



Executive Summary
INSTITUTIONAL AUDIT REPORT
ON THE
UNIVERSITY OF LIMPOPO

(August 2023)

© Council on Higher Education, South Africa 2023

1 Quintin Brand Street

Persequor Technopark

P.O. Box 94

Brummeria

0020

South Africa

Tel: +27 12 349 3840

Website: <http://www.che.ac.za>

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

CAE	Centre for Academic Excellence
CE	Community Engagement
CFO	Chief Financial Officer
CHE	Council on Higher Education
COVID-19	Coronavirus disease of 2019, caused by SARS-CoV (2019-nCoV) Corona Virus
CPD	Continuous Professional Development
CSCD	Centre for Student Counselling and Development
CV	Curriculum Vitae
DHET	Department of Higher Education and Training
DVC	Deputy Vice-Chancellor
EMC	Extended Management Committee
ERT	Emergency Remote Teaching
ES	Engaged Scholarship
EXCO	Executive Committee
FTE	Full-Time Equivalent
HE	Higher Education
HELTASA	Higher Education Learning and Teaching Association of South Africa
HEMIS	Higher Education Management Information System
HEQC	Higher Education Quality Council
HEQSF	Higher Education Qualifications Sub-Framework
HOD	Head of Department
HR	Human Resources
IA	Institutional Audit
ICT	Information and Communications Technology
IF	Information Technology
IPD	Institutional Planning Division
IPMS	Integrated Performance Management System
IQAF	Integrated Quality Assurance Framework
IT	Information Technology
ITS	Integrator Tertiary System
JD	Job Description

KPA	Key Performance Area
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
LMS	Learning Management System
MIS	Management Information System
NQF	National Qualifications Framework
PC	Performance Contract
PGDE	Postgraduate Diploma in Education
PM	Performance Management
PMS	Performance Management System
PoE	Portfolio of Evidence
PowerHEDA	Higher Education Data Analyser (DHET Business intelligence tool)
PQM	Programme and Qualification Mix
QA	Quality Assurance
QAF	Quality Assurance Framework (2024)
QAU	Quality Assurance Unit
QM	Quality Management
QMS	Quality Management System
RDIH	Rural Development and Innovation Hub
RLB	Respondus Lockdown Browser
RPL	Recognition of Prior Learning
SAPC	Senate Academic Planning Committee
SAQA	South African Qualifications Authority
SCM	Supply Chain Management
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SER	Self-Evaluation Report
SLP	Short Learning Programmes
SoTL	Scholarship of Teaching and Learning
SRC	Student Representative Council
T&L	Teaching and Learning
TTO	Technology Transfer Office
UAC	University Academic Calendar
UCDP	University Capacity Development Programme
UL	University of Limpopo

ULQAF	University of Limpopo Quality Assurance Framework
ULWASA	University of Limpopo women's Academic Solidarity Association
VC	Vice-Chancellor
VMGs	Vision, Mission and Goals
VPN	Virtual Private Network
WIL	Work-Integrated Learning

Executive Summary

The Council on Higher Education (CHE) was established through the Higher Education Act (No. 101 of 1997, as amended) primarily to assure quality in the South African higher education sector and to advise the Minister on aspects of higher education. The National Qualifications Framework Act (No. 67 of 2008, as amended) conferred additional responsibilities on the CHE as the Quality Council for higher education, with overall responsibility for the Higher Education Qualifications Sub-Framework (HEQSF). The CHE executes its quality assurance responsibilities through its permanent committee, the Higher Education Quality Committee (HEQC). The CHE, through the HEQC, exercises its quality assurance function using a variety of mechanisms, one of which is the institutional audits that are mandated by the Higher Education Act.

The *Framework for Institutional Audits* (2021)¹ and its attendant *Manual for Institutional Audits* (2021)² are key instruments to regulate the implementation of institutional audits. These documents are also aligned in important aspects to the new Quality Assurance Framework (QAF)³ that was approved by the HEQC and Council in September 2020, and which are being implemented in the medium term by the CHE. Institutional audits are strongly influenced by both the specific context within which each HEI works and by the national transformational agenda within which higher education functions. The HEQC has identified a need to do full audits of all HEIs in South Africa. A full audit of an institution determines whether or not, and to what extent, an institution's IQA systems, policies, and procedures ensure the effective provisioning of good quality higher education that enhances the likelihood of student success through quality learning and teaching, research opportunities, and integrated community engagement. The emphasis is less on ensuring that required standards are met at a particular threshold than on the deliberate, continuous, systematic, and measurable improvement of the student experience, as well as on building reflexive praxis to develop quality cultures in institutions.

