COUNCIL ON HIGHER EDUCATION

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INSTITUTIONAL AUDIT REPORT ON THE UNIVERSITY OF MPUMALANGA

(8 November 2024)

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**

Acronyms and Abbreviations

APP   Annual Performance Plan
ASSU   Academic Support Services Unit
ARIT   Audit, Risk, and Information Technology
ARS   Academic Registration System
CE   Community Engagement
CESM   Categorization of Educational Subject Matter
CHE   Council on Higher Education
DQMD   Director: Quality Management Directorate
DHET   Department of Higher Education & Training
DLT   Directorate of Learning & Teaching
DRI   Directorate of Research Development & Innovation
DVC   Deputy Vice-Chancellor
DVC: T & L Deputy Vice-Chancellor: Teaching and Learning
DVC: R & I Research, Internationalization
FTE   Full-Time Equivalent
IF   Institutional Forum
IT   Information Technology
IPO   Institutional Portfolio of Evidence
ITS   Integrated Tertiary Software
HEDA   Higher Education Data Analyser
HEIs   Higher Education Institutions
HEMIS   Higher Education Management Information System
HEQC   Higher Education Quality Committee
HEQSF   Higher Education Qualifications Sub-Framework
HoD   Head of Department
ICT   Information and Communications Technology
IPE   Institutional Portfolio of Evidence
IRP   Institutional Research & Planning
LCA   Lowveld College of Agriculture
ManCo   Management Committee
NQF   National Qualifications Framework
PQM   Programme and Qualification Mix
QA   Quality Assurance
QAD   Quality Assurance Directorate
QAF   Quality Assurance Framework
QMA   Quality Management & Assurance
QMS   Quality Management System

RIP	Research, Innovation and Partnerships
SER	Self-Evaluation Report
SAQA	South African Qualifications Authority
SLTC	Senate Learning & Teaching Committee
SoTL	Scholarship of Teaching & Learning
SRC	Student Representative Council
UCDG	University Capacity Development Grant
UMP	University of Mpumalanga
VC	Vice-Chancellor
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 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 with important aspects of the new Quality Assurance Framework (QAF)[3] that was approved by the HEQC and Council in September 2020 and which will be 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 Mpumalanga (UMP):

---

[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

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 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 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 Mpumalanga.

A Brief Overview of the Institution

The SER describes the UMP as an "African University rooted in its home province of Mpumalanga". The university prides itself on being locally relevant and globally competitive. Established in 2013, UMP became one of the two youngest, post-apartheid universities in South Africa, the other being Sol Plaatje University. It thus typifies the ideal of an inclusive, non-racial, non-sexist, transformed, and democratic South Africa.

In establishing the University, the Lowveld College of Agriculture (LCA) was incorporated, effective 1 January 2015. The University operates on two campuses, one in Mbombela and the

other in Siyabuswa, about 300km apart. The Siyabuswa campus houses the Faculty of Education, following the integration of the former Kwa-Ndebele College of Education into UMP.

The interim council was appointed by the Minister of Higher Education and Training in 2013, whilst the substantive Council took a foothold in 2014.

The foundation executive management team was appointed by the Council in 2014, led by the Vice-Chancellor, Professor Thoko Mayekiso. Others comprised the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic), Professor Ric Bernard, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Planning and Institutional Support), Professor Richmond Howard, and the Registrar, Mr Sello Legodi. Under the leadership of the inaugural Vice-Chancellor, the Management Committee (ManCo) members, namely the Executive Director: Finance, Executive Director: Human Resources, Dean of Students, and Director of Siyabuswa campus, were appointed in 2015.

The University opened its doors to students in 2014, starting with three programmes in conjunction with partner universities, after accreditation by CHE and programme-approval by SAQA. The programmes included the Bachelor of Education (Foundation Phase Teaching), developed in partnership with the University of Johannesburg (UJ) and offered at the Siyabuswa Campus. The third programme was the Bachelor of Agriculture in Agricultural Extension and Rural Resources.

