deployment strategy should be undertaken to reduce excessive teaching loads. Measures should be put in place to ensure adequate staffing, enhance teaching quality, and promote sustainable academic delivery.

11. RESEARCH AND PUBLICATION

The information presented to the review team on research publication trends at the College of Health Sciences (CoHS) focused solely on broad research areas without disaggregated data by individual faculty. Key areas highlighted where research is mostly centered included:

- **FAHS**: Medical parasitology, immunology, and immunogenetics
- **SMS**: Cleft surgery, emergency care, zoonotic disease control, and genetic research on TB, stroke, infectious, and neglected tropical diseases

- **SoNM**: Public health interventions in maternal and child health, diabetes, pain management, and emergency care

However, the presentation lacked details on research funding, financial support, and notable research breakthroughs. Furthermore, staff publication data showed a declining trend over the past three years, dropping from 772 in 2022 to 659 in 2024.

CoHS is required to submit a detailed report on research publications for the past five years, disaggregated by department and indicate any notable research breakthroughs. This will enable the Commission to evaluate the consistency and impact of scholarly output across the faculties. In line with University policy, CoHS must also develop and submit a list of credible journals and recognised publishing houses where faculty are encouraged to publish.

12. COLLABORATIONS AND PARTNERSHIPS

The College of Health Sciences reported having partnerships with both local and international partners across the continents. International partnerships include institutions such as:

- Aarhus University, Denmark
- Brunel University, London
- University of Illinois, Chicago
- Yale University, USA
- University of Georgia
- University of Ilorin, Nigeria
- University of Buea, Cameroon, etc.
- Local partners include:
- Ministry of Health
- Ministry of Food and Agriculture
- Ghana Health Service
- Ghana Standard Authority
- West African College of Surgeons, among others.

However, the information provided did not include essential details for each partnership or collaboration, such as evidence of signed Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs), their respective time frames, objectives, expected benefits, and current status (i.e., whether active or inactive).

Submit comprehensive details on all institutional collaborations and partnerships. This should include copies of signed Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs), the time frame for implementation, stated objectives and anticipated benefits, as well as the current status of each partnership (i.e., active or inactive).

13. STUDENT EXPERIENCE

The information presented on student experience outlined several initiatives aimed at enhancing student satisfaction, including:

- Surveys such as course/lecturer assessments, exit surveys, the Feedback App, and engagement through the Directorate of Student Affairs (DoSA)
- Student representation on College and School/Faculty Boards
- College-wide WiFi and MiFi services
- Comprehensive orientation programmes for new students
- Access to off-campus library resources
- E-learning platforms
- Student exchange programmes

However, no formal report on student experience was made available for the review team's verification.

It is therefore recommended that the College systematically document and submit a comprehensive student experience report, detailing implemented initiatives, student feedback trends, measurable outcomes, and areas for improvement. This will not only support internal quality assurance but also facilitate external reviews and continuous enhancement of student services.

14. STRATEGIC PLAN THEMATIC AREAS

The strategic plan presented outlines critical development areas necessary for institutional growth and sustainability, including Governance and Leadership, Human Resource Development, Infrastructure, Teaching and Learning, Research and Innovation, Resource Mobilisation, ICT,

Faculty Integration, and Community Engagement. However, the absence of a monitoring and implementation report, significantly hinders the ability to assess progress, resource alignment, and overall feasibility.

It is therefore recommended that the College develop and provide a detailed monitoring and evaluation framework, along with periodic implementation reports to the Commission for review. This will ensure transparency, track progress against set objectives, and enable timely adjustments to strategic priorities.

15. GRANTMANSHIP

The presentation on grantsmanship covered annual inflows, associated grants, and the total number of active projects, along with details on retained overheads to the central administration. However, it did not include information on the specific projects funded by the grants.

It is recommended that future presentations on grantsmanship include detailed information on the specific projects funded by the grants to enhance transparency, facilitate impact assessment, and support informed decision-making.

16. KEY CHALLENGES

The College of Health Sciences identified several key challenges that impede its effective operation. These include inadequate staff/high student-staff ratio, transportation challenges, rising cost of consumables, completion of KNUST Teaching Hospital, student accommodation, and many others. However, the College did not propose any strategic interventions or solutions to mitigate these challenges.

Submit a detailed report outlining the key challenges currently facing the School, along with proposed solutions to address them. Additionally, provide a forward-looking plan that reflects a SMART framework—Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound—for guiding the College's strategic direction.

17. TRACER STUDIES

The presentation did not include any information on the conduct of tracer studies by the College of Health Sciences (CoHS) over the past five years, thereby limiting the panel's ability to assess graduate employability outcomes.

Submit to the Commission a detailed report on tracer studies conducted by the CoHS over the past five years, aimed at tracking the career progression and outcomes of its graduates. The report should demonstrate how the findings have been used to evaluate the relevance and effectiveness of academic programmes, inform curriculum improvements, and ensure alignment with labour market demands. The CoHS is further advised that the conduct of tracer studies will henceforth be a mandatory requirement for programme re-accreditation.

18. FUTURE OUTLOOK

A future outlook is crucial for the success and relevance of all institutions since it enables them to adapt to evolving societal needs. However, the presentation by the College did not provide any information on its future outlook.

Submit a report on the future outlook of the college and ensure that it is firmly aligned with the University's Strategic Plan to ensure coherence with institutional priorities. All proposed actions should meet the 'SMART' criteria (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound) and directly respond to the challenges outlined, offering a realistic and actionable path for the College's development and growth.

19. OUTSTANDING ISSUES FROM THE PREVIOUS FIVE-YEAR CYCLICAL REVIEW AT KNUST – COLLEGE OF HEALTH SCIENCES (CoHS)

A number of outstanding issues identified during the last five-year cyclical review of the College of Health Sciences at KNUST remain unresolved. The Commission, therefore, directs that a comprehensive status report be submitted for review, addressing each of the following outstanding matters:

- The qualification profile of teaching staff, specifically the low proportion of PhD holders (41%), with 59% without terminal degrees.

- The current status of systems or interventions intended to support academically struggling students.

- The implementation and effectiveness of innovative teaching methodologies.

- The adequacy of supervision and oversight of affiliated private universities.

- The persistent challenges related to water supply on campus.

- Reports of lecturers selling handouts to students, which contravenes academic ethics.

- The level and quality of laboratory supervision provided by Teaching Assistants.

- Student complaints regarding perceived bias against Doctor of Pharmacy students.

- The repeated use of past questions in examinations raises concerns about assessment quality.

- The absence of tracer studies to monitor graduate outcomes and institutional impact.

- The alignment of the College's strategic plan with that of the broader university.

This report is to be submitted to the Commission for review and further action.

6.3 COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES (CANR)

1. VISION STATEMENT

The vision statement of the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources (CANR) is limited to an African context without a global perspective. It lacks focus and ambition necessary to effectively drive the College's strategic growth. In addition, it did not meet the criteria of being 'SMART', thereby making it impossible to measure.

CANR is advised to revise its vision statement to ensure they are focused and ambitious, while clearly reflecting the College's strategic growth. The revised vision statement should meet the 'SMART' criteria, making it measurable and should be aligned and reflective of the overarching vision of the university.

2. STRATEGIC PLAN

The strategic plan presented outlines critical development areas necessary for institutional growth and sustainability, including Governance and Leadership, Academic Excellence through Research, Teaching and Leaning, Collaborations and Visibility, Income generation and Financial Management and Environment and Infrastructure. However, the absence of a monitoring and implementation report, significantly hinders the ability to assess progress, resource alignment, and overall feasibility.

It is therefore recommended that the College develop and provide a detailed monitoring and evaluation framework, along with periodic implementation reports to the Commission for review. This will ensure transparency, track progress against set objectives, and enable timely adjustments to strategic priorities.

3. GOVERNANCE

The presentation did not include an organogram of the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources (CANR), and it was noted that there were Vice Deans appointed in line with the University's Statutes (Statute 37). However, specific responsibilities assigned to that positioned were unavailable, raising questions about their importance within the governance structure as observed from the management meeting.

This undermines principles of lean management and carries financial implications for the University's budget.

CANR should develop and present a comprehensive organogram that captures all positions available within the College. In addition, the College should liaise with management to redefine the roles assigned to Vice Deans in the light of the review of the University's Act/Statutes that is on-going.

4. CURRRICULUM DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT

The college's Curriculum Design and Development flow chart reveals that the Quality Assurance and Planning Committee (QAPC) is positioned at the final stage of the process. This placement potentially obscures the extent of QAPC's influence on programme development and accreditation-related matters. As a result, it becomes challenging to fully recognize or appreciate the role and impact of QAPC in ensuring academic quality and standards throughout the curriculum design and accreditation lifecycle.

It is recommended that the curriculum design and accreditation flow chart be revised to position the Quality Assurance and Planning Committee (QAPC) more strategically within the process. Placing the QAPC earlier in the flow will better reflect its integral role in guiding programme development and ensuring compliance with accreditation standards, thereby enhancing clarity and institutional effectiveness.

5. PROGRAMMES ACCREDITATION

While the presentation provided a general overview of the number of programmes running at the undergraduate and graduate levels and the number of programmes accredited, ongoing and expired at the faculty level, data was not submitted according to departments and accreditation timeframe (i.e., specific dates of accreditation and expiry).

Furthermore, the presentation disclosed that out of the 59 academic programmes currently offered at the college encompassing both undergraduate and graduate levels, 16 programmes did not possess valid accreditation. This finding raises significant concerns regarding the institution's compliance with established regulatory and quality assurance standards.

CANR should provide detailed, departmental-level data on the accreditation status of all academic programmes, including specific accreditation and expiry dates. Urgent steps must also

be taken to regularize the accreditation of the 16 unaccredited programmes to ensure full compliance with regulatory and quality assurance standards.

It must be emphasized that operating academic programmes without valid accreditation is unacceptable. Furthermore, Policy Approval and Administrative Approval do not constitute formal accreditation. In addition, the College must undertake an immediate review of the status of all its programmes and ensure that the re-accreditation process is initiated at least one year prior to the expiry of existing accreditation.

6. TEACHING AND LEARNING

Based on the information provided, Teaching and Learning (T&L) is guided by a policy framework that promotes innovation and demand-driven academic programmes aimed at knowledge and skills development. However, the review team noted the absence of a mentorship report within the College for evaluation.