The following principles guided the institutional audit of the University of Limpopo:

1. The primary responsibility for internal quality assurance rests with individual HEIs. Each institution is responsible for the establishment, implementation, maintenance, improvement and enhancement of its own quality management and assurance systems.
2. The uniqueness of each institution's size, shape, location, context and mission is recognised.
3. The value of institutional audits rests on the compilation of credible, contextually relevant and reliable information that is required for internal

¹ <https://www.che.ac.za/publications/frameworks/framework-institutional-audits-2021>

² <https://www.che.ac.za/publications/frameworks/manual-institutional-audits-2021>

³ <https://www.che.ac.za/publications/frameworks/quality-assurance-framework-qaf-higher-education-south-africa>

- quality-related planning and self-evaluation, peer review and public reporting (for example, by publishing executive summaries).
4. Student experience, student engagement and participation and the student voice are central to an evaluation of an institution's quality management system.
 5. The institutional audit is a peer-driven and evidence-based process to ensure that the HEQC and its audit Panel reports are transparent, informed and consistent.
 6. Institutional audits are developmental and intent on supporting continuous quality improvement and enhancement.
 7. Institutional audits are required to balance their developmental character with the regulatory requirement that the CHE and the HEQC act on poor provisioning where institutions have no clear commitments, processes, practices or plans to improve.
 8. Institutional audits are a key component of the HEQC's broad-based quality assurance mandate.

Aligned to international practice, the HEQC uses a review methodology consisting of an institutional self-evaluation report (SER), and an external peer review which verifies, triangulates, and validates the institution's self-evaluation. The external peer review consists of a document analysis of the SER and the institutional portfolio of evidence, as well as a site visit at which interviews are conducted with constituencies and physical infrastructure is visited. This audit report forms the outcome of the institutional audit of the University of Limpopo.

The SER acknowledges the University of Limpopo as a historically disadvantaged institution, born out of the purpose of extending and entrenching the apartheid ideology at the tertiary education level. The institutional history dates to 1956 when traditional leaders in the region petitioned the government for a school or college that would serve (a) the educational needs of their sons, and (b) more particularly, to develop a creative land utilisation plan for the impoverished rural inhabitants of their territories, and the College of the North was established. The University College of the North functioned under the academic tutelage of the University of South Africa.

With the passage of the Extension of the University Education Act 45 of 1959, the College of the North, together with other ethnically based educational institutions meant exclusively for "non-whites", gained university status and became known as the University of the North (UNIN).

The University of the North has a legacy of political activism and reform. The SER notes that while the socio-political system of the time and the institutional structures were unacceptable to large sectors of the black population intended to be served by the institution, there was also an acknowledgment of the fact that it provided an opportunity for the African youth to access and achieve higher education and develop a cadre of Black professionals. Students thus

registered at the institution albeit under protest, and the SER reflects proudly on the alumni and the significant contributions they have made to the national development over the years.

Flowing from a decision to restructure the national higher education sector in 2005, the University of the North was merged with the Medical University of South Africa (Medunsa), which had been established in 1975 to train black health professionals in a wide variety of health disciplines, and the University of Limpopo (UL) was born. The new University of Limpopo spanned ten years operating across two campuses namely, the Medunsa campus and the Turfloop Campus (the former UNIN). In 2013, the Minister proclaimed an intention to unbundle the Medunsa Campus from the University of Limpopo and merge it with the new Sefako Makgatho Health Sciences University and establish a new medical school at the University of Limpopo. The first student cohort for the MBChB programme at the University of Limpopo was enrolled in 2016 and successful students completed their qualifications at the end of 2021. (Prior to this, however, MBChB students graduated from the Medunsa Campus of the University of Limpopo from 2005 on.)