Management courses were developed in partnership with the University of KwaZulu-Natal (UKZN) and offered from the Mbombela Campus of UMP. A Diploma in Hospitality Management was developed with the University of Johannesburg. Devoid of suitable facilities to offer the courses at the Mbombela campus, the Mpumalanga Regional Training Trust (MRTT) facility at KaNyamazane was used between 2014 and 2017.

The founding Senate, appointed in 2014 for two years, consisted of professors drawn from the University of KwaZulu-Natal (UKZN), the University of Pretoria (UP), the University of the Witwatersrand (Wits) and other institutions such as the Agriculture Research Council (ARC). By 2017, following senior staff appointments, the Senate comprised UMP staff only.

All academic, support, and governance structures are fully established and functional. Institutional culture is uniform and consistent across campuses. Well-maintained student accommodation and recreational facilities abound. Accommodation is allocated based on merit, serving as an excellent motivation for students. Postgraduate students are assigned self-contained accommodation in some wings of residences. Students and staff expressed happiness over the situation at the university and unequivocally attested to the quality of effective and efficient leadership and the management of resources. The enormous infrastructural facilities; road networks, accessibility to buildings, the hotel school, Centre for Entrepreneurial Studies, Libraries, state-of-the-art lecture

halls, auditoriums, computer centres, and laboratories corroborated these expressions of satisfaction.

Work Integrated Learning, credit accumulation units, articulation possibilities, programme managers and advisors, engagement, transportation, and logical coherence of activities on both campuses are deeply entrenched. The completed and ongoing infrastructural projects within a matter of ten years are exemplary.

The general administration of financial aid (including NSFAS bursaries) was applauded, but students requested the establishment of a more permanent financial aid office at the Siyabuswa campus. Students, while trumpeting the great strides of the University over the last ten years, canvassed the need for dedicated residences for postgraduate students in addition to making Siyabuswa a university town.

After dealing with the historical antecedents and challenges, the summary of the findings, commendations, and recommendations for the UMP are presented below:

The audit processes

In executing the audit, the panel relied on the institution's Self Evaluation Report (SER), which had been submitted through the CHE before the commencement of the audit. The SER reflects UMP's Vision "To be an African University leading in creating opportunities for sustainable development through innovation", its Mission "to offer high-quality education and training opportunities that foster the holistic development of students through teaching and learning, research and scholarship, and engagement, in collaboration with strategic partners", as well as the seven values of "excellence, integrity, diversity, collaboration, adaptability, relevance, and inspiration." The SER is balanced, articulating the antecedents of the institution, the status quo, and future perspectives, especially against the backdrop of the fourth industrial revolution (4IR) and the future of work.

The panel held a series of meetings to review, triangulate, and authenticate the self-evaluation report and formulate questions for the audit site visit, as stipulated in the HEQC's protocol for institutional audits.

The reviews, triangulation, and authentication comprised critical analysis of the SER and the institutional portfolio of evidence (IPE), as well as interview sessions with diverse groups in the academic and support structures, including students, alumni, convocation and council, and site

visits to both campuses at Mbombela and Siyabuswa to glean informed information on physical infrastructure.

The panel requested additional information and supporting evidence before, during, and after the site visit. The online, hybrid, and physical site visit spanned 22- 26 May 2023.

Conclusion

As a young university, the UMP has made remarkable progress in the core areas of teaching and learning, research, innovation, post-graduate studies, and community engagement. Considerable progress has also been made in the support services of finance, the registrar's division, human resources, security, infrastructure, marketing, and communications, amongst others.

The demonstrable increase in curricular offerings of different programmes, the rapid increase of student numbers at undergraduate and postgraduate levels, the establishment of a hotel that also serves as a hotel school, the demonstrable evidence of work-integrated learning, state-of-the-art residences and recreational facilities, a good network of roads on campuses, cohesion among staff and students, attest to a university that has a solid foothold from which to consolidate its gains and achieve formidable international recognition and acclaim. The University is commended for this multum-in-parvo of achievements.