It is recommended that the College develop and submit a comprehensive mentorship report. This will enable effective evaluation of mentorship activities and ensure alignment with the overall objectives of the academic programme.

7. STUDENT ASSESSMENT AND PROGRESSION

The College of Agriculture and Natural Resources (CANR) reported the use of various assessment and progression methods, including assignments, mid-semester and final examinations and project work. However, the presentation did not specify the marks allocations for each component within the modes for the continuous assessment component of 30%.

The CANR is required to submit a detailed report on the student assessment modes, clearly indicating the mark allocations assigned to each assessment component. It must be emphasised that the choice of assessment mode should be aligned with the intended learning outcomes of each course.

Furthermore, justification is required to determine the relevance of the 30:70 assessment structure, which is currently in use, within the context of 21st-century quality tertiary education delivery.

Finally, all lecturers must ensure strict adherence to the assessment policy guidelines stipulated for each programme.

8. STUDENT-STAFF RATIO

The submitted data on the student-staff ratio (SSR), disaggregated by department over the past three years, did not indicate the number of full-time and adjunct faculty used in the determination of the SSR. The reported SSRs varied significantly, with several departments having high SSRs and other departments having very low SSRs compared to the GTEC norm of 18:1.

Programmes that recorded high STRs include, the Department of Horticulture reported an SSR of 43:1 in the academic year 2022/2023, Wood Science Technology recorded 58:1 in 2023/2024, and the Department of Agriculture, Agribusiness and Extension reported 46:1 in 2022/2023, all substantially above the recommended threshold. Conversely, some departments recorded SSRs well below the norm, such as Animal Science (2:1), Agroforestry (2:1), and Silviculture and Forest Management (1:1) in the 2022/2023 academic year. These disparities raised concerns, particularly regarding the sustainability of such programmes.

CANR should submit a comprehensive report outlining urgent measures to address the current student-staff ratios (SSRs) and bring them in line with the GTEC-approved norm of 1:18. The calculation of SSRs must take into consideration part-time teaching staff to ensure accurate SSRs. Furthermore, the College should provide a clear roadmap and outline the mechanisms implemented to rectify the significantly low STRs in certain departments, as this is critical for enhancing cost-effectiveness. The College must also establish robust monitoring and control systems to ensure the effective delivery of teaching by faculty. In addition, deliberate efforts should be made to strengthen the recruitment and retention of full-time academic staff.

9. GRADUATION RATE

The information presented by the College on graduation statistics included a list of programmes categorized under "regular" and "special" from 2022/2023 to 2025/2025 academic years. However, the absence of detailed descriptions limited the review panel's ability to fully understand and evaluate the data. Additionally, the figures were presented as raw numbers without corresponding graduation rates (%), further hindering meaningful analysis.

41

It is recommended that the College submit a comprehensive report to the Commission by complimenting the graduation statistics with clear descriptions of each programme category and disaggregated by departments over the past five years. The corresponding graduation rates should also be submitted. This will enhance clarity, facilitate effective evaluation, and support data-driven decision-making.

10. POSTGRADUATE STUDIES

The information provided on the Graduate Studies highlighted that the School of Graduate Studies (SGS) coordinates all the postgraduate programmes in the departments. The presentation also stated that SGS liaises with HoDs on postgraduate education in KNUST. The College also had **49 postgraduate programmes (MSc/Mphil/PhDs)** out of which **32 of these programmes** are run at the Faculty of Agriculture (FoA) with a student population of **478** whiles **17** are been run at the Faculty of Renewable Natural Resources (FRNR) with **student population of 197** However, it lacked critical data, including total staff enrolment, graduation trends, programme durations, and other relevant statistical information.

Submit to the Commission, a comprehensive report on the operations of the postgraduate unit at the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources. The report should be supported by relevant data and should include information on programme structure, student and staff numbers, graduation trends, duration of programmes, and other key operational details.

11. DISTANCE EDUCATION

During the presentation, it was noted that the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources runs three programmes under the Institute of Distance Learning (IDL) within three departments namely; Department of Agriculture, Department of Agriculture Economics, Agribusiness and Extension and Horticulture at the Kumasi and Accra Centres. The information provided included student numbers between the 2022/2023 to 2024/2025 academic years. Additionally, the review team observed that faculty from the main College also teach on the IDL programmes, leading to high teaching loads. This arrangement raises concerns regarding the quality and sustainability of academic delivery.

The College of Agricultural and Natural Resources should submit a comprehensive report on the operations of programmes offered on IDL modes. The report should be supported by relevant data and should include information on programme structure, student and staff numbers, graduation trends, duration of programmes, and other key operational details.

There should be a review of the current faculty deployment strategy at the IDL to reduce excessive teaching loads. Measures should be put in place to ensure adequate staffing, enhance teaching quality, and promote sustainable academic delivery.

12. STAFF STRENGHT (PYRAMIDAL STRUCURE)

The presentation revealed that out of the 124 teaching staff within the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources (CANR), the pyramidal structure of the College is as follows:

- Professors – 13.7% (GTEC norm: 10%)

- Associate Professors – 20.16% (GTEC norm: 15%)

- Senior Lecturers – 31.5% (GTEC norm: 35%)

- Lecturers – 30% (GTEC norm: 40%)

- Assistant Lecturers – 4%

While the proportion of Professors exceeds the GTEC norm, the percentages of Senior Lecturers and Lecturers fell below the required benchmarks. Furthermore, the presentation did not provide information on strategies in place to support Assistant Lecturers in pursuing higher qualifications (PhD) to enhance academic progression.

CANR should submit to the Commission a detailed roadmap, including concrete timelines, outlining the mechanisms instituted by management to support faculty members currently serving as Assistant Lecturers in obtaining their PhDs.

13. RESEARCH AND PUBLICATIONS

The presentation on research and publications at the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources (CANR) focused primarily on the number of research projects conducted, with data disaggregated by department over the past three years. It highlighted the support provided by staff from the Grants and Research Office (OGR) in areas such as grant application, project planning, budget management, donor communication, and research compliance. The list of funding institutions,

including the European Commission, WPF, Forestry Commission, and Innovate UK were also provided. However, the presentation lacked critical details regarding actual research funds received, levels of financial support, and notable research outcomes or breakthroughs.

CANR is required to submit a detailed report on research publications for the past five years, disaggregated by department and indicate any notable research breakthroughs. This will enable the Commission to evaluate the consistency and impact of scholarly output across the faculties. In line with University policy, CANR must also develop and submit a list of credible journals and recognised publishing houses where faculty are encouraged to publish.

14. INNOVATIONS

The presentation on innovations highlighted six faculty members along with their respective project titles, such as *Oil Palm Mushroom Spawn Production* by Dr. Samuel Boadi, *Developing a Breeding Protocol for African Bony-Tongue (Heterotis niloticus) for Commercial Culture in Ghana* by Dr. Kwasi Adu Obirikorang, and *Sustainable Ceramic Hive for Beekeeping in West Africa*, among others. However, the presentation did not indicate any specific breakthroughs that stood out and were worthy of note.

It is recommended that future presentations on innovations include detailed information on each project's objectives, breakthroughs made, and measurable outcomes or outputs. This will provide a clearer picture of the impact and relevance of the innovations and support informed evaluation by stakeholders (GTEC).

15. PARTNERSHIPS AND COLLABORATIONS

The College of Agriculture and Natural Resources reported having partnerships with both local and international institutions. Notable among some of the local partners include Forestry Commission, Rocha-Ghana, Environmental Protection Agency, Goldfields Ghana Limited, Samartex. Accra Compost and Recycling Plant Limited (ACARP), etc. International partners include Winrock International, Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency, University of Lowa, USA, United State Department of Agriculture, among others. However, the information

provided did not include essential details such as evidence of signed Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs), their respective time frames, objectives, expected benefits, and current status (i.e., whether active or inactive).

Submit comprehensive details on all institutional collaborations and partnerships. This should include copies of signed Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs), the time frame for implementation, stated objectives and anticipated benefits, as well as the current status of each partnership (i.e., active or inactive).

16. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT, CONSULTANCY AND OUTREACH

The presentation on community engagement by the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources outlined various areas of involvement, including community outreach activities by faculty and student bodies, academic staff participation on editorial boards of international journals, senior members serving on national and international committees and boards, orientation programmes for new students, promotion of a student-centred system fostering inclusivity and innovation, provision of campus-wide WiFi and MiFi services, and availability of counselling services. However, the College did not provide detailed descriptions of student involvement in these activities.

CANR should submit a detailed report outlining all community engagement activities and services rendered by the School over the past five years. The report should include clear descriptions of each activity, objectives, participants involved, and the outcomes or impact achieved.

17. TRACER STUDIES

The presentation did not include any information on the conduct of tracer studies by the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources (CANR) over the past five years, thereby limiting the panel's ability to assess graduate employability outcomes.

Submit to the Commission a detailed report on tracer studies conducted by the CANR over the past five years, aimed at tracking the career progression and outcomes of its graduates. The report should demonstrate how the findings have been used to evaluate the relevance and

effectiveness of academic programmes, inform curriculum improvements, and ensure alignment with labour market demands. The CANR is further advised that the conduct of tracer studies will henceforth be a mandatory requirement for programme re-accreditation.

18. KEY CHALLENGES

The College of Agriculture and Natural Resources identified several key challenges that impede its effective operation. These include increasing student numbers without corresponding increase in staff numbers, inadequate practical training for students, low level of industry engagement, inadequate funding and infrastructure, and many others. However, the College did not propose any strategic interventions or solutions to mitigate these challenges.

Submit a detailed report outlining the key challenges currently facing the School, along with proposed solutions to address them. Additionally, provide a forward-looking plan that reflects a SMART framework (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound) for guiding the College's strategic direction.

19. FUTURE OUTLOOK

A future outlook is crucial for the success and relevance of all forward-looking institutions since it enables them adapt to evolving societal needs. However, the presentation by the College did not provide any information on its future outlook.

Submit a report on the future outlook of the college and ensure that it is firmly aligned with the University's Strategic Plan to ensure coherence with institutional priorities. All proposed actions should meet the 'SMART' criteria (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound) and directly respond to the challenges outlined, offering a realistic and actionable path for the College's development and growth.