From 1 January 2015, the Turfloop Campus retained the name University of Limpopo. The Institutional Statute of the University of Limpopo was published in the Government Gazette No. 211 on 10 March 2017. The University of Limpopo has a Faculty of Humanities, Faculty of Management and Law, Faculty of Science and Agriculture, and a Faculty of Health Sciences (which includes the Medical School). The University is a traditional university that offers degree qualifications from Bachelors to Doctoral degrees. The University also has a few Postgraduate Diplomas in selected discipline areas. The SER emphasises that the University of Limpopo programmes remain responsive and relevant, and of such a nature that they produce students with graduate attributes appropriate for the socio-economic development agenda of the country.

The University of Limpopo continues to serve the surrounding region and the racial demographic of the University of Limpopo has remained relatively consistent over the five years under review. In 2015, 99.9% of the student population was Black and African while in 2020, 99.8% (of the student body was Black and African. While the staff component has increased from 1 066 (consisting of 51% research and instructional staff, 12% of whom were female) in 2015 to 1 418 in 2020, 47% comprise the research and instructional staff with 46% being female. There has been a material improvement towards gender parity in staffing and the SER notes that the university aims to sustain this trajectory in the coming years. The dominant nationality (99%) is South African for both staff and students who predominantly speak local African languages namely, Sesotho sa Leboa/Sepedi, Xitsonga, and Tshivenda, with English being the designated medium of instruction at the University of Limpopo.

The University of Limpopo emphasises the importance of understanding its historical *and* geographical context as explanatory of the challenges the University continually faces in pursuing its vision and strategic objectives. Concerning the geographical context, UL considers its unique location, which defines it as a rural-based institution with the majority of the students being from poor rural backgrounds with significant financial constraints. The

students are mainly from Quintile 1-3 schools around the Limpopo and Mpumalanga Provinces and a smaller number of them are from other provinces in the country as well as from countries within the SADC regions.

The evaluation of the student throughput and completion rates per programme highlights the success of the Quintile 1-3 students as comparable to that of the Quintile 4-5 students. The university underscores this achievement as a positive indication that it provides sufficient academic support to students who could otherwise be educationally disadvantaged.

The Panel acknowledges the above historical account and the geographical designation of UL as a unique background worth considering about all the developments of the institutional audit of UL.

The Panel received the University's SER from the Council on Higher Education on 16 May 2022. It held several meetings before the site visit commencing with the inception induction meeting with the CHE Director: Institutional Audits to clarify the audit process, requirements, and the outputs from the audit. The Panel then met every week to refine its processes in preparation for the audit. During its preparations, the Panel requested further information (evidence) from the University regarding matters raised in the SER, as well as that the University of Limpopo presents a self-rating score for each of the Focus Areas. The Panel further requested that the site visit schedule be populated and clarified the groups and institutional representatives that it wished to interview. There were difficulties with accessing documents embedded in the SER. All these issues were resolved.

It was further agreed by the Panel that whilst all members would study the SER, Panel members would work in teams of two (the "Focus Area team") and concentrate on a specific Focus Area according to their areas of specialist knowledge and expertise. The teams identified areas/issues to be further probed during the site visit and the composite list of identified issues was then discussed by the Panel collectively. Cognisant of the number of stakeholders to be interviewed and the time constraints, a list of questions per stakeholder group that would constructively support the purpose of the audit was prioritised. Panel members, however, retained the discretion to digress during the interviews to engage with other matters that might have arisen but were not part of the planned engagement.

The site visit took a hybrid format with two days of online meetings between the Panel and UL stakeholders (11-12 July 2022), a day of on-site face-to-face engagements (14 July 2022), and on the last day (15 July 2022), the Panel was taken on a tour of the Turfloop campus, the programme for which was developed by the institution. There was a call-back session and an open session on 14 July 2022. No stakeholders attended the open session. The preliminary feedback session was presented to the Vice Chancellor and management team of the university on 15 July 2022.

Following the site visit, the Panel commenced the preparation of the audit report processing, critically analysing information from the SER, the PoE, and the transcript of information

received during the site visit. Where reference was made to matters outside of the SER during the site visit interviews, and the evidence was provided by UL, this information was also considered in compiling the audit report. The approach to writing the Report was predicated on two pillars namely, (i) attention to detail and ensuring the correctness of the information in the Report, and (ii) ensuring that all members of the Panel approved and took ownership of the final Report.

In compiling the SER, the University responded to all four Focus Areas as stipulated in the CHE Framework and Manual with varying degrees of specificity and particularity per Standard. The information in the SER spans the period 2015-2020.

