

External Evaluators' Report

EXTERNAL EVALUATORS' REPORT ON THE NAME OF THE INSTITUTION

APPLICATION FOR INSTITUTIONAL ACCREDITATION

BY

THE GRENADA NATIONAL ACCREDITATION BOARD (GNAB)

First Floor, Building #12
Church Street
St. George
Grenada
T: +473 435-1970/+473 440-3204
Email: gnaboffice@accreditation.gd
www.accreditation.gd



Assurance Section

Name of Institution

ASSURANCE SECTION

REPORT OF A COMPREHENSIVE SITE VISIT

TO

NAME OF INSTITUTION

DATE

FOR

INSTITUTIONAL ACCREDITATION

 \mathbf{BY}

THE GRENADA NATIONAL ACCREDITATION BOARD (GNAB)



Evaluation Team	Name	Signature
Team Chair:		
Members:		



Contents

- I. CONTEXT AND NATURE OF VISIT
- II. COMMITMENT TO EXTERNAL REVIEW
- III. FULFILLMENT OF THE CRITERIA

Criterion One

Criterion Two

Criterion Three

Criterion Four

Criterion Five

IV. STATEMENT ON THE STATUS TO BE AWARDED



I. CONTEXT AND NATURE OF VISIT

This section provides background information on the university including its most recent history with respect to external review by GNAB. It briefly discusses general information on the purpose of the visit and summarizes the main evaluation activities conducted by the team such as its meetings with key personnel and campus tours etc.



II. COMMITMENT TO PEER REVIEW

This section briefly discusses the team's general assessment about the extent to which (from the evidence presented is the written submission and during the site visit) the institution demonstrated commitment to external review as part of its Quality Management System. The following areas are normally addressed in the team's comments:

- a. Comprehensiveness of the Self-Study Process
- b. Integrity of the Self-Study Report submitted



III. FULFILLMENT OF THE CRITERIA

In this section, the team prepares evaluative statements, which indicate the extent to which the evidence presented in the report and site visit satisfies each standard. An evaluative statement must be prepared for <u>each standard</u> and placed into one of four categories as follows:

- I. Evidence that Standards are surpassed
- II. Evidence that standards are met
- III. Evidence that one of more specified standards requires institutional attention to meet Standard
- IV. Evidence that one or more specified standards are not met and requires follow-up by GNAB

The evaluative statement should be placed in the appropriate category as shown below:

Criterion 3.0: TEACHING & LEARNING

The institution demonstrates faculty effectiveness and achievement of desired student learning outcomes. It is achieving its educational goals and can continue to do so

Evidence that standards are met

3.1 The institution undertakes academic planning and periodic evaluation of its programmes to maintain relevance and academic quality.

The institution has properly defined and documented processes for the design, approval, monitoring and review of its academic programmes. We reviewed the documents in which these processes are set out, and found them to be robust and in accordance with good practice in higher education around the world. In the course of our visits to campus(es), we asked faculty to give accounts of their experience of submitting programmes to the approval process. The processes were generally well understood, and were regarded as robust.

The processes are due to be reviewed, in the light of extensive use of them since their first introduction. This is sensible, as any process is bound to have scope for revision to secure greater efficiency, in the light of experience.

Evidence that one or more specified standards need institutional attention



3.2 The institution's programme documents are developed and published to provide appropriate information to learners and other stakeholders

Clear programme specifications result from the programme approval process, and although the institution's prospectus is the primary source of information on programme objectives, learning outcomes and entry requirements, it is not always readily available. There is evidence of some delays in the printing and publishing of programme documents after new programmes are introduced or the existing programme is revised.

Recommendation of the Team

Criterion is met; however, there is evidence that standard 3.2 needs institutional attention. Implementation of a more effective system is required to ensure that when changes are made to the institution's programmes, the prospectus is revised in a timely manner.

REPEAT ABOVE FOR EACH INSTITUTIONAL ACCREDITATION STANDARD



IV. STATEMENT ON THE STATUS TO BE AWARDED

In this section, the team produces an evaluative statement called the Rationale for Recommendation which makes a recommendation to GNAB on the status to be awarded. The *Rationale for Decision Outcomes on Accreditation (IACC 2.4)* should guide the overall Rationale for Recommendation. Should the recommendation be to award the status, this section will also state: what level of degree the institution is permitted to offer; the campuses of sites approved; whether it is permitted to offer distance programmes; and whether any special conditions are prescribed. Additionally, the team makes a statement in this section on any required reports or focused site visits before the next scheduled comprehensive site evaluation. The team may also recommend a sanction or adverse action such as Probation. These are detailed in the *Guidelines on Sanctions and Adverse Actions* (GENP 7.2). The following are included in this section:

a. Rationale for recommendation.

An evaluation statement which makes the recommendation to GNAB on the status to be awarded.

b. Degrees awarded

A statement on the level of degrees the institution is allowed to awarded following its evaluation.

c. Approval of degree sites

A statement on the campuses or sites covered under the accreditation

d. Approval of distance education degree

A statement on whether the institution is permitted to offer distance programmes.

e. Special Conditions

This outlines any special conditions which the institution must comply with as part of the status awarded.

f. Reports required

A statement on whether any progress or monitoring reports are required based on one or more recommendations related to the fulfillment of the criteria.

g. Sanction or Adverse Action



An evaluative statement on whether any sanction or adverse action is recommended related to evidence that one or more specified standards are not met and require Council follow-up.

E. Next scheduled Visit

A statement on the timeframe for the next comprehensive site evaluation.



ADVANCEMENT SECTION

REPORT OF A COMPREHENSIVE SITE VISIT

TO

Name of Institution

Campus visited

Date

FOR
INSTITUTIONAL ACCREDITATION

EVALUATION TEAM

Team Chair: Members:



Contents

- I. OVERALL OBSERVATIONS ABOUT THE INSTITUTION
- II. CONSULTATION OF THE TEAM



I. OVERALL OBSERVATIONS ABOUT THE ORGANISATION

In this section the team provides general comments about the institution. It recognizes the work of the institution in conducting its self-study and producing its report. It also applauds the institution for those areas which have shown strength and improvement since the previous visit. Additionally, it highlights any areas where there may be need for improvement and strengthening. This section should be congruent with the Assurance Section of the report.



II. CONSULTATION OF THE TEAM

In this section the team makes general suggestions with respect to the criteria and standards which can assist the institution in its improvement efforts.

END OF REPORT