20. OUTSTANDING ISSUES FROM THE PREVIOUS FIVE-YEAR CYCLICAL REVIEW AT KNUST – COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES (CANR)

A number of outstanding issues identified during the last five-year cyclical review of the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources (CANR) at KNUST remain unresolved. The Commission,

therefore, directs that a comprehensive status report be submitted for review, addressing the following:

- The existence and implementation status of a strategic plan for the College.
- The current number and status of professors and PhD holders undergoing training under the Danida programme.
- The progress and current status of community service initiatives at Mentukwa, including those under the 1D1F programme, Community Forest, and related activities.
- The status of land acquisition for hands-on student training and its current utilization.
- Progress made in the provision of extension services to farmers.
- The current publication rate in relation to the previously reported figure of 186 papers (1.7 per faculty).
- The status and outcomes of the exchange programme with the University of Eastern Finland.
- A list of academic programmes that have been discontinued at the College, including reasons for their discontinuation.
- The absence of tracer studies at the College and any steps being taken to address this gap.
- A comparative analysis of past and current student enrolment and graduation rates, highlighting trends and challenges.
- The status of mentorship and academic support provided to affiliated private institutions.

This report is to be submitted to the Commission for review and further action.

6.4 COLLEGE OF ART AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT (CABE)

1. VISION STATEMENT

The vision statement of the College of Art and Built Environment (CABE) is limited to an African context without a global perspective. It lacks focus and ambition necessary to effectively drive the College's strategic growth. In addition, it did not meet the criteria of being 'SMART', thereby making it not measurable.

CABE is advised to revise its vision statement to ensure they are focused and ambitious, while clearly reflecting the College's strategic growth. The revised vision statement should meet the 'SMART' criteria making it measurable and should be aligned and reflective of the overarching vision of the university.

2. MISSION STATEMENT

The mission statement is essential as it defines the institution's core purpose and guides its strategic direction by reflecting the key activities of the College. However, the mission statement presented by the College fails to adequately capture these core activities.

Submit the College's mission statement to the Commission for consideration, ensuring it aligns with the University's overarching mission and accurately reflects the core activities undertaken by the College.

3. CURRICULUM DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT

The college's Curriculum Design and Development flow chart reveals that the Quality Assurance and Planning Committee (QAPC) is positioned at the final stage of the process. This placement potentially obscures the extent of QAPC's influence on programme development and accreditation-related matters. As a result, it becomes challenging to fully recognize or appreciate the role and impact of QAPC in ensuring academic quality and standards throughout the curriculum design and accreditation lifecycle.

It is recommended that the curriculum design and accreditation flow chart be revised to position the Quality Assurance and Planning Committee (QAPC) more strategically within the process. Placing the QAPC earlier in the flow will better reflect its integral role in guiding programme development and ensuring compliance with accreditation standards, thereby enhancing clarity and institutional effectiveness.

4. ACCREDITATION SUMMARY

While the presentation provided a general overview of the number of programmes running at the undergraduate and graduate level and the number of programmes accredited, ongoing and expired at the faculty level, it lacked detailed, disaggregated data by department and accreditation timeframe (i.e., specific dates of accreditation and expiry).

Furthermore, the presentation disclosed that out of the 108 academic programmes currently offered at the college encompassing both undergraduate and graduate levels, 38 programmes do not possess valid accreditation. This finding raises significant concerns regarding the institution's compliance with established regulatory and quality assurance standards.

CABE should provide detailed, departmental-level data on the accreditation status of all academic programmes, including specific accreditation and expiry dates. Urgent steps must also be taken to regularize the accreditation of the 38 unaccredited programmes to ensure full compliance with regulatory and quality assurance standards.

It must be emphasized that operating academic programmes without valid accreditation is unacceptable. Furthermore, Policy Approval and Administrative Approval do not constitute formal accreditation. In addition, the College must undertake an immediate review of the accreditation status of all its programmes and ensure that the re-accreditation process is initiated at least one year prior to the expiry of existing accreditation.

5. TEACHING AND LEARNING

The presentation submitted on the teaching and learning at the College of Art and Built Environment (CABE) only highlighted the various policies guiding teaching and learning. Some of the policies highlighted were KNUST Teaching and Learning Policy, KNUST Guide for Preparation and Evaluation of Higher Degree Research Thesis, KNUST Students' Guide and Code of Conduct and KNUST Peer and Professional Evaluation of Teaching Policy. However, detailed information on the various learning resources available at the College, including how these resources are utilized to enhance the teaching and learning experience for both faculty and students were not presented to the review team.

Submit to the Commission detailed information on the various learning resources available at the CABE, including how these resources are utilized to enhance the teaching and learning experience for both faculty and students.

6. STUDENT ASSESSMENT AND PROGRESSION

The College of Arts and Built Environment (CABE) did not report on the use of various assessment and progression methods, including assignments, mid-semester and final examinations and project work in their presentation but only highlighted that the University manages academic and financial records with the Student Information System (SIS) and also indicated that students access financial and academic records with the Academic Info Manager (AIM) App. However, the presentation did specify the marks allocations for each component within the continuous assessment (30%) and 70% examination.

The CABE is required to submit a detailed report on the student assessment methods, clearly indicating the mark allocations assigned to each assessment component. It must be emphasised that the choice of assessment methods should be aligned with the intended learning outcomes of each course.

Furthermore, justification is required to determine the relevance of the 30:70 assessment structure, which is currently in use, within the context of 21st-century quality tertiary education delivery.

7. POSTGRADUATE STUDIES

The information provided on the Graduate Studies course highlighted that the School of Graduate Studies (SGS) co-ordinates all the postgraduate programmes in KNUST. The presentation also stated that the Director of SGS oversees admissions, student progression and graduation. However, it lacked critical data, including total staff enrolment, graduation trends, programme durations, and other relevant statistical information.

Submit to the Commission, for consideration, a comprehensive report on the operations of the postgraduate unit at the College of Arts and Built Environment. The report should be supported

by relevant data and should include information on programme structure, student and staff numbers, graduation trends, duration of programmes, and other key operational details.

8. STUDENT ENROLLMENT AND DROPOUT RATE

The presentation by the College of Arts and Built Environment (CABE) indicated an average student attrition rate of 15.6% over the past three years. However, the visiting panel expressed concern over the declining numbers of student enrollment particularly for the undergraduate level over the past three years. Notably, enrollment dropped from 8,243 during the 2021/2022 academic year to 7,846 in the 2023/2024 academic year. Despite these figures, the presentation lacked disaggregated data by department across the three-year period. The College acknowledged this as a significant limitation affecting its strategic growth and development efforts.

Submit to the Commission a detailed report on student enrolment and student dropout rate over the past three (3) academic years, disaggregated by department. The report should also include an analysis of the factors contributing to the observed dropout in student enrolment, particularly from the past three years. Additionally, outline the strategies that have been implemented or are being planned to address this high dropout rate trend and enhance student recruitment and retention.

9. GRADUATION STATISTICS

The information presented by the College on graduation statistics included a list of faculties with figures categorized into undergraduates and graduates from the 2021/2022 to 2023/2024 academic years. However, the absence of detailed descriptions limited the review panel's ability to fully understand and evaluate the data. Additionally, the figures were presented as raw numbers without corresponding graduation rates (%), further hindering meaningful analysis.

It is recommended that the College submit a comprehensive report to the Commission by supplementing the graduation statistics with clear descriptions of each programme disaggregated by departments over the past five years and present the data in both absolute numbers and corresponding graduation rates (%). This will enhance clarity, facilitate effective evaluation, and support data-driven decision-making.

10. STUDENT-STAFF RATIO

The submitted data on the student-staff ratio (SSR), disaggregated by department, included figures for both full-time and adjunct faculty. However, several departments exceeded the GTEC-recommended SSR norm of 18:1, with most programmes recording high ratios. For example, the Faculty of Art reported an average SSR of 58:1, the Faculty of Built Environment 70:1, and the Faculty of Educational Studies 81:1. Furthermore, the data did not specify the years covered in the analysis.

CABE should submit a comprehensive report outlining urgent measures to address the current high student-staff ratios (STRs) and bring them in line with the GTEC-approved norm of 1:18.

11. STAFF STRENGTH

The presentation revealed that out of the 231 teaching staff within the College of Arts and Built Environment (CABE), the distribution by academic rank is as follows:

- Professors – 9.5% (GTEC norm: 10%)
- Associate Professors – 17.7% (GTEC norm: 15%)
- Senior Lecturers – 25.5% (GTEC norm: 35%)
- Lecturers – 36.8% (GTEC norm: 40%)
- Assistant Lecturers – 10.4%

While the proportion of Professors exceeds the GTEC norm, the percentages of Senior Lecturers and Lecturers fall below the required benchmarks. Furthermore, the presentation did not provide information on strategies in place to support the 10.4% Assistant Lecturers in pursuing higher qualifications (PhD) to enhance academic progression.

CABE should submit to the Commission a detailed roadmap, including concrete timelines, outlining the mechanisms instituted by management to support faculty members currently serving as Assistant Lecturers in obtaining their PhDs.

12. DISTANCE LEARNING

The presentation did not provide any information on the Institute of Distance Learning operating in the College. However, during the review team's interaction with the management of the College, it was observed that faculty from the main College also teach at the IDL, leading to high teaching loads. This arrangement raises concerns regarding the quality and sustainability of academic delivery.

The College of Art and Built Environments should submit a comprehensive report on the programmes offered on DL modes within the College. The report should be supported by relevant data and should include information on programme structure, student and staff numbers, graduation trends, duration of programmes, and other key operational details.
There should be a review of the current faculty deployment strategy at the IDL to reduce excessive teaching loads. Measures should be put in place to ensure adequate staffing, enhance teaching quality, and promote sustainable academic delivery.

13. RESEARCH AND PUBLICATION

The presentation on research and publications at the College of Art and Built Environment (CABE) did not include disaggregated data on research publications by individual staff members. It merely indicated the coordination by the Office of Grants and Research (OGR) which is headed by a director who provides research and grant administration support services to sponsored research activities. The publication trend presented reveals an increasing staff publication trend over the past four years. However, the presentation lacked critical details regarding actual research funding received, levels of financial support, and notable research outcomes or breakthroughs.

CABE is required to submit a detailed report on research publications for the past five years, disaggregated by department and indicate any notable research breakthroughs. This will enable the Commission to evaluate the consistency and impact of scholarly output across the faculties. In line with University policy, CABE must also develop and submit a list of credible journals and recognised publishing houses where faculty are encouraged to publish.

14. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT, CONSULTANCY AND OUTREACH

The presentation on community engagement by the College of Arts and Built Environment outlined various areas of involvement, including community outreach activities by faculty and student bodies. They include the following:

- Communication design: TEKTV multimedia studio video coverage in institutions
- Industrial Art: contributing to the authorship of Creative Arts and Design textbooks
- DIAT: skill Training of Autistic Children in Kumasi
- Painting and Sculpture: intergenerational exhibitions, etc.

However, the College did not provide detailed descriptions of student involvement in these activities or evidence of their implementation.

CABE should submit a detailed report outlining all community engagement activities and services rendered by the School over the past five years. The report should include clear descriptions of each activity, objectives, participants involved, and the outcomes or impact achieved.

15. PARTNERSHIPS AND COLLABORATIONS

The College of Arts and Built Environment reported having partnerships with both local and international institutions. Notable among some of the local partners include:

- Institute of Packaging Ghana
- EMEFA Jewellery
- Opoku Ware II Meseum
- Ghana Publishers Association
- GNPC
- Lands Commission, Ghana
- National Teaching Council, etc.

International partners include:

- Cape Peninsula
- Amal Jyothi College of Engineering (AJCE), India

54

- Sacramento City College in California
- Walter Sisulu University of South Africa, etc.

However, the information provided did not include essential details for each partnership or collaboration, such as evidence of signed Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs), their respective time frames, objectives, expected benefits, and current status (i.e., whether active or inactive).

Submit comprehensive details on all institutional collaborations and partnerships. This should include copies of signed Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs), the time frame for implementation, stated objectives and anticipated benefits, as well as the current status of each partnership (i.e., active or inactive).

16. STUDENT EXPERIENCE

The information presented on student experience outlined several initiatives aimed at enhancing student satisfaction, including:

- CABE operated a student-centred system to foster inclusivity, innovation and entrepreneurship
- Liaises with DOSA in all its divisions: Students Support, Counselling, Housing International Students Affairs, Financial Services and Student Conduct
- The KNUST Vodafone SIM Card Package
- The 2024 SONSOL Project where 503 brilliant but needy students received laptops
- The SRC 'Ketewa biara nsua' and KNUST Bursary 2024/2025 academic year
- The KNUST Master Card Foundation Scholarships, etc.

However, no formal report on student experience was made available for the review team's verification.

It is therefore recommended that the College systematically document and submit a comprehensive student experience report, detailing implemented initiatives, student feedback trends, measurable outcomes, and areas for improvement. This will not only support internal quality assurance but also facilitate external reviews and continuous enhancement of student services.

17. QUALITY ASSURANCE

It was highlighted during the presentation that there is a Quality Assurance and Planning Office (QAPO) at the university level which works with the sub-committees at the Colleges. Further, the sub-committee liaises with the College Management to ensure quality in the College. In addition, there are Accreditation Committees at the faculty/department levels to help facilitate the accreditation processes. However, there was no detailed explanation or supporting documentation for these processes.

Submit to the Commission a detailed report on the Quality Assurance activities of the College level. This should include quality assurance reports generated over the past few years, as well as a list of staff members serving in the Quality Assurance Unit. Additionally, provide copies of the curriculum vitae, appointment letter, and acceptance letter of the head of the unit.

18. STRATEGIC PLAN

Ther was no presentation provided on the Strategic Plan and its thematic areas of the College, which happens to be crucial in providing a roadmap for achieving log-term goals, ensuring alignment of activities and adapting to a changing educational environment. Further, the absence of a monitoring and implementation report, along with the lack of an accompanying budget allocation, significantly hinders the ability to assess progress, resource alignment, and overall feasibility.

It is therefore recommended that the College develop and submit a report of its Strategic Plan and provide a detailed monitoring and evaluation framework, along with periodic implementation reports. This will ensure transparency, track progress against set objectives, and enable timely adjustments to strategic priorities.

19. TRACER STUDIES

The presentation did not include any information on the conduct of tracer studies by the College of Arts and Built Environment (CABE) over the past five years, thereby limiting the panel's ability to assess graduate employability outcomes.

- The progress made in efforts to increase female student enrollment in the College.
- The present arrangement regarding the engagement of external lecturers.
- The issue of student supervision being undertaken predominantly by Teaching Assistants.
- The current state of Industrial Attachment programmes.
- The continued lack of designated office space and consultation hours for lecturers, which hampers student access to academic staff.

This report is to be submitted to the Commission for review and further action.

Submit to the Commission a detailed report on tracer studies conducted by the CABE over the past five years, aimed at tracking the career progression and outcomes of its graduates. The report should demonstrate how the findings have been used to evaluate the relevance and effectiveness of academic programmes, inform curriculum improvements, and ensure alignment with labour market demands. The CABE is further advised that the conduct of tracer studies will henceforth be a mandatory requirement for programme reaccreditation.

20. FUTURE OUTLOOK

A future outlook is crucial for the success and relevance of all forward-looking institutions since it enables them to adapt to evolving societal needs. However, the presentation by the College did not provide any information on its future outlook.

Submit a report on the future outlook of the college and ensure that it is firmly aligned with the University's Strategic Plan to ensure coherence with institutional priorities. All proposed actions should meet the 'SMART' criteria (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound) and directly respond to the challenges outlined, offering a realistic and actionable path for the College's development and growth.

21. OUTSTANDING ISSUES FROM THE PREVIOUS FIVE-YEAR CYCLICAL REVIEW AT KNUST – COLLEGE OF ARTS AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT (CABE)

A number of outstanding issues identified during the last five-year cyclical review of the College of Arts and Built Environment (CABE) at KNUST remain unresolved. The Commission, therefore, directs that a comprehensive status report be submitted for review, addressing the following matters:

- The current support mechanisms in place to assist Assistant Lecturers without PhDs in pursuing doctoral studies.
- The present status of postgraduate student enrollment levels at the College, given the previously noted low percentage.
- The availability and implementation of a Tracer Study by the College.
- The status of staff promotions within the Faculty of Fine Arts for the past five years.
- The effectiveness and current state of the Student Mentorship programme.

6.5 COLLEGE OF SCIENCE (CoS)

1. MISSION STATEMENT

The mission statement is essential as it defines the institution's core purpose and guides its strategic direction by reflecting the key activities of the College. However, the mission statement presented by the College fails to adequately capture these core activities.

Submit the College's mission statement to the Commission for consideration, ensuring it aligns with the University's overarching mission and accurately reflects the core activities undertaken by the College.

2. VISION STATEMENT

The vision statement of the College of Science (CoS) is limited to an African context without a global perspective. It lacks focus clarity especially with this phrase 'high calibre science graduates' to effectively drive the College's strategic growth. In addition, it did not meet the criteria of being 'SMART', thereby making it not measurable.

CoS is advised to revise its vision statement to ensure they are focused and ambitious, while clearly reflecting the College's strategic growth. The revised vision statement should meet the 'SMART' criteria making it measurable and should be aligned and reflective of the overarching vision of the university.

3. STRATEGIC THEMES

The strategic plan presented outlines critical development areas necessary for institutional growth and sustainability, including Manpower training in science and technology, expand physical and ICT infrastructure including ICT application, promote research, innovation and dissemination, pursue financial resource mobilization, promote gender parity, promote continuous professional development, etc. However, the absence of a monitoring and implementation report, significantly hinders the ability to assess progress, resource alignment, and overall feasibility.

It is therefore recommended that the College develop and provide a detailed monitoring and evaluation framework, along with periodic implementation reports and clearly defined

budgetary provisions to the Commission for review. This will ensure transparency, track progress against set objectives, and enable timely adjustments to strategic priorities.

4. GOVERNANCE

Although the creation of the Vice Dean position is provided for under the University's Statutes (Statute 37), which outlines the Vice Dean's role as acting on behalf of the Dean and performing assigned duties, the review team observed that these responsibilities were not duly considered in establishing the position. This oversight undermines principles of lean management and carries financial implications for the University's budget.

CoS should reconsider the position of Vice Dean across the Faculties. Furthermore, any creation of administrative positions such as the Vice Dean must be guided by the University's Statutes, with a clear justification of roles and financial implications to ensure alignment with lean management principles and institutional efficiency.

5. CURRICULUM DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT & ACCREDITATION FLOW CHART

The college's Curriculum Design and Development flow chart reveals that the Quality Assurance and Planning Committee (QAPC) is positioned at the final stage of the process. This placement potentially obscures the extent of QAPC's influence on programme development and accreditation-related matters. As a result, it becomes challenging to fully recognize or appreciate the role and impact of QAPC in ensuring academic quality and standards throughout the curriculum design and accreditation lifecycle.

It is recommended that the curriculum design and accreditation flow chart be revised to position the Quality Assurance and Planning Committee (QAPC) more strategically within the process. Placing the QAPC earlier in the flow will better reflect its integral role in guiding programme development and ensuring compliance with accreditation standards, thereby enhancing clarity and institutional effectiveness.

6. ACCREDITATION OF PROGRAMMES

While the presentation provided a general overview of the number of programmes running at the undergraduate and graduate level and the number of programmes accredited, ongoing and expired

at the faculty level, it was not disaggregated by department and accreditation timeframe (i.e., specific dates of accreditation and expiry).

Furthermore, the presentation disclosed that out of the 85 academic programmes currently offered at the college encompassing both undergraduate and graduate levels, 19 programmes do not possess valid accreditation. This finding raises significant concerns regarding the institution's compliance with established regulatory and quality assurance standards.

CoS should provide detailed, department-level data on the accreditation status of all academic programmes, including specific accreditation and expiry dates. Urgent steps must also be taken to regularize the accreditation of the 19 unaccredited programmes to ensure full compliance with regulatory and quality assurance standards.

It must be emphasized that operating academic programmes without valid accreditation is unacceptable. Furthermore, Policy Approval and Administrative Approval do not constitute formal accreditation. In addition, the College must undertake an immediate review of the status of all its programmes and ensure that the re-accreditation process is initiated at least one year prior to the expiry of existing accreditation.