In compiling the SER, the University followed a descriptive rather than evaluative approach, which resulted in limited self-reflection. The Panel was able to probe for greater self-reflection during the site visit interviews and these reflections have been included in the report, as relevant and appropriate. On a conspectus of the available information and evidence, the Panel notes that notwithstanding its identified constraints and challenges, the University of Limpopo continues to serve as a beacon of hope and upliftment for the surrounding community and its students in the region.

The following is a summary of the audit Panel's commendations and recommendations for the University of Limpopo:

Focus area 1: Governance, strategic planning, management, and leadership support the core academic functions

The four standards in Focus Area 1 concentrate on the role that an institution's *governance, strategic planning (as contained in its vision, mission, and strategic goals), management, and academic leadership* play in its quality management to enhance the likelihood of student success and to improve the quality of learning, teaching and research engagement, as well as accommodating the results of constructive, integrated community engagement.

Standard 1: *The institution has a clearly stated vision, mission, and strategic goals which have been approved by appropriate governance structures, subject to comprehensive stakeholder engagement.*

Commendation

- a. The UL is commended for the research, community engagement, and other projects, aligned to the VMGs and Motto, noting the impact and developmental initiatives created to address the needs of local and regional communities.

Recommendation

1. It is recommended that UL conduct an impact assessment of its strategic projects regularly to ascertain return on investment in financial and institutional brand/reputation terms.

Standard 2: *The stated vision, mission, and strategic goals align with national priorities and context (e.g. transformation, creating a skilled labour force, developing scarce skills areas and a critical citizenry, and contributing to the fulfillment of national goals as informed by the NDP and related national planning), as well as sectoral, regional, continental and global imperatives (e.g. Africa Vision 2063 or the Sustainable Development Goals).*

Commendations

- b. The UL is commended for the research projects instituted that promote and further the pockets of excellence in indigenous knowledge and IKS domestically, regionally, and continentally, and more especially for its two patents for the strelitzia project (licensed) and water purification project (provisionally licensed).
- c. The UL is commended for its flagship Materials Modelling Centre of Excellence and the research work being conducted is ground-breaking on the national and global scale. The University is commended for the world-class research being conducted, the new knowledge generated in the Centre, the international partnerships and funding generated, and the opportunities that it opens for UL postgraduate students to engage with national and international projects.

Recommendations

2. It is recommended that there must be a training intervention for the Council, Executive Management, and the Institutional Forum for the various role players to understand their roles and functions vis-à-vis the transformation agenda at UL.
3. It is recommended that consideration should be given to an institutional audit on the implementation of Africanisation in the curricula across all Faculties to identify areas for improvement.

Standard 3: *There is demonstrable strategic alignment between the institution's quality management system for core academic activities across all sites and modes of provision and its vision, mission, and strategic goals, as well as its governance and management processes.*

Recommendation

4. It is recommended that an integrated Institutional Research and Innovation Strategy with a reporting system be developed to link research projects, activities, and partnerships to

the Institutional Strategy and commitments to Africanisation and transformation at UL as well as to the annual budget allocation.

Standard 4: *There is a clear understanding of and demonstrable adherence to the different roles and responsibilities of the governance structures, management, and academic leadership.*

Recommendations

5. It is recommended that the Council should always be properly constituted and that vacancies must be filled with reasonable efficiency. Vacancies of key stakeholders are contrary to the governance principles of stakeholder engagement.
6. It is recommended that the Alumni Office and Convocation need to be managed to ensure that they become active role players at UL and perform the functions expected of them. UL should develop an Alumni Engagement Plan to promote constructive engagement with its graduate cohort and ensure that the activities of the Office are relevant and attractive to the graduate members.

Focus area 2: The design and implementation of the institutional quality management system supports the core academic functions

The four standards in Focus Area 2 concentrate on how the *design and implementation of an integrated quality management system* in the institution enhances the likelihood of student success and improves the quality of learning, teaching and research engagement, as well as accommodating the results of constructive, integrated community engagement within the context of the institution's mission.

Standard 5: *A quality assurance system is in place, comprising at a minimum, of:*

- (i) *governance arrangements*
- (ii) *policies*
- (iii) *processes, procedures and plans*
- (iv) *instructional products*
- (v) *measurement of impact*
- (vi) *data management and utilisation*

as these give effect to the delivery of the HEI's core functions.