The panel recommends that the university draft an institutional implementation plan for this report, detailed in an institutional implementation manual.

The report presented here constitutes the outcome of the institutional audit of the UMP.

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.

UMP's approach to strategic planning is marked by inclusivity and engagement with various stakeholders. The institution developed its first strategic plan, UMP Vision 2022, which was followed by the development of UMP Vision 2030. These plans were crafted through an extensive consultation process, involving both internal and external stakeholders. The consultation process was thorough, comprising face-to-face meetings, online discussions, questionnaires, and individual interviews. This iterative approach allowed for a shared understanding of UMP Vision 2030 among stakeholders, reflecting their inputs and co-ownership.

Recommendation

1) The panel recommends that UMP develop a repository system for its iQMS, which should integrate the practice of archiving institutional records for all its core functions.

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 fulfilment 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).

UMP's vision, mission, and strategic goals are in alignment with national, provincial, and local priorities. The institution pays attention to local, provincial, and national development challenges, including socio-economic issues in the Mpumalanga Province. These priorities inform UMP's programme offerings, staff- and student-recruitment strategies, and initiatives such as Work Integrated Learning (WIL). However, the SER lacks clarity on how UMP incorporates broader, global perspectives, as indicated by the "steering documents" referenced in the SER.

Recommendation

2) The panel recommends that the university should demonstrate how its collaborative endeavours transcend national boundaries, especially in the context of Africa Vision 2063 and the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals.

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.

UMP has established a robust quality management system that extends from the strategic plan down to individual staff members' performance agreements. The institution's quality assurance framework covers core academic activities, including teaching, research, and engagement. This system is integrated into policy development, procedures, and manuals, with Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) aligned to policy frameworks approved by the ManCo. Performance management at UMP is meticulous, extending to 360-degree evaluations for executives. The university's approach to performance management ensures that staff members are aligned with institutional goals. Some disparities between the two campuses of the University do exist.

Recommendations

3) The panel recommends that infrastructural facilities and other services at the Siyabuswa campus should be improved to maximise the student experience and academic integrity.
4) The panel recommends that staff and students at the Siyabuswa campus be enabled to participate in institutional events fully.

Standard 4

There is a clear understanding of and demonstrable adherence to the distinct roles and responsibilities of the governance structures, management, and academic leadership.

UMP demonstrates a clear understanding of the roles and responsibilities of its governance structures, management, and academic leadership. The Institutional Forum (IF) serves as an advisory body, comprising diverse stakeholders from unions, students, Senate, Council, and Convocation. The IF actively contributes to shaping the institution's culture, including through

workshops on a staff code of conduct and engagement with the university's values. It collaborates with other bodies to advocate for specific agendas. UMP's academic leadership structure is well-defined, with responsibilities cascading from the Vice-Chancellor to programme coordinators. This clear delineation empowers individuals at various levels of responsibility.

Recommendations

5) The panel recommends that UMP consider developing strategic indicators for measuring the effectiveness and efficiency of its governance structures.
6) The panel recommends that UMP should investigate using a self-evaluation instrument to determine the performance levels of the Council, such as the Governance Indicators Scorecard for Councils of South African Public Higher Education Institutions, developed by the Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET)

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.

Quality Assurance (QA) is central to the institution's academic activities. The institution has instituted measures to ensure that QA permeates all boundaries. Policies, procedures, and processes are well-articulated, and implementation is anchored on establishing the QA system, Quality Management System (QMS) manual, driven by Academic Planning and the Quality Assurance (APQA) unit.

Commendation

a) The number of new programmes introduced by UMP in less than eight years of its existence is commendable.

Recommendations

7) It is recommended that UMP develops, implements, monitor, and evaluates a road map or strategy for quality assurance in support structures.
8) It is recommended that UMP should prioritise staffing of the Quality Assurance Directorate (QAD).

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.