7. GRADUATION RATE

The College's presentation on graduation statistics included a list of programmes with figures spanning the 2022 to 2025 academic years. It was noted during interactions with management that graduation rates for the period ranged between 80–85%, indicating that 15–20% of students did not complete their programmes. However, the lack of detailed explanations and the presentation of raw figures without corresponding percentages limited the review panel's ability to conduct a comprehensive analysis.

It is recommended that the College submit a comprehensive report to the Commission with data disaggregated by department over the past five years. The data should be presented in both absolute figures and corresponding graduation rates (%) to enhance clarity, enable effective evaluation, and support data-driven decision-making. Additionally, the report should outline the systems and interventions implemented to support students who are unable to graduate within the expected timeframe.

8. STAFF STRENGTH

The presentation indicated that among the 225 teaching staff within the College of Science (CoS), the academic rank distribution is as follows:

- Professors – 12.9% (GTEC norm: 10%)
- Associate Professors – 20.44% (GTEC norm: 15%)
- Senior Lecturers – 23.6% (GTEC norm: 35%)
- Lecturers – 40.44% (GTEC norm: 40%)
- Assistant Lecturers – 2.7%

While the proportion of Professors and Associate Professors exceeds the GTEC benchmarks, the percentage of Senior Lecturers falls significantly short, and Lecturers are only marginally below the standard. Notably, the presentation did not outline any strategies or support mechanisms in place to assist Assistant Lecturers in pursuing PhD qualifications, which is essential for academic progression and capacity development.

CoS should submit to the Commission a detailed roadmap, including concrete timelines, outlining the mechanisms instituted by management to support faculty members currently serving as Assistant Lecturers in acquiring their PhDs. Additionally, efforts should be made to reduce reliance on part-time and post-retirement faculty through the recruitment and retention of full-time staff, in line with GTEC norms, to ensure sustainable academic capacity and institutional growth.

9. STUDENT-STAFF RATIO

The submitted data on the student-staff ratio (SSR), disaggregated by departments, did not include figures for both full-time and adjunct faculty. However, several departments exceeded the GTEC-recommended SSR norm of 18:1 for science-related programmes, with most programmes recording high ratios. For example, the department of Computer Science reported an average SSR of 107.3:1, the department of Theoretical and Applied Biology had 129:1, and the department of Mathematics 96:1. Furthermore, the data did not specify the years covered in the analysis nor strategies put in place to address these high SSRs.

CoS should submit a comprehensive report outlining urgent measures to address the current student-staff ratios (SSRs) and bring them in line with the GTEC-approved norm of 1:18 for science-related programmes. The calculation must specify the years covered in the analysis. The College must also establish robust monitoring and control systems to ensure the effective delivery of teaching by faculty. In addition, deliberate efforts should be made to strengthen the recruitment and retention of full-time academic staff.

10. DISTANCE EDUCATION

The presentation outlined only the programmes offered by the Institute of Distance Learning (IDL), limiting the review team's ability to gain a comprehensive understanding of the overall academic structure. However, interactions with College management revealed that faculty from the main College also teach at the IDL, resulting in increased teaching loads. This dual responsibility raises concerns about the quality and long-term sustainability of academic delivery.

The College of Sciences should submit a comprehensive report on the operations of the institute. The report should be supported by relevant data and should include information on programme structure, student and staff numbers, graduation trends, duration of programmes, and other key operational details.

There should be a review of the current faculty deployment strategy at the IDL to reduce excessive teaching loads. Measures should be put in place to ensure adequate staffing, enhance teaching quality, and promote sustainable academic delivery.

11. TRACER STUDIES

The information presented by the College regarding tracer studies consisted solely of a pie chart showing the distribution of graduates across various industries. However, it lacked other details on the actual conduct of tracer studies by the College of Sciences (CoS) over the past five years. This omission limited the panel's ability to evaluate graduate employability outcomes effectively.

Submit to the Commission a detailed report on tracer studies conducted by the CoS, aimed at tracking the career progression and outcomes of its graduates. The report should demonstrate how the findings have been used to evaluate the relevance and effectiveness of academic

programmes, inform curriculum improvements, and ensure alignment with labour market demands. The CABE is further advised that the conduct of tracer studies will henceforth be a mandatory requirement for programme reaccreditation.

12. RESEARCH AND PUBLICATIONS

The presentation on research and publications at the College of Sciences (CoS) lacked disaggregated data on individual staff publications, limiting the ability to assess faculty research performance. It focused primarily on the role of the Office of Grants and Research (OGR), which oversees research coordination and grant administration. While it highlighted initiatives such as enhanced grantsmanship through the Research Professional Platform (since 2022), international collaborations, support for early career researchers, and the use of AI tools like Grammarly, these claims were presented without supporting evidence or details on active MoUs. Although the total value of research grants over the past four years (USD 6,564,204.72), along with the number of grants applied for and awarded, was provided, the presentation lacked key information on levels of financial support per project and tangible research outcomes or breakthroughs.

CoS is required to submit a detailed report on research publications from the past five years, disaggregated by department and indicate any notable research breakthroughs. This will enable the Commission to evaluate the consistency and impact of scholarly output across the faculties. In line with University policy, CoS must also develop and submit a list of credible journals and recognised publishing houses where faculty are encouraged to publish.

13. PARTNERSHIP AND COLLABORATION

The College of Science reported having over 100 local and international collaborating institutions and funders, including:

- Ghana Meteorological Agency
- Environmental Protection Agency
- University of Leeds
- Technical University of Munich
- Spencer Foundation

64

- Simon's Foundation
- University of Cambridge

Key funders cited include the Rockefeller Foundation, Wellcome Trust, National Institutes of Health, American Heart Association, European Union, and GHACEM. However, the presentation lacked critical details for each partnership, such as evidence of signed Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs), defined objectives, anticipated benefits, and the current status of each collaboration (active or inactive), thereby limiting the ability to assess the depth and effectiveness of these engagements.

Submit comprehensive details on all institutional collaborations and partnerships. This should include copies of signed Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs), the time frame for implementation, stated objectives and anticipated benefits, as well as the current status of each partnership (i.e., active or inactive).

14. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND INDUSTRIAL LINKAGE

The presentation on community engagement by the College of Science highlighted a range of activities, including the Junior Mathematics and Science Quiz (JMSQ) for junior schools, STEM workshops for teachers in the Ashanti Region, the Meteorological Virtual Weather Seminar Series, laboratory refurbishment and classroom furniture support for KNUST SHS, as well as consultancy services in the mining industry. It also referenced several stakeholder-targeted short courses, such as those in Machine Learning and Biodata Science, the UCSC Genome Browser Workshop, Food Hygiene and HACCP Training, and Cyber Security. However, the College did not provide detailed accounts of student participation in these initiatives or verifiable evidence of their implementation.

CoS should submit a detailed report outlining all community engagement activities and services rendered by the College over the past five years. The report should include clear descriptions of each activity, objectives, participants involved, and the outcomes or impact achieved.

15. CONSULTANCY AND OUTREACH

The presentation on Consultancy and Outreach by the College of Science showcased a range of initiatives, supported by photographic evidence. These included the ANAB ISO/IEC 17025:2017 accreditation of the KNUST Food Science and Technology Laboratories, the SciFest Ghana 2024

aimed at promoting scientific interest among youth in Kumasi, the GQuantum Education Outreach Initiative, and the inaugural High Skuul Maths League Competition culminating in Excellence Awards in the Adansi District. However, the presentation did not provide a formal policy document on Consultancy and Outreach. Although the review team was informed that a policy is currently under development, only a financial handbook outlining consultancy and outreach guidelines was referenced.

While the presentation effectively highlighted notable initiatives with visual documentation, the absence of an approved policy framework limits strategic coordination and institutional accountability. Reliance on a financial handbook alone is insufficient.
It is therefore recommended that the College of Science expedite the development and formal adoption of a comprehensive Consultancy and Outreach Policy.

16. STUDENT EXPERIENCE

The information presented on student experience outlined several initiatives aimed at enhancing student satisfaction supported by photographic evidence, including:

- Conducive learning space for students
- Computer Based Examinations
- Plan Summit 2025 to empower students for Academic and Professional Success.
- posterFest Highlights Role of AI in Modern Research.
- Freshers Orientation Program to guide new students towards academic success at the College of Science, KNUST

However, no formal report on student experience was made available for the review team's verification.

It is therefore recommended that the College systematically document and submit a comprehensive student experience report, detailing implemented initiatives, student feedback trends, measurable outcomes, and areas for improvement. This will not only support internal quality assurance but also facilitate external reviews and continuous enhancement of student services.

17. STAFF ATTRITION

The College's presentation on staff attrition included a bar graph with departmental figures; however, it lacked detailed descriptions and data trends over the past five years, limiting the review panel's ability to conduct a comprehensive assessment. Furthermore, the data were presented solely as absolute numbers without corresponding attrition rates (%), reducing their analytical value.

It is recommended that the College submit a detailed report to the Commission, including attrition data disaggregated by department over the past five years, presented in both absolute numbers and percentage rates. This will enhance data clarity, support effective evaluation, and enable informed decision-making. Additionally, the College should outline the strategies currently in place to address staff attrition and promote retention.

18. KEY CHALLENGES

The College of Science (CoS) identified several key challenges that impede its effective operation. These include office space for new staff/departments, less research laboratories, increasing student number is not corresponding to lecture intake, procurement bureaucracy and institutional bureaucracy. However, the College did not propose any strategic interventions or solutions to mitigate these challenges.

Submit a detailed report outlining the key challenges currently facing the College, along with proposed solutions to address them. Additionally, provide a forward-looking plan that reflects a SMART framework—Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound—for guiding the College's strategic direction.

19. FUTURE OUTLOOK

A future outlook is crucial for the success and relevance of all forward-looking institutions since it enables them adapt to evolving societal needs. However, the presentation by the College did not provide any information on its future outlook.

Submit a report on the future outlook of the college and ensure that it is firmly aligned with the University's Strategic Plan to ensure coherence with institutional priorities. All proposed actions should meet the 'SMART' criteria (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and

Time-bound) and directly respond to the challenges outlined, offering a realistic and actionable path for the College's development and growth.