Commendations

- d. The UL is commended for evidence of some excellent research that is relevant to rural development and African context problems being carried out by some faculties. This includes amongst others, research carried out in the Department of Criminology on victim

rights, complementary and alternate medicine research, water research, and marula tree research from the Biochemistry, Microbiology, and Biotechnology departments.

- e. The UL is commended for ULWASA, which is seen as an important association that promotes mentorship and collegiality, as well as research support, to women in achieving equity and academic excellence.

Recommendations

7. It is recommended that institutional student satisfaction surveys and module surveys must be consistently implemented and regularly monitored. The results should form part of the performance discussions with the lecturing staff. In addition, there must be an embedded regime to monitor and evaluate student support initiatives to ensure value and to promote continual improvements.
8. It is recommended that UL revisit its implementation of work-integrated learning to ensure that appropriate standards are met in practice across the various Departments and that there is adherence to the norms indicated in the CHE accreditation submissions.
9. It is recommended that data analytics be used to proactively identify students at risk and make timely referrals to the CAE so that affected students may receive the necessary counseling and support. Further, an institutional process should be approved that promotes feedback between the relevant faculty and the CAE monitoring the students' progress.
10. It is recommended that research output and impact reports be carried out to determine not only the number of publications but also the journal impact factors, H-indices, patent registrations, international awards, and rankings. This should be coupled with qualitative assessments of quality and impact. These results must be included in the University's Annual Research Report each year.

Standard 6: *Human, infrastructural, knowledge management, and financial resources support the delivery of the institution's core academic functions across all sites of provision, in alignment with the concomitant quality management system, in accordance with the institution's mission.*

Recommendations

11. It is recommended that the facilities and adequacy of equipment at the mathematics and science educational laboratories specifically, but at all laboratories generally, need to be assessed, and a plan and budget for the upgrading of the infrastructure and resources be put in place (if required) for Management approval.
12. It is recommended that a comprehensive WIL policy with clearly stated practices and procedures should be developed and implemented to assist students with practical work, and experiential learning, and to prepare them to enter the job market. (See also Recommendation 8.)

13. It is recommended that Continuous Professional Development (CPD) should be embedded into the academic programme and monitored and reported on an annual basis.
14. It is recommended that, given the contradictory information regarding staff numbers and the availability of suitably competent academic staff, the University must conduct an audit of all staff qualifications to ensure that staff is adequately qualified for the levels at which they are teaching and the tasks they are performing.
15. It is recommended that an institutional review of staff wellness should be carried out to assess the impact of the online teaching stresses being experienced by the academic staff. This review process should include recommendations for addressing any wellness challenges that the staff are encountering. (See also Recommendation 30 regarding workload allocation and performance review.)
16. It is recommended that UL reconsider the institutional norm for the appointment of laboratory support staff and assess whether the current standard serves the imperatives of teaching, learning, and student support.

Standard 7: *Credible and reliable data (for example, on throughput and completion rates) are systematically captured, employed, and analysed as an integral part of the institutional quality management system so as to inform consistent and sustainable decision-making.*

Recommendations

17. It is recommended that student evaluation surveys should be carried out regularly for each module and should include lecturer assessments. The results need to be monitored and reported at least once a year to the School and Faculty Teaching and Learning Committees as part of the integrated quality assurance programme. These results must inform module design and content and be used by lecturers for self-reflection and improvement planning for the following year. The CAE should coordinate and manage this process.
18. The Panel has observed that the LMS allows for only analytics and reflection and it is recommended that urgent consideration be given to procuring an appropriate analytics package to support the LMS which will provide data analytics and reports and enable the integration of quality management into teaching and learning.
19. It is recommended that the academic leadership must be trained to use the existing management information system so that they are enabled to make informed strategic decisions for their Schools and Faculties.
20. It is recommended that regular staff satisfaction surveys should be carried out by HR and the results reported and improvement plans be monitored.
21. It is recommended that an integrated report on all community engagement projects needs to be established and updated on an annual basis.