During the site visits of both campuses, the panel observed state-of-the-art lecture venues, examination venues, auditoriums, computer laboratories, and physics-, chemistry-, biology- and microbiology laboratories with state-of-the-art- equipment. Given the size and curricula offerings, academic and support staff are best prepared to ensure effective service delivery of the core mandates. At various levels, ranging from departments to schools and faculties, the calibre of staff is such that the various committees are populated with experienced and senior academics. The Teaching and Learning Committee, Research Committee, Promotions Committee, and Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee meet periodically to drive and sustain university functions.

As detailed in the SER, the financial resources are sufficient to guarantee the QMS's planning, implementation, improvement, and monitoring. ICT infrastructure and related services are well-developed, coordinated, and managed.

Commendation

b) UMP is commended for its state-of-the-art infrastructure and learning facilities at Mbombela campus, including ICT services and a fully functional hotel and hotel school.

Recommendation

9) The panel recommends that UMP provides standby generators at the Siyabuswa campus to mitigate the impact of load shedding and to enhance Wi-Fi coverage.

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 to inform consistent and sustainable decision-making.

UMP has developed and maintained a series of data management systems that provide credible information on student progression. The ARS contains valuable student data that the university can use to allocate resources to student interventions to support student learning. Appropriate student access to monitoring their own progress on the ITS could enhance student agency in their academic journey.

Recommendations

10) The panel recommends that UMP develop an improvement plan to implement the range of academically at-risk interventions.
11) The panel recommends that UMP should grant appropriate ITS access to students to view their academic status, thus enabling them to actively participate in monitoring their own progress and taking advantage of the interventions offered by the university to seek timeous academic support.

Standard 8

Systems and processes monitor the institution's capacity for quality management based on the evidence gathered.

UMP has systems and processes that monitor its capacity for quality management based on evidence gathered. However, the roles of individual academic staff in the annual quality monitoring processes are not clearly articulated, including how they use data to enhance student success at module levels and how their reflections feed into programme, school, and faculty reporting processes. UMP also needs to improve its student engagement mechanisms which will result in the development of terms of reference for class representatives that will also clearly outline the process for their nomination and training. This will also create a transparent process of which the SRC will be aware.

Commendation

c) UMP is commended for developing formal contingency plans and implementing strategies to deal effectively with the COVID-19 pandemic without disruptions to the academic calendar as well as upholding the academic integrity of the institution despite its young age.

Recommendations

12) The panel recommends that UMP ensure that data sets and information are readily available to academics for planning and decision-making purposes at the module- and programme levels. The role of annual reflections by lecturers should also be fully articulated to demonstrate how they contribute to enhancing student success at module- and programme levels.

13) The panel recommends that UMP develop an implementation handbook for student engagement in quality assurance and promotion. This should be aligned with the 'Good Practice Guide on Student Engagement in Quality Assurance and Promotion in Higher Education', published by the Council on Higher Education (CHE) in February 2023.

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.

A reasonable, functional, coherent, evidence-based meaningfully structured relationship exists between all components of the UMP's IQMS. However, there are a few areas that need to be strengthened. These include the appointment of the two DVCs, namely the DVC Teaching & Learning (T&L) and the DVC Research, Innovation and Partnerships (RIP) the development of formal processes for the monitoring and review of community engagement as well as developing

a repository system for all institutional records, including the documents that emanate from all quality assurance processes.

Recommendations

14) The panel recommends that UMP develop guidelines to monitor and review community engagement.
15) The panel recommends that UMP expedite the appointment of both the DVC: Teaching and Learning and DVC: Research, Innovation and Partnerships.

Standard 10

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

Evidence-based, regular, and dedicated governance- and management oversight of the quality assurance system exists at UMP. There are explicit reporting processes in the governance structures for teaching and learning as well as for research and innovation. However, the governance processes are impacted by having two vacancies for the DVC positions (as alluded to in Standard 9). The absence of quality assurance processes and reviews for support services also needs to be addressed.