20. OUTSTANDING ISSUES FROM THE PREVIOUS FIVE-YEAR CYCLICAL REVIEW AT KNUST – COLLEGE OF SCIENCE (CoS)

A number of outstanding issues identified during the last five-year cyclical review of the College of Science (CoS) at KNUST remain unresolved. The Commission hereby directs the College to submit a detailed status report for review, addressing the following critical areas:

1. The current status of the construction of the proposed Teaching Hospital initiated by the College.

2. Measures being taken to address challenges related to limited classroom space, inadequate laboratory equipment, increasing student admissions, large class sizes, low representation of female students and staff, limited presence of international students and faculty, and low postgraduate enrollment.

3. The issue of high Student-Staff Ratios (SSR) and proposed solutions to mitigate its impact on academic quality.

4. Efforts to improve the uptake and quality of postgraduate studies, including enrollment trends and strategic interventions.

5. The status of deliberate training initiatives on grantsmanship for both staff and students.

6. Clarification on the appropriate location and institutional responsibility for the Doctor of Optometry programme.

7. The status of tracer studies conducted at the College level to track graduate outcomes.

8. The situation regarding the shortage of projectors in classrooms and steps taken to resolve it.

9. The challenge of overcrowding in science laboratories, notably the ratio of seven students per microscope, and actions being taken to enhance practical learning experiences.

10. The overall balance between theoretical instruction and practical training and plans to strengthen hands-on learning.

This report is to be submitted to the Commission for review and further action.

6.6   INSTITUTE OF DISTANCE LERANING (IDL)

1. VISION STATEMENT

The vision statement of the Institute of Distance Learning (IDL) is 'To be a leading institute in providing access to continuing and tertiary education and training through distance learning in Africa'. This is limited to an African context without a global perspective. It lacks focus and ambition necessary to effectively drive the College's strategic growth.

IDL is advised to revise its vision statement to ensure they are focused and ambitious, while clearly reflecting the College's strategic growth. The revised vision statement should meet the 'SMART' criteria making it measurable and should be aligned and reflective of the overarching vision of the university.

2. ACADEMIC PROGRAMMES

The presentation indicated that the Institute of Distance Learning (IDL) offers 74 academic programmes, comprising 21 undergraduate programmes, 7 diplomas and 14 top-up programmes, and 53 postgraduate programmes, with an estimated student population of 12,000. However, the absence of year-on-year student enrollment figures and the undergraduate-to-postgraduate ratio limited the review panel's ability to conduct a detailed analysis.

It is recommended that the Institute of Distance Learning (IDL) provide disaggregated year-on-year student enrollment data, including a clear breakdown of undergraduate and postgraduate populations, to enable a more comprehensive analysis of programme growth and student distribution trends.

3. MODE OF DELIVERY

The presentation noted that the Institute of Distance Learning (IDL) employs innovative strategies to deliver higher education through a blended learning model of 50% face-to-face and 50% online (both synchronous and asynchronous). Assessment methods include a 30:70 ratio (continuous assessment to end-of-semester examination) for undergraduates and a 60:40 ratio for postgraduates. However, the presentation did not address student enrollment figures in relation to the capacity of available facilities. Additionally, admissions are made to the university rather than specific centres, with students subsequently selecting their preferred centres. Centre-specific student enrollment data was not provided.

It is recommended that the Institute of Distance Learning (IDL) submit centre-specific student enrollment data and provide a clear alignment between student numbers and available facilities to facilitate effective planning and resource allocation. Further, It must be emphasised that the choice of assessment methods should be aligned with the intended learning outcomes of each course.

Furthermore, justification is required to determine the relevance of the 30:70 assessment structure, which is currently in use, within the context of 21st-century quality tertiary education delivery. Additionally, the Institute should develop and present a formal policy on assessment methods to ensure consistency and transparency across programmes and centres.

4. GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

The organogram of the Institute of Distance Learning depicts the Deputy Director reporting directly to the Director. However, the review team requested further justification for the inclusion of the Deputy Director position, specifically regarding the role and responsibilities it entails within the institute's governance structure.

It is recommended that the Institute of Distance Learning provide a detailed justification for the inclusion of the Deputy Director position, outlining the specific roles, responsibilities, and added value of the position within the institute's governance and operational structure.

5. ACCREDITATION PROCESS FLOW CHART

The Institute's accreditation flow chart reveals that the Quality Assurance and Planning Committee (QAPC) is positioned at the final stage of the process. This placement potentially obscures the extent of QAPC's influence on programme development and accreditation-related matters. As a result, it becomes challenging to fully recognize or appreciate the role and impact of QAPC in ensuring academic quality and standards throughout the curriculum design and accreditation lifecycle.

It is recommended that the curriculum design and accreditation flow chart be revised to position the Quality Assurance and Planning Committee (QAPC) more strategically within the process. Placing the QAPC earlier in the flow will better reflect its integral role in guiding programme

development and ensuring compliance with accreditation standards, thereby enhancing clarity and institutional effectiveness.

6. STUDENT-STAFF RATIO

The submitted data on the student-staff ratio (SSR) indicated a general ratio of 30:1, without reference to the prevailing norm. However, the presentation did not include programme-specific SSRs, thereby limiting the review team's ability to fully assess the SSR situation within the Institute.

It is recommended that the Institute of Distance Learning provide programme-specific student-staff ratios (SSRs) and benchmark them against the relevant normative standards to enable a more accurate and comprehensive assessment of teaching capacity and resource adequacy across programmes.

7. ACCREDITATION OF CENTRES

The presentation revealed that none of the satellite study centres (Kwabenya, Tamale, Takoradi, Adenta, and McCarthy Hill) are accredited, a situation the review team noted with serious concern.

It is strongly recommended that the Institute of Distance Learning take immediate steps to regularise the accreditation status of all satellite study centres, as the continued operation of unaccredited centres raises significant quality assurance and regulatory compliance concerns.

8. PROGRAMME ACCREDITATION

While the presentation provided a general overview of the number of programmes running at the undergraduate and graduate level and the number of programmes accredited, ongoing and expired, it lacked detailed, disaggregated data by centre and accreditation timeframe (i.e., specific dates of accreditation and expiry). Furthermore, the presentation disclosed that out of the 74 academic programmes currently offered at the Institute encompassing both undergraduate and graduate levels, 52 programmes do not possess valid accreditation. This finding raises significant concerns regarding the institution's compliance with established regulatory and quality assurance standards.

IDL should provide detailed, College-level data on the accreditation status of all academic programmes, including specific accreditation and expiry dates. Urgent steps must also be taken

to regularize the accreditation of the 52 unaccredited programmes to ensure full compliance with regulatory and quality assurance standards.

It must be emphasized that operating academic programmes without valid accreditation is unacceptable. Furthermore, Policy Approval and Administrative Approval do not constitute formal accreditation. In addition, the College must undertake an immediate review of the accreditation status of all its programmes and ensure that the re-accreditation process is initiated at least one year prior to the expiry of existing accreditation.

9. PRACTICAL TRAINING

The presentation on practical training at the Institute of Distance Learning (IDL) outlined various training modalities across programmes: Engineering includes on-campus lab sessions, virtual labs and simulations, project-based assignments, video demonstrations, and industry-based case studies; Life Sciences involve fieldwork, on-campus lab work, and collaborative research projects; while Social Sciences emphasize community-based action projects and case studies. However, the presentation lacked information on the effectiveness and outcomes of these training approaches, limiting the review team's ability to assess their impact.

It is recommended that the Institute of Distance Learning provide evidence-based evaluations of the practical training approaches across its programmes, including data on learning outcomes, student feedback, and industry relevance, to enable a thorough assessment of their effectiveness and impact.

10. PARTNERSHIP AND INTERNATIONALISATION

The data provided on partnership and internationalisation include the following:

1.   Member of the International Council for Open and Distance Education (ICDE)
2.   University of Abomey-Calivi (Benin)
3.   Apex Technology (USA)
4.   UNIDO-IDL TVET Training
5.   Information Systems Audit and Control Association (ISACA Accra Chapter)

However, the presentation lacked critical details for each partnership, such as evidence of signed Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs), defined objectives, anticipated benefits, and the current status of each collaboration (active or inactive), thereby limiting the ability to assess the depth and effectiveness of these engagements. In addition, no information was provided on the international drive from outside.

Submit comprehensive details on all institutional collaborations and partnerships. This should include copies of signed Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs), the full content of each MOU, the time frame for implementation, stated objectives and anticipated benefits, as well as the current status of each partnership (i.e., active or inactive). In addition, provide detailed information on the international drive from outside.

11. MISSION STATEMENT

The presentation lacked any reference to the Institute's mission statement, which is essential for articulating its purpose and guiding its actions and decision-making processes.

Submit the Institute's mission statements to the Commission, ensuring that they are aligned with and reflective of the overarching vision and mission of the University, for consideration.

12. STRATEGIC PLAN

No information was provided or references regarding the Strategic Plan of the Institute of Distance Learning (IDL) which provides a roadmap for achieving its mission and vision, ensuring resource allocation and fostering a culture of continuous improvement.

Submit the Strategic Plan of the IDL to the Commission, ensuring that it is aligned with the overarching Strategic Plan of the University. In addition, an implementation status report on the strategic plan should be submitted.

13. TRACER STUDIES

The presentation did not include any information on the conduct of tracer studies by the Institute of Distance Learning (IDL) over the past five years, thereby limiting the panel's ability to assess graduate employability outcomes.

Submit to the Commission a detailed report on tracer studies conducted by the IDL aimed at tracking the career progression and outcomes of its graduates. The report should demonstrate how the findings have been used to evaluate the relevance and effectiveness of academic programmes, inform curriculum improvements, and ensure alignment with labour market

demands. The IDL is further advised that the conduct of tracer studies will henceforth be a mandatory requirement for programme reaccreditation.

14. KEY CHALLENGES

The Institute of Distance Learning (IDL) identified several key challenges that impede its effective operation. These include connectivity issues, self-discipline and motivation, support issues, lack of technical know-how of the online ecosystem,, programme running at both regular and distance learning, accreditation of science-based programmes, closure of rented centres, among others. However, the Institute did not propose any strategic interventions or solutions to mitigate these challenges.

Submit a detailed report outlining the key challenges currently facing the Institute, along with proposed solutions to address them. Additionally, provide a forward-looking plan that reflects a SMART framework—Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound—for guiding the College's strategic direction.

15. FUTURE OUTLOOK

A future outlook is crucial for the success and relevance of all forward-looking institutions since it enables them to adapt to evolving societal needs. However, the presentation by the IDL did not provide any information on its future outlook.