Standard 8: *Systems and processes monitor the institution's capacity for quality management, based on the evidence gathered.*

Recommendations

22. It is recommended that the risk mitigation plans and standard operating procedures for addressing long-term disruptions should be clearly documented to prepare staff. If such a need were to arise.
23. It is recommended that quality management through data analysis, improvement planning, and continual monitoring must be embedded in the institutional management culture – and staff training must be prioritised. The institution needs to improve its processes to enable the timely dissemination of data to the relevant University departments and units, and further monitor and evaluate how the data is used to inform decision-making processes.

Focus area 3: The coherence and integration of the institutional quality management system supports the core academic functions

The four standards in Focus Area 3 concentrate on the coherence and integration of the various components comprising the institutional quality management system and on how these work in concert to support the likelihood of student success and improve the quality of learning, teaching and research engagement, as well as accommodating the results of constructive integrated community engagement in accordance with the institution's mission.

Standard 9: *An evidence-based coherent, reasonable, functional, and meaningfully structured relationship exists between all components of the institutional quality management system.*

Recommendations

24. It is recommended that all staff receive training to conceptually understand quality assurance, its integration, its management, and the importance of regular monitoring. Integrated quality management must be considered at all levels across disciplines, Schools, Departments, and Faculties.
25. It is recommended that a centralised, systematic, well-structured IQMS that incorporates all the core functions of the University needs to be implemented, with monitoring and evaluation processes in place. This system must integrate all relevant policies relating to teaching and learning, research, and community engagement.
26. It is recommended that policies and actions linked to Community Engagement should be institutionalised centrally. Engaged scholarship training programmes need to be undertaken across the institution. The policy should include a section on the legislation and rights of vulnerable communities to ensure that all staff and students have the appropriate knowledge and skills when working with these vulnerable communities.
27. It is recommended that ongoing training and awareness programmes regarding the status and implementation of the new IPMS Policy must be presented to all staff so that misconceptions can be ventilated, discussed, and addressed.
28. It is recommended that quality management and reporting should be standing items on the agenda of *all* quarterly management and governance meetings, and the minutes of

these meetings should reflect the discussions and how quality assurance matters are being monitored. Concomitantly, UL should ensure that all staff (including the academic management) are aware of and understand their reporting and accounting obligations. The management performance indicators should include the implementation and application of such practices to enable and promote quality management at UL.

Standard 10: *Evidence-based regular and dedicated governance and management oversight of the quality assurance system exists.*

Recommendation

29. It is recommended that UL establish clear monitoring and reporting mechanisms for all relevant staff up to the executive management level in order to effectively report on and account for quality management to their line managers. The established mechanisms should include strategies to identify and deal with QMS-related non-compliance.

Standard 11: *Planning and processes exist for the reasonable and functional allocation of resources to all components of the institutional quality management system.*

Recommendations

30. It is recommended that UL develop a comprehensive systems-enabled workload allocation model, which integrates all facets of the academic project. The norms must: (i) promote a fair allocation of work across staff members in a department; (ii) support a principle of sustainable workloads for academic staff; (iii) ensure that there is no 'exploitation' of the junior academic staff and ensure that all staff has a reasonable and responsible workload allocation; and (iv) take cognisance of the situation in the Health Sciences and establish appropriate standards for staff carrying a dual function of clinical and teaching responsibilities as this will alleviate the high workload on certain staff members that adversely impacts the overall academic performance at UL, as well as on individual staff growth and development opportunities. Furthermore, UL should pay heed to strike a balance between junior and senior academics' commitments at undergraduate levels in teaching and learning, ensuring appropriate mentoring for junior staff, and creating space for junior academics to engage in research and community engagement. (See also Recommendation 15.)

31. It is recommended that an institutional academic culture survey should take place (ideally facilitated by an external vendor) that reviews staff wellness and the impact of the workload stresses that are being experienced by some academic staff, as well as other factors identified in the discussion under the previous Standards.

Standard 12: *The quality assurance system achieves its purpose efficiently and effectively.*

Recommendations

32. It is recommended that UL develop and implement a comprehensive and integrated quality

assurance framework which includes clear parameters for the monitoring of resources allocated to the QMS to ensure that these resources are used for the intended purposes. Monitoring of the implementation of the framework should be a function of all the governance structures to facilitate a combined assurance model for quality management at UL.

33. It is recommended that UL proactively plan for projected student enrolments, infrastructure needs, and resources (including staff and facilities) to ensure that the student experience and academic project are not compromised and that adequate numbers of qualified staff are appointed to offer a quality academic project.