Recommendations

16) The panel recommends that UMP strengthen its platforms on which good practices across the diverse areas of quality assurance can be shared, internally and externally. These may include public lectures, webinars, or seminars presented by the awardees to share their practices which will encourage and inspire other colleagues.
17) The panel recommends that UMP merge the quality assurance and enhancement policy, and the policy on developing new academic programmes into one overarching policy on quality assurance. The University should also develop implementation manuals to accompany this policy.

Standard 11

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

Planning and processes exist at UMP for the reasonable and functional allocation of resources for all the components of the IQMS. However, the approval and allocation of resources for new programmes need to be strengthened. This also relates to the allocation of workload for both academics and professional support staff, effectively covered in the institutional policy on workload allocation.

Recommendations

18) It is recommended that UMP develop guidelines for allocating and approving resources for proposed academic programmes and other quality assurance reviews.
19) It is recommended that UMP develop guidelines on workload allocation for staff in support services.
20) It is recommended that UMP ensure equitable distribution of support staff at both campuses.

Standard 12

The quality assurance system achieves its purpose efficiently and effectively.

The university efficiently allocates resources, supported by a strong audit record. The Mbombela campus exemplifies effective resource utilisation, with leadership from ManCo and experienced staff. Staff undergo transparent performance appraisals, but adaptation is needed for the growing workforce. Expansion of the Health Clinic is essential, and stakeholder engagement should inform partnerships. The University's commitment to provincial needs includes Work-Integrated Learning and student entrepreneurial opportunities.

Commendation

d) UMP is commended for unqualified audits from independent auditing firms since 2014.

Recommendation

21) It is recommended that UMP provide guidelines for evaluating WIL partnerships that incorporate the input of the industry partners.

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.

The UMP has clear and concrete procedures which are followed in programme-design, development, approval, delivery, and review. There is also good coherence between the intentions articulated during accreditation applications and the implemented programmes.

Recommendation

> 22) It is recommended that UMP clearly describe and define the oversight role of the QAD in design and development, approval, delivery, and review of academic programmes.

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.*

The UMP has put in place satisfactory structures, policies, and procedures to address curriculum transformation, curriculum reform, and renewal. Examples of these include extensive debates with the general community and other stakeholders on matters of curriculum transformation in respect of decolonisation and the integration of technology. Based on the SER, the interviews, and site visits, there is evidence that discussions around curriculum renewal and transformation occur through formal structures such as the Academic Project sub-committee of the

Transformation Committee. In addition, Advisory Boards are used for career-oriented programmes such as the Diploma in Agriculture and Diploma in Hospitality Management.

Recommendations

23) It is recommended that UMP establishes well-defined programmes, activities, and distinct reporting structures for the Transformation Committee.
24) It is recommended that UMP develops a clear culture compact which demonstrates extensive consultation with stakeholders.
25) It is recommended that UMP implements a compulsory Academic Support Programme for students with identified gaps in English Language proficiency.

Standard 15

The student's exposure to learning and teaching at the institution, across all sites and modes of provision, is experienced as positive and enabling of their success.

The UMP has put in place structures, policies and procedures to enhance the students` experience of teaching and learning. Examples of this include the involvement of students in the teaching and learning process through the Class Representative System and the Student Evaluation of Teaching. Additionally, there are Academic Officers who work with class representatives to improve the connection between students on the one hand, and the lecturers on the other. Another example is the existence of structures for handling students' complaints like the quarterly meetings between MANCO and SRC, as well as the monthly meetings between the Student Representative Council (SRC) and the Dean of Students. There are structures for students to channel their appeals. There is recognition of the different types of appeals and the existence of different pathways for handling these. For instance, academic appeals are handled differently from those which are of a disciplinary nature.

Recommendation

26) The panel recommends that UMP develops a formal process for handling and responding to postgraduate students` feedback.

Standard 16

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

Given that UMP is a young university, it is in the process of implementing graduate destination surveys. Likewise, the UMP is in the process of collecting and analysing data on the employability of its graduates. It established the Convocation and its Executive in 2018 to provide a link between the University and its alumni.

Recommendation

27) The panel recommends that UMP finalise the processes for tracking and conducting research on graduate employability.