Submit a report on the future outlook of the college and ensure that it is firmly aligned with the University's Strategic Plan to ensure coherence with institutional priorities. All proposed actions should meet the 'SMART' criteria (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound) and directly respond to the challenges outlined, offering a realistic and actionable path for the College's development and growth.

16. OUTSTANDING ISSUES FROM THE PREVIOUS FIVE-YEAR CYCLICAL REVIEW AT KNUST – INSTITUTE OF DISTANCE LEARNING (IDL)

A number of outstanding issues identified during the last five-year cyclical review of the Institute of Distance Learning (IDL) at KNUST remain unresolved. The Commission hereby directs the College to submit a comprehensive status report addressing the following key areas for review:

1. The current accreditation status of all satellite study centres.
2. The practice of students engaging facilitators during programme delivery—what is the prevailing situation?
3. The number and status of core full-time staff assigned to IDL programmes.
4. The present status and implementation of Access Programmes.
5. The use of accredited main university programmes within the Institute of Distance Learning.
6. The availability of Study Manuals at the Institute for all programmes.
7. The status of tracer studies conducted by the Institute.
8. Progress made towards the development of a Strategic Plan for the Institute.

This report is to be submitted to the Commission for review and further action.

6.7 COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

The College of Humanities and Social Sciences is made up of the KNUST School of Business, The Faculty of Social Sciences and the Faculty of Law.

Presentations were made by the individual Faculties and not as a College. In view of this it was impossible to access the performance of the College as a unit in relation to the other Colleges of the University. Outlined below are the observations and recommendations of the Faculties under the College of Humanities and Social Sciences:

a. KNUST SCHOOL OF BUSINESS
1. GOVERNANCE

The position of Vice Dean, as was observed from the management presentation, was part of the governance structure of the School. This position had been indicated on the organogram, but from feedback obtained, there are no statutory roles assigned to the Vice Dean, and this raises the question of relevance and adopting cost-cutting measures.

The School should submit a write-up clearly justifying the role of the Vice Dean within the governance structure of the School.

2. VISION AND MISSION

The vision and mission statements of the School were not indicated during the presentation to the Team. The suitability of otherwise of the vision and mission was therefore unable to be determined.

The School should clearly indicate the vision and mission statements of the School and indicate how this feeds into the College and general University mission and vision statements.

3. ASSESSMENT AND PROGRESSION

The School adopts the continuous assessment (30%) and end-of-semester examinations (70%) assessment criteria for undergraduate programmes. Taking the nature of the courses offered, the question of suitability of this assessment mode was raised.

The School should justify the use of this assessment mode, especially taking into consideration the programmes offered.

4. ENROLMENTS

There was no indication of the total number of students in the School and how this compared to the total number of enrollments into postgraduate programmes.

The School should submit data for the total number of enrollments into undergraduate programmes. This should be further broken down into departments and programmes specific. In addition, the percentage of undergraduate enrollments compared to postgraduate enrollments should be indicated.

5. STUDENT DROP OUT RATE

Students dropout rate was high. There was a 1% to 2% dropout rate per cohort for undergraduate programmes. Generally, there was a 13% dropout rate for undergraduate programmes annually.

In addition, there was a 53% to 86% dropout rate for postgraduate programmes per cohort. Generally, there was a 15% dropout rate for postgraduate studies annually.

The School should submit a road map with timelines to considerably improve upon the dropout rates. In addition, the School should submit a report identifying the challenges that have caused such high dropout rates and suggest remedies to resolve them. Available student support services in place for struggling students should also be outlined.

6. GRADUATION RATE

The graduation rate for postgraduate programmes was low. The graduation rate for 2023 and 2024 were 14% and 47% respectively. This amounted to an average graduation rate of 31% for postgraduate programmes.

The School should submit a report and outline the challenges that have accounted for the low graduation rate for postgraduate programmes. This should clearly outline suggested remedies to deal with the challenges identified.

7. INTERNATIONALISATION

The School had some partnerships/collaborations, notably the University at Buffalo, the Technical University of Munich, Arizona State University, CIMA and ACCA. It was, however, unclear what benefits the School derived from these partnerships.

The School should clearly outline the benefits derived from all partnerships/collaborations. In addition, it should be indicated if there are MOUs and which ones are valid or otherwise.

8. KEY CHALLENGES

The School outlined some key challenges it is currently grappling with. However, there were no solutions outlined on how to address these challenges. In addition, the School's future outlook was not indicated.

KNUST School of Business should indicate possible solutions for the challenges identified and also the school's future outlook should clearly be outlined. This future outlook should be linked to the School's Strategic Plan.

b. FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

1. CURRICULUM DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT

The flow chart on curriculum design and development had no provision for Quality Assurance in the entire process.

The Faculty should clearly indicate the role of either the Faculty Quality Assurance set up or that of the Quality Assurance Directorate of the University in the entire process.

2. MODE OF ASSESSMENT

The Faculty made use of the continuous assessment (30%) and end of semester examination (70%) modes during assessment of courses. The Team expressed concern about the fitness of purpose of this mode of assessment.

The allocations made for the assessment modes employed by the Faculty should be reconsidered especially taking into consideration the nature of programmes offered.

3. STRATEGIC PLAN

The Faculty had a Strategic Plan that was due to elapse at the end of 2025. A committee had been set up to review the Faculty's Strategic Plan and develop a new plan.

A status of implementation report on the current Strategic Plan should be submitted to GTEC to determine the extent of implementation of the current plan.

4. STUDENT DROP OUT RATE

Students' dropout rates were presented as 3% and 5% for undergraduate and postgraduate, respectively, for the past five years. It was therefore impossible to determine the average per year for the past five years.

Data on student dropout rate should be presented for each year for the past five years to be able to determine the pattern of increase. The data should also be submitted according to cohorts.

5. GRADUATION RATE

Graduation rate was presented as 95% and 90% for undergraduate and postgraduate prorammes respectively for the past three years. There was no indication of the rate of increase or decrease since the data was not presented for each year.

The Faculty should submit data for average graduation rates per year for the past five years. In addition, the data should be submitted according to cohorts to be able to appreciate the extent of the increase or decrease.

6. PYRAMIDAL STRUCTURE

Lecturers and Assistant Lecturers constituted 46% of the total teaching staff. This was considered high.

The Faculty should submit a write-up on efforts in place to ensure that these categories of staff progress to the next academic rank, especially when the rank of Assistant Lecturer is transitionary and not part of GTEC's academic ranks structure.

7. PARTNERSHIP AND COLLABORATION

The Faculty had some partnerships and collaboration. There was no indication the availability of valid MOUs for each partnership/collaboration and the benefit the Faculty was deriving from each of them.

The Faculty should submit a write-up on the benefits derived from each partnership and confirm the availability of valid MOUs for each of them.

8. STAFF STUDENT RATIO

The Faculty did not indicate staff-student ratios for the programmes offered.

The Faculty should submit data on current staff-student ratios for each of the programmes offered to determine if the GTEC norms have been met.

9. FUTURE OUTLOOK

There was no information submitted on the Faculty's future outlook.

Information on the future outlook of the Faculty should be presented and this should be hinged on the Strategic Plan of the Faculty.

C. FACULTY OF LAW

1. CURRICULUM DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT

The flow chart on curriculum design and development had Quality Assurance placed at the end prior to the submission of documents to GTEC.

The Faculty should clearly indicate the role of either the Faculty Quality Assurance set up or that of the Quality Assurance Directorate of the University in the entire process.

2. STUDENT ASSESSMENT

There was no indication of the percentage allocations for continuous assessment and end of semester examinations.

The Faculty of Law should clearly indicate the allocations for end of semester examinations and end of semester examinations.

3. DROP OUT RATES

Dropout rates were submitted for 2021/2022 to 2023/2024. This data was not submitted according to cohorts to be able to make meaningful analysis.

The Faculty of Law should resubmit the drop out rates according to cohorts to be able to determine the number of students that were admitted in a particular year and the number of students that were able to graduate within that cohort.

4. GRADUATION RATE

Data on graduation rates were submitted but not according to cohorts. This made it impossible to determine how many students were able to graduate within a particular cohort.

The Faculty should resubmit the graduation rate according to cohorts.

5. TEACHING STAFF

The pyramidal structure of teaching staff was presented without a comparison to the GTEC norms to be able to determine where there are shortfalls. In addition, there are 3 Assistant Lecturers as part of the Faculty's pyramidal structure.

The Faculty should resubmit data on the pyramidal structure and match it against the GTEC norms to be able to make some meaningful analysis. In addition, there are teaching staff on the rank of Assistant Lecturer, which is a transitionary rank. The Faculty should inform the Commission of plans in place to ensure that this category of staff are transitioned to the rank of Lecturer.

6. RESEARCH

Data on research output of staff for the past three years was not submitted. The presentation only stated the forms of research outlets available to staff and the total number of publications.

The Faculty should submit data on research output of staff for the past three years. This should be submitted according to Departments if applicable.

7. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Some community engagement undertaken the Faculty was stated. However, there was no information on the target group and expected outcome of these engagements.

The Faculty should provide further information on the target groups and intended outcomes for these community engagement activities.

8. QUALITY ASSURANCE

The Faculty indicated it had a Quality Assurance team within its set up. There were no copy of a report submitted to confirm its functionality.

The Faculty should submit a copy of the reports produced to confirm the functionality of the Quality Assurance setup.

9. KEY CHALLENGES

Key challenges were identified without any concrete measure to resolve them. These challenges were not linked to the Strategic Plan of the Faculty.

Key challenges identified should be resubmitted and concrete actionable plans to resolve them outlined. These key challenges should not be indicated in a vacuum but should be linked to the Faculty's strategic plan.

d. **OUTSTANDING ISSUES FROM THE PREVIOUS FIVE-YEAR CYCLICAL REVIEW AT COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES**

A number of outstanding issues identified during the last five-year cyclical review of the College of Humanities and Social Sciences at KNUST remain unresolved. The Commission, therefore, directs that a comprehensive status report be submitted for review, addressing each of the following outstanding matters:

- The NAB Review Team expressed concern about the high SSR in the College and indicated that concrete measures should be put in place to reduce the high SSR.