Focus area 4: Curriculum development, learning, and teaching support the likelihood of student success

The four standards in Focus Area 4 concentrate on how effectively the institutional quality management system enhances the likelihood of student success, improves learning and teaching, and supports the scholarship of learning and teaching. These standards drill down in greater detail in Focus Area 2.

Standard 13: An effective institutional system for programme design, approval, delivery, management, and review is in place.

Recommendations

34. It is recommended that UL develop, document, and implement clear systems and processes for the HoDs and other relevant institutional structures to follow in validating and monitoring the consistency between the module/programmes being implemented, and the programme purpose and outcomes articulated in the accreditation applications.
35. It is recommended that UL develop and put in place institutional, context-adapted guidelines for academics for the teaching and learning, and assessment, including online provisioning of the academic project during times of disruption, to ensure ongoing quality of implementation and monitoring. In this process, UL must pertinently consider norms for the quality of teaching and learning in modules that include practical/experiential learning. (See also Recommendations 8 and 12.)
36. It is recommended that the institutional assessment strategies, policies, and procedures should be reviewed to include provisions for credible assessment during times of disruption, including online provisioning.
37. It is recommended that UL identify and put in place, as part of its programme management provisions, clear information management systems and processes to monitor teaching and learning, student academic experience, success, and retention, both (i) if it intends to persist with online teaching and learning, and (ii) specifically, during times of disruption.

Standard 14: *There is evidence-based engagement at various institutional levels, among staff, and among staff and students, with:*

- a. *curriculum transformation, curriculum reform, and renewal;*
- b. *learning and teaching innovation; and*
- c. *the role of technology (1) in the curriculum, (2) in the world of work, and (3) in society in general.*

Recommendations

38. It is recommended that UL develop and implement an institutional engagement strategy to facilitate the shared understanding of and positioning of the scholarship of teaching and learning at the institution.
39. It is recommended that curriculum transformation, reform, and renewal, as well as learning and teaching innovation (including academic literacies and language support) must be foregrounded at UL and become standing items in the formal agendas of the institutional teaching and learning management and governance structures/committees to ensure effective engagement and monitoring. As such:
 - (i) UL must develop and implement a clear curriculum renewal framework and/or guidelines to drive the alignment with the institutional VMGs; and
 - (ii) UL must develop and implement a structured curriculum strategy for purposes of epistemological access provisioning, and clearly establish the relevant norms for institution-wide implementation that include academic literacy and language support.

Standard 15: *The students' exposure to learning and teaching at the institution, across all sites and modes of provision, is experienced as positive and enabling of their success.*

Recommendations

40. It is recommended that UL institute a student success framework/strategy and ensure consistent implementation of institutionally approved norms and processes across all faculties and in all Schools. The framework/strategy should encompass all the student success interventions, including modules-, students-, and any programmes-at-risk; and ensure that relevant data and reports are used to inform improvements in curriculum delivery, teaching and learning, and student experience and success.
41. It is recommended that UL develop and implement standardised norms and processes for the evaluation of teaching, including teaching evaluations by peers, and student evaluation surveys to further enhance teaching and learning and student success. In addition to the monitoring and evaluation practices, the norms must make express provision that guarantees feedback to the students on the improvements implemented because of their inputs from the completed surveys.

42. It is recommended that UL develop an Awareness Plan and Strategy to enable and promote the dissemination of information that will better facilitate students' awareness and understanding of the student support, wellness- and psychosocial services available at the University.
43. It is recommended that UL consider the introduction of a Service Practice Charter that informs its service culture. The Charter should specify the principles, and standards of service and characterising the interactions of staff with students and other institutional stakeholders, to ensure that the goals are commonly understood, shared, and implemented.

Standard 16: *Institutions engage with and reflect on the employability of their graduates in a changing world.*

Recommendations

44. It is recommended that UL institute a comprehensive graduate employability/destination survey (building on the 2019 pilot project) that will accumulate data that is representative of UL's graduate profile and programmes. The study should monitor and track (a) graduates entering the world of work, (b) graduates continuing with postgraduate study at UL, and (c) graduates continuing with postgraduate study at other universities. It is also important for UL to understand (and address) the reasoning behind why many students continue to postgraduate study.
45. It is recommended that UL implement a periodic graduate desirability evaluation instrument that gauges employers' perceptions of UL graduates.