81

- The NAB Review Team inquired about the College's mission, vision, and strategic plan. The College indicated that it was yet to develop its Vision and Mission statements.
- The College had no Strategic Plan during its previous visit by the Commission.
- The College indicated that it had created a grants office during the previous visit. The Commission would want to be informed of the successes chalked by the grants office and the number/amount of grants received over the past 5 years.
- The Review Team raised concerns about the mentoring ability of the Faculty of Law to supervise other academic units of law in other institutions given that it had very few PhD holders. The Commission would like the College to submit data on the number of terminal degree holders in the Faculty of Law now and indicate how that has improved over the past 5 years.
- The KNUST School of Business (KSB) mentioned that it had undertaken a tracer study. However, it was indicated that the report was not readily available. The KNUST School of Business should submit a copy of the most recent tracer studies report to the Commission.

7.0 OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM EXPERTS' REPORTS

The following observations were made by the experts and the GTEC team during the visit:

7.1   LIBRARY FACILITIES

a. Observations

i. The Library Budget

The team noticed the KNUST Library has adequate facilities and resources for its operations. It was also revealed that for the past three years, the library has received substantial budget allocation from the University. However, it was not clear the percentage of the University budget allocated to the library yearly since there was no evidence of that.

Based on the above, it is recommended that the University management provide evidence of regular yearly budget allocation to the library which according to the GTEC norm, should be 5% of the University's annual budget.

ii.   The Library Building

The KNUST Library, named *Prempeh II Library System*, has modern facilities and is strategically and centrally located. However, the team observed some of the floor tiles, tables, and chairs had broken down, which had safety implications for users.

Therefore, efforts should be made to provide regular maintenance of the library facilities. It is suggested that management should provide regular maintenance to ensure the maximum preservation of the library facility.

iii.   Compliance with the Disability Act 2006 (Act 715)

The main Library building has an automatic elevator for disability access. However, some colleges, faculties, departments, libraries, and offices within the main Library are not disability friendly. Again, there are emergency exit signage in most of the offices and reading areas.

It is recommended that all the libraries in the University should be made disability friendly as the 2006 Act (Act 715). The Library should provide enough visible signs showing emergency exit and assembly station signs.

7.2   PHYSICAL FACILITIES

Summary of findings and recommendations for physical facilities

i.   **Classroom doors**

The doors in the School of Nursing & Midwifery open inwards instead of the required outward opening.

The doors in the classrooms that seat more than 20 persons should swing outwards to permit quick evacuation during an emergency.

ii.   **Fire certificate**

At the time of the assessment, a fire certificate was not available.

Although a fire station is present on campus, the university still needs to obtain fire certificates for its facilities.

iii.   **Exposed Electrical wiring**

At the Social Sciences Block, some exposed electrical wiring was observed, particularly in the auditorium and the ground-floor library discussion room.

Immediate action should be taken to secure the exposed electrical wiring in the Social Sciences Block, particularly in the auditorium and ground floor library discussion room, to ensure safety and prevent potential hazards.

iv.   **Unsealed Electrical sockets**

Numerous electrical outlets at the Social Sciences Block were left unsealed, with empty socket spaces missing the necessary covers.

Install covers on all unsealed electrical outlets and empty socket spaces in the Social Sciences Block to enhance safety and prevent accidental contact.

7.3 FINANCIAL SUSTAINABILITY
Summary of findings and recommendations for financial sustainability

i. Observations

- Quarterly Management Accounts were not submitted.
- Management letters of External Auditors for 2023, 2022, and 2021 were not submitted.
- Inadequate staffing in the Finance and Audit Directorates.

- Library Expenditure should be increased to support teaching and learning in line with 5% expenditure norm of GTEC. This should demand urgent attention of management.

ii. Recommendations

- KNUST has huge end-of-year cash balances and should consider appropriate safe investments to avoid holding on to idle funds.
- Lack of projection of interest income on Endowment Fund confirms non-establishment of Endowment Fund, which should claim the attention of management.
- KNUST should apprise GTEC as the regulator on major projects, particularly the West Bridge project, expected to cost US$67 million.

8.0 MEETING WITH STUDENTS

8.1 SHORTCOMINGS IDENTIFIED BY STUDENTS THAT REQUIRE ACTION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

i. STUDENTS EXPERIENCE

a. Academic Workload & Scheduling

- Level 100 courses are overly packed, disregarding students' comprehension abilities.
- Medical students face excessive stress due to short breaks (e.g., only 5 weeks off in an academic year).
- Examination timetables are overly packed, affecting performance.

b. Information management & Support

- Limited guidance on licensure examination for medical students.
- Students are unaware of procedures in place to rectify concerns with examination results.

c. Transportation

- No shuttle services for medical students traveling to hospitals for clinicals.
- Agricultural students pay for shuttle services but do not receive them.

ii.　TEACHING & LEARNING ISSUES

a.　Assessment of Teaching Staff

- Intimidating teaching styles (Especially College of Humanities and Social Sciences and College of Agriculture and Natural Resources).
- Overemphasis on theory as compared to practicals (Especially School of Veterinary Medicine, Faculty of Renewable Natural Resources - Packaging and College of Engineering).
- Lecturers fail to show up in class sometimes without prior notification.
- Outdated teaching methods (especially Engineering simulations).

b.　Practical Training Deficiencies

- Lack of field trips despite payment (Agriculture Science, Agri Biotech).
- PPEs not provided despite payment (Engineering).

c.　Student-Lecturer Interaction

- Some lecturers are hostile, and they discourage student engagement.
- There are some large class sizes which hinder meaningful interactions between teaching staff and students (especially Medical Lab. Technology, Level 100).

iii.　EXAMINATION CONCERNS
a.　Examination structure & fairness

- Unfair marks distribution to examination questions (e.g., 20/80 split for two questions only in Petroleum Engineering programme).
- Excessive number questions within a very limited time (e.g., 120 questions to be answered in 1 hour, 250 questions to be answered in 2 hours, History: 20 essays to be answered in 2 hours).

b.   **Administrative Issues**

- Changing examination timetable within short notice without putting adequate plans in place to inform students.
- Delayed release of results (especially College of Engineering).

c. Student Grievances

- Complaints from students are ignored by management.
- Students are excluded in decision-making process.

iv. LABORATORY & LIBRARY RESOURCES
a. Laboratory Shortcomings

- Laboratory spaces are inadequate.
- Inadequate equipment in some of the laboratories (especially Biomedical Engineering and Veterinary Medicine).

b. Library Deficiencies

- Books are either outdated or non-existent (College of Agriculture and Natural Resources and College of Engineering).
- Recommended books are unavailable (College of Humanities and Social Sciences).
- The library is mostly closed in the evenings and students have no access.

v. INFRASTRUCTURE & FACILITIES
a. Lecture Halls

- Overcrowding in some of the lecture halls (e.g., 600 students in a 300-capacity hall).
- Poor lighting, ventilation, and faulty audio systems in some of the lecture halls.
- CoHS library is not disability-friendly.

b. Washrooms

- Washrooms are often locked (CoHS, Agricultural Engineering).
- There are broken taps and soap/tissues are mostly unavailable.

vi. SECURITY CONCERNS

- There are often thefts/robberies due to poor lighting and weak security presence on campus.
- There were no night patrols or security posts on campus.
- Some students openly display weapons, especially in Kantaka Hall and in some cases, foreign students have been harassed/attacked.

- There is a bureaucratic CCTV retrieval process, especially when a theft has just occurred and the CCTV footage will need to be accessed as soon as possible to be able to identify the culprit.

vii. SEXUAL HARASSMENT

- A Professor teaching Medical Genetics who constantly threatens students for sexual favors.
- There was a high incidence of sexual harassment in the College of Humanities & Social Sciences.
- Most of the students indicated they had no knowledge of a policy document or steps to take in reporting incidents of sexual harassment.
- There was a general impression that management protects perpetrators, and the system lacks confidentiality and trust.
- There were limited counsellors for victims.

viii. INSTITUTIONAL AWARENESS

- The majority of students that were met by the team across the colleges do not know the University's vision/mission statements.

8.2 STUDENT RECOMMENDATIONS

- The University must ensure a balance between theory/practice (especially during the final year).
- Update laboratory equipment and teaching methods (e.g., Engineering simulations).
- There must be flexible examination timetables and fair assessment structures.
- Management must put in place structures to ensure that lecturer's performance post-assessments are addressed, and decisions taken must be communicated to students since there is a general impression that these assessments are not put to any use.
- Libraries across the Colleges must be restocked and laboratories must be equipped with current and relevant equipment.
- Improve hostel conditions and reduce the cost of renting these facilities.
- Washrooms and lecture hall infrastructure must be improved.
- Security provisions must be strengthened, especially ensuring the provision of adequate lighting and increased patrols on campus and its environments.
- A conscious effort must be made to sensitize students on policies in place to curb the incidence of sexual harassment.
- Enrollments must be aligned with available infrastructure.

Despite these challenges, most students indicated that they would recommend the University to their colleagues.

9.0   MEETING WITH NON-TEACHING STAFF

The following observations were made during the meeting with non-teaching staff:

- Most of the non-teaching staff present had worked in the University for more than 20years.
- Most of them expressed interest to continue working in the University for the next ten years.
- Most of them indicated that KNUST was a good employer.
- There were no engagements or interactions/durbars or any quarterly meetings with management.
- Staff appraisals were not done. It was only done when promotions were due.
- Non-teaching staff were made to contribute by themselves to be able to attend training programmes of retreat to discuss work matters.
- Career progression had been stalled and there were limited opportunities for non-teaching staff.
- Arrears accrued from promotions are limited to only three months on promotion does not pay but only pay three months arrears
- Management implementation on certain directives was not communicated to non-teaching staff such as the withdrawal of some allowances.

9.1   RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations were made:

- Students' disciplinary decisions should be taken as quickly as possible.
- There is the need to call for durbars often
- Council decisions should be communicated to the university community on a timely basis.

10.0 CONCLUSION

Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology (KNUST) is focused on becoming a world class education provider, nationally entrenched, regionally recognized and globally relevant. Despite the vision, KNUST is faced with some key challenges and these challenges could, as a result, have serious implications on quality teaching and learning and ensuring cost effectiveness. In light of this, KNUST needs to put in place robust strategies and framework to ensure continuous improvement in academic standards by paying attention to issues of high and low staff-student ratios across departments, strengthening of its governance systems, improving internal quality assurance systems and processes, equipping staff with skills in grantsmanship and improving its research output in order to position the University as a world class tertiary education